AGENDA
SAN BRUNO CITY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING - CLOSED SESSION
January 8, 2019
6:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: San Bruno Senior Center, 1555 Crystal Springs Road, San Bruno, CA

City Council meetings are conducted in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised and City Council Rules of Procedure. All regular Council meetings are recorded and televised on CATV Channel 1 and replayed the following Thursday, at 2:00 pm. Recordings of the City Council meetings are available for listening at the City Clerk’s Office and video of the City Council meetings may be viewed at www.sanbruno.ca.gov. Audio CDs with recordings of City Council meetings may be purchased at the City Clerk’s office, or may be listened to at the San Bruno Library. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals requiring reasonable accommodations or appropriate alternative formats for notices, agendas and records for this meeting should notify us 48 hours prior to meeting. Please call the City Clerk’s Office 650-616-7061, or email your request to Melissa Thurman, City Clerk at mthurman@sanbruno.ca.gov.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA
   Individuals allowed three minutes, groups in attendance, five minutes. It is the Council’s policy to refer matters raised in this forum to staff for investigation and/or action where appropriate. The Brown Act prohibits the Council from discussing or acting upon any matter not agendized pursuant to State Law.

4. CLOSED SESSION:
   a. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation
      • Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code § 54956(d)(2), One Case

5. ADJOURNMENT:
   The next Regular City Council Meeting will be held on January 8, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the Senior Center, 1555 Crystal Springs Road, San Bruno.

Posted Pursuant to Law 01/04/19
AGENDA
SAN BRUNO CITY COUNCIL
January 8, 2019
7:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: San Bruno Senior Center, 1555 Crystal Springs Road, San Bruno, CA

City Council meetings are conducted in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order Newly Revised and City Council Rules of Procedure. All regular Council meetings are recorded and televised on CATV Channel 1 and replayed the following Thursday, at 2:00 pm. Recordings of the City Council meetings are available for listening at the City Clerk's Office and video of the City Council meetings may be viewed at www.sanbruno.ca.gov. Audio CDs with recordings of City Council meetings may be purchased at the City Clerk’s office, or may be listened to at the San Bruno Library. In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals requiring reasonable accommodations or appropriate alternative formats for notices, agendas and records for this meeting should notify us 48 hours prior to meeting. Please call the City Clerk's Office 650-616-7061, or email your request to Melissa Thurman, City Clerk at mthurman@sanbruno.ca.gov.

Thanks to the San Bruno Garden Club for providing the floral arrangement.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:
   Individuals allowed three minutes, groups in attendance, five minutes. It is the Council's policy to refer matters raised in this forum to staff for investigation and/or action where appropriate. The Brown Act prohibits the Council from discussing or acting upon any matter not agendized pursuant to State Law.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATIONS
   a. The City of San Bruno State of the City Address will be held on Tuesday, January 22, 2019, beginning at 5:30 p.m. at the San Bruno Senior Center, 1555, Crystal Springs Road. The presentation reflects on the City's accomplishments over the last year and goals for the upcoming year.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR:
   All items are considered routine or implement an earlier Council action and may be enacted by one motion; there will be no separate discussion, unless requested.
   d. Adopt Resolution Approving Amendment #1 to Employment Agreement Between the City of San Bruno and Melissa Thurman, City Clerk.
   e. Adopt Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement for On-call Consultant Services with Woodard & Curran for Sanitary Sewer Hydraulic Modeling Support.
   f. Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement for On-call Consultant Services with West Yost Associates for Water Hydraulic Modeling Support.
g. **Adopt** Resolution Adopting the Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual for Professional Services on Federally Funded Transportation Projects.

h. **Adopt** Resolution Amending the City Classification Plan by Adopting Position Description and Salary Range for Headend Technician.

i. **Adopt** Resolution Accepting the Fire Station 52 Reroofing Project as Complete, Authorizing the Filing of a Notice of Completion with the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office.

j. **Adopt** Resolution Approving the Declaration of a Homeless Shelter Crisis in connection to the County of San Mateo’s Homeless Emergency Aid Program.

6. **CONDUCT OF BUSINESS:**

   a. **Receive** Report and Confirm Appointment of City Councilmembers:

      1. To City Council Subcommittees; and
      2. As Liaisons to the City’s Citizen Advisory Commissions, Boards and Committees; and
      3. As Representatives and Alternates to San Mateo County and other Regional Agencies.

   b. **Adopt** Resolution Increasing the Expenditure Authority of the City Manager and City Attorney from $25,000 to $75,000.

   c. **Adopt** Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Professional Consultant Services Agreement with WRT for the Development of the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan in an Amount not to Exceed $125,000 and Appropriating Funds in the Adopted FY2018-19 Budget in the Amount of $125,000 from the City’s General Fund.

7. **COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS**

8. **ADJOURNMENT:**

   The next Regular City Council Meeting will be held on January 22, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the Senior Center, 1555 Crystal Springs Road, San Bruno.

   **Posted Pursuant to Law 01/03/2019**
DATE: December 10, 2018

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Keith DeMartini, Finance Director
Kathleen O’Malley, Accounting & Customer Service Representative

SUBJECT: Accounts Payable Warrant Register

This is to certify that the claims listed on pages 1 to 3 inclusive, and/or claims numbered from 178756 through 178883 inclusive, totaling $1,029,144.61 have been checked in detail and approved by the proper officials, and in my opinion, represent fair and just charges against the City in accordance with their respective amounts. The table below summarizes the total paid by Fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Fund Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$201,734.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Agency On Aging</td>
<td>316.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery Fund</td>
<td>68,969.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Street Improvement Projects</td>
<td>203,742.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td>74,927.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Stormwater Fund</td>
<td>106.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Wastewater Fund</td>
<td>415,821.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Cable TV Fund</td>
<td>38,749.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Central Garage</td>
<td>12,351.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Facility Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>204.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>7,934.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Self-Insurance</td>
<td>2,877.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Project Development Trust</td>
<td>1,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FOR APPROVAL</td>
<td>$1,029,144.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Finance Director

Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTEMS</td>
<td>178756</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,352.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACME SURPLUS STORE</td>
<td>178757</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>937.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADECCO EMPLOYMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>178758</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,946.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCED BUSINESS FORMS</td>
<td>178759</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>951.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRPORT AUTO PARTS INC.</td>
<td>178760</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>324.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL CITY MANAGEMENT SVC.INC.</td>
<td>178761</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,881.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLIED SECURITY ALARMS</td>
<td>178762</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN MESSAGING</td>
<td>178763</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>52.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAN PLANNING ASSOCIATION</td>
<td>178764</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>759.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON PACIFIC ENGINEERING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>178797</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>380,243.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREI HLUSHKO</td>
<td>178811</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDY'S WHEELS &amp; TIRES</td>
<td>178765</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,348.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAMARK UNIFORM SERVICES</td>
<td>178766</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,640.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIES INDUSTRIES, INC.</td>
<td>178767</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>5,449.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>178768</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>18.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>178769</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>3,277.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER &amp; TAYLOR BOOKS</td>
<td>178770</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>965.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTERY SYSTEMS</td>
<td>178771</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>714.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE PLUMBERS</td>
<td>178772</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELL PLUMBING OF SAN MATEO</td>
<td>178773</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN HEALEY</td>
<td>178810</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>50.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLSEYE PLUMBING</td>
<td>178777</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARDINAL RULES, LLC</td>
<td>178778</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,924.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS MANAGEMENT SVCS LLC</td>
<td>178779</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>213.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL COUNTY FIRE DEPT.</td>
<td>178780</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION</td>
<td>178782</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>164.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION</td>
<td>178783</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>491.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT</td>
<td>178784</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>425.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF MILLBRAE</td>
<td>178785</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>677.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION NETWORK RESOURCE</td>
<td>178786</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SAN MATEO</td>
<td>178788</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>76.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAC EXCESS INSURANCE AUTHORITY</td>
<td>178799</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>10,638.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSG CONSULTANTS INC.</td>
<td>178789</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>57,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWEA-TCP</td>
<td>178790</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS BOSCH</td>
<td>178791</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>218.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCOUNT PLUMBING</td>
<td>178792</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>15,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUSTIN SISON</td>
<td>178863</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST BAY TIRE CO</td>
<td>178793</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>776.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EATON PUMP &amp; SALES</td>
<td>178794</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>14,319.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELITE LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>178795</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>63,279.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE INFORMATION SUPPORT SVCS. INC.</td>
<td>178814</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOWERS ELECTRIC &amp; SVC.CO.INC.</td>
<td>178800</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>667.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK J. BIANCHI</td>
<td>178774</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>254.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALE/CENGAGE LEARNING</td>
<td>178801</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>66.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARRATT CALLAHAN</td>
<td>178802</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,116.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCS ENVIRONMENTAL &amp; EQUIPMENT SVC.</td>
<td>178798</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>189.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL TELECOM&amp;TECHNOLOGY INC.</td>
<td>178803</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>4,947.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL TRACKING COMMUNICATIONS, INC.</td>
<td>178874</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOETZ BROTHERS SPORTING GOODS</td>
<td>178804</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>750.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAINGER</td>
<td>178805</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,474.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANITE ROCK COMPANY</td>
<td>178806</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>112.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT AMERICA FINANCIAL SVC.</td>
<td>178807</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>165.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANLON'S TIRE SERVICE</td>
<td>178808</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Code &amp; Name</td>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Check Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0095762 HARRISON &amp; BONINI</td>
<td>178609 178812</td>
<td>12/10/2018 12/10/2018</td>
<td>82.67 78.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105378 HOME MAID RAVIOLI COMPANY INC.</td>
<td>178613 178815</td>
<td>12/10/2018 12/10/2018</td>
<td>9,313.50 153.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001786 IN DEMAND-NYC</td>
<td>178616 178816</td>
<td>12/10/2018 12/10/2018</td>
<td>352.56 2,367.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106403 INFRASTRUCTURE TECHNOLOGIES, LLC</td>
<td>178617</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>354.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0015531 INTERSTATE BATTERY SYS. OF SF</td>
<td>178618</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,991.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000581 IRVINE &amp; JACHENS INC.</td>
<td>178619</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>112.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108009 JASON BOWMAN</td>
<td>178620</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>11.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108067 JASON SATO</td>
<td>178621</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104708 JEREMY BRANDENBURG</td>
<td>178622</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,359.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108037 JIMMY AND SHELLY CHU</td>
<td>178623</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108065 JORGE SILVA</td>
<td>178624</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000075 K-119 TOOLS OF CALIFORNIA INC.</td>
<td>178625</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>173.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018050 KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN</td>
<td>178626</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>3,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000112 KAMAN INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGIES</td>
<td>178627</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0096379 KAREN OJAKIAN</td>
<td>178628</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>236.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108066 KEVIN TANAKA</td>
<td>178629</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>40.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108064 KWAN YEE LAU</td>
<td>178630</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>240.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103799 LDVALI LLC</td>
<td>178631</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>240.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105034 LFP BROADCASTING, LLC</td>
<td>178632</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>94.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0093274 LINDSTROM CO</td>
<td>178633</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>240.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018177 LOWE'S</td>
<td>178634</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017026 LYNX TECHNOLOGIES, INC.</td>
<td>178635</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>173.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106044 MAYCROFT INVESTIGATION AGENCY</td>
<td>178636</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>3,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016041 METROMOBILE COMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>178637</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0092286 MICROMARKETING LLC</td>
<td>178638</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>236.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016863 MIDWEST TAPE, LLC</td>
<td>178639</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>40.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098298 MIKE ETCHEVERRY</td>
<td>178640</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>107.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106788 MIKE SOSS</td>
<td>178641</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098800 MOBILE CALIBRATION SVCS. LLC</td>
<td>178642</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000333 MOSS RUBBER &amp; EQUIP. CORP.</td>
<td>178643</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>256.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000357 NATIONAL CABLE TV CO-OP, INC.</td>
<td>178644</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>487.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108070 NICK KOBAYASHI</td>
<td>178645</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>682.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0092263 OFFICE DEPOT INC</td>
<td>178646</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>12.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000210 OLE'S CARBURETOR &amp; ELECTRIC INC</td>
<td>178647</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,104.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108050 OLIVIA LOPEZ-WHEELER</td>
<td>178648</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>373.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0097567 ONE HOUR DRY CLEANING</td>
<td>178649</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001292 ORCHARD BUSINESS/SYNCB</td>
<td>178650</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>349.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000012 PACIFIC GAS &amp; ELECTRIC</td>
<td>178651</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106156 PENGUIN RANDOM HOUSE LLC</td>
<td>178652</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>70,513.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107711 PLATINUM CONSULTING AND INVESTIGATIONS</td>
<td>178653</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>73.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016770 PRAXAIR DISTRIBUTION INC -192</td>
<td>178654</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105836 PRIMETIME PAPER &amp; PROMOTIONS</td>
<td>178655</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>144.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018598 QUALITY CODE PUBLISHING LLC</td>
<td>178656</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>517.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016851 QUALITY TUNE-UP SHOPS</td>
<td>178657</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>4,015.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013981 QUILL CORPORATION</td>
<td>178658</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>989.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000071 R &amp; B COMPANY</td>
<td>178659</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>432.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107697 ROSAS BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>178660</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>7,475.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016213 ROZZI REPRODUCTION&amp;SUPPLY INC.</td>
<td>178661</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>193,555.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098811 S.A.M</td>
<td>178662</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>101.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106070 SAFETY-KLEEN SYSTEMS, INC.</td>
<td>178663</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016774 SAN DIEGO POLICE EQUIPMENT CO.</td>
<td>178664</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>234.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0093465 SAN MATEO COUNTY SHERIFF</td>
<td>178665</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>16,321.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018597 SAN MATEO DAILY JOURNAL</td>
<td>178666</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>5,415.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0098129 SCOTT ZAYAC</td>
<td>178667</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>9,384.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106788 SCOTT ZAYAC</td>
<td>178883</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor Code &amp; Name</td>
<td>Check #</td>
<td>Check Date</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERRAMONTE FORD, INC.</td>
<td>1788658</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>144.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPUC FINANCIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>178859</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>9,291.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHRED-IT USA</td>
<td>178860</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>57.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIADAT ENTERPRISES INC.</td>
<td>178861</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,071.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOAN SAKAI YEUNG &amp; WONG LLP</td>
<td>178864</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>5,505.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONITROL/PACIFIC WEST SECURITY, INC.</td>
<td>178882</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>216.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOK, INC.</td>
<td>1788866</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>145.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAPLES CREDIT PLAN</td>
<td>178867</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,747.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD(SWF)</td>
<td>178849</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNRISE FOOD DISTRIBUTOR INC.</td>
<td>178868</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>237.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPLYWORKS</td>
<td>178869</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,044.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAMSTERS LOCAL 350</td>
<td>178871</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>2,312.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>178796</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIFCO INDUSTRIES INC.</td>
<td>178873</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,255.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIDENT K9 CONSULTING INC.</td>
<td>178875</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSQ SOLUTIONS INC.</td>
<td>178876</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV GUIDE MAGAZINE, LLC</td>
<td>178877</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>63.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYLER TECHNOLOGIES INC.</td>
<td>178878</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>41,892.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPS</td>
<td>178879</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>178880</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>1,974.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WECO INDUSTRIES LLC</td>
<td>178881</td>
<td>12/10/2018</td>
<td>671.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,029,144.61</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total count:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: December 17, 2018

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Keith DeMartini, Finance Director
Kathleen O’Malley, Accounting & Customer Service Representative

SUBJECT: Accounts Payable Warrant Register

This is to certify that the claims listed on pages 1 to 2 inclusive, and/or claims numbered from 178884 through 178982 inclusive, totaling $299,691.15 have been checked in detail and approved by the proper officials, and in my opinion, represent fair and just charges against the City in accordance with their respective amounts. The table below summarizes the total paid by Fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Fund Name</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$128,023.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Police Asset Forfeiture</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Federal/State Grants</td>
<td>$35.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Agency On Aging</td>
<td>8,308.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Restricted Revenues</td>
<td>1,067.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery Fund</td>
<td>439.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Street Improvement Projects</td>
<td>69,580.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td>10,027.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>Stormwater Fund</td>
<td>216.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Wastewater Fund</td>
<td>10,046.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>Cable TV Fund</td>
<td>26,985.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>Central Garage</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Facility Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>1,375.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Technology Development</td>
<td>2,759.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>Project Development Trust</td>
<td>40,401.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL FOR APPROVAL $299,691.15

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Finance Director

[Date: 12/18/18]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AARON WONG</td>
<td>178980</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>285.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTEMS</td>
<td>178884</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>2,345.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS SUPPORT</td>
<td>178885</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>484.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION TOWING &amp; ROAD SVC. INC.</td>
<td>178886</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLIED SECURITY ALARMS</td>
<td>178887</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,255.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTA LANGUAGE SERVICES, INC.</td>
<td>178888</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANVAY SULE</td>
<td>178966</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>43.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAGON VETERINARY CLINIC</td>
<td>178889</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>275.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTHUR REEVES</td>
<td>178956</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>162.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAKER &amp; TAYLOR BOOKS</td>
<td>178890</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,842.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOETHING TREELAND FARMS, INC.</td>
<td>178891</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>169.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROADMOOR LANDSCAPE SUPPLY</td>
<td>178893</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>253.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAINE COMPUTER CONSULTING, LLC</td>
<td>178894</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>3,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROL COSTAKIS</td>
<td>178903</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS SPORTS NETWORK</td>
<td>178895</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,320.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINTAS CORPORATION</td>
<td>178896</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>274.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF BURLINGAME</td>
<td>178897</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>3,280.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF BURLINGAME</td>
<td>178898</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SAN BRUNO</td>
<td>178899</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>4,722.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLMA FIREMEN'S SOCIAL CLUB</td>
<td>178900</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATION NETWORK RESOURCE</td>
<td>178902</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>6,633.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SAN MATEO</td>
<td>178905</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,378.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPOA</td>
<td>178906</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>2,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRITICAL REACH, INC.</td>
<td>178907</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>435.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARYC SMITH</td>
<td>178963</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>812.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATASAFE, INC.</td>
<td>178909</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAI PRODUCTS</td>
<td>178910</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>485.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMCO SUPPLY INC.</td>
<td>178911</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>412.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DYTE &amp; BHATIA</td>
<td>178912</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>40,350.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVA RANGEL</td>
<td>178955</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>87.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELIX HERNANDEZ-PRADO</td>
<td>178925</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>33.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOWERS ELECTRIC &amp; SVC.CO.INC.</td>
<td>178915</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLYERS ENERGY, LLC</td>
<td>178916</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>10,426.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAN WILSON</td>
<td>178979</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>431.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCHISE TAX BOARD</td>
<td>178917</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>644.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL TELECOM&amp;TECHNOLOGY INC.</td>
<td>178920</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>3,450.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOBAL TRACKING COMMUNICATIONS, INC.</td>
<td>178968</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>89.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA NETWORK INC.</td>
<td>178921</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>2,293.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOLDEN GATE POLYGRAPH SERVICES</td>
<td>178922</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT LAKES DATA SYSTEMS INC</td>
<td>178924</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA TRAN</td>
<td>178926</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSU CHUN LIU</td>
<td>178931</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>23.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRON MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>178927</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>189.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAMIE SMITH</td>
<td>178964</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>67.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JESSE BONNER</td>
<td>178892</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>14,718.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE VALIENTE</td>
<td>178973</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>192.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JORDAN GIANG</td>
<td>178919</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIA MALONEY</td>
<td>178935</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>73.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY-MOORE PAINT CO. INC.</td>
<td>178928</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>159.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC</td>
<td>178929</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>5,289.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEXISNEXIS RISK DATA MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>178956</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>129.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVE OAK MEDIA</td>
<td>178932</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>32.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWE'S</td>
<td>178933</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>777.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page: 1
## Positive Pay Listing
### City of San Bruno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor Code &amp; Name</th>
<th>Check #</th>
<th>Check Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0108078 MARCUS RULLODA</td>
<td>178959</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>76.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102770 METLIFE</td>
<td>178936</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>373.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108082 MICHELLE CRONIN</td>
<td>178908</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>58.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0092285 MICROMARKETING LLC</td>
<td>178937</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>28.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0016863 MIDWEST TAPE, LLC</td>
<td>178938</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>34.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0001709 MILLBRAE LOCK</td>
<td>178939</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000333 MOSS RUBBER &amp; EQUIP. CORP.</td>
<td>178940</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>42.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017289 MUNISERVICES, LLC</td>
<td>178941</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000357 NATIONAL CABLE TV CO-OP, INC.</td>
<td>178942</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>426.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018157 OCLC INC</td>
<td>178943</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>389.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0092263 OFFICE DEPOT INC</td>
<td>178944</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,519.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0097567 ONE HOUR DRY CLEANING</td>
<td>178945</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000012 PACIFIC GAS &amp; ELECTRIC</td>
<td>178946</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>11,996.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106156 PENGUIN RANDOM HOUSE LLC</td>
<td>178947</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>97.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0014961 PENINSULA UNIFORMS &amp; EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>178948</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,540.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106229 PET FOOD EXPRESS</td>
<td>178949</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>109.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108075 PIETRO GHIAZZA</td>
<td>178918</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>122.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000294 PITNEY BOWES</td>
<td>178950</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>249.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0097558 PURCHASE POWER</td>
<td>178951</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>349.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0013981 QUILL CORPORATION</td>
<td>178952</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>42.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108087 RAHUL VERMA</td>
<td>178975</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>25.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107923 REDWICK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY</td>
<td>178954</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>66,101.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000229 REEVES Co., INC.</td>
<td>178955</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>29.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104637 REGIONAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES AUTHORITY</td>
<td>178923</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>8,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103531 RICOH USA, INC.</td>
<td>178957</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>561.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0018839 RYAN JOHANSEN</td>
<td>178960</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>264.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017807 SAN MATEO COUNTY CONTROLLER'S OFFICE</td>
<td>178904</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>14,872.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0099047 SAN MATEO CTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE</td>
<td>178961</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>4,087.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106354 SEWER RAT PLUMBING, INC.</td>
<td>178962</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>189.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108081 SONG LUAN</td>
<td>178934</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>21.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108068 SONIA FLEMING</td>
<td>178914</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>91.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000102 SONITROL/PACIFIC WEST SECURITY, INC.</td>
<td>178977</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>729.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0097079 SPRINT</td>
<td>178965</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>1,463.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017802 SUPPLIES WORKS</td>
<td>178967</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>116.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0000265 TELECOMMUNICATIONS ENGINEERING ASSOCIATE</td>
<td>178913</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>2,342.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106116 TIAA COMMERCIAL FINANCE, INC.</td>
<td>178901</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>374.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0107727 TRI COUNTIES BANK</td>
<td>178969</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>37,086.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017133 TURBO DATA SYSTEMS INC</td>
<td>178970</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>3,756.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0102744 UNIVERSAL BUILDING SERVICES</td>
<td>178971</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>163.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105133 UTILITY TELECOM, INC.</td>
<td>178972</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>202.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0095749 VERIZON WIRELESS</td>
<td>178974</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>746.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104256 VIVO MUSIC CENTER</td>
<td>178976</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>123.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104660 WEST YOST ASSOCIATES, INC.</td>
<td>178978</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>19,669.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0017917 WING WONG</td>
<td>178981</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>492.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0093430 WORLD BOOK INC</td>
<td>178982</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>977.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108083 ZI LING</td>
<td>178930</td>
<td>12/17/2018</td>
<td>36.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GrandTotal:** 299,691.15

**Total count:** 99
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Benjie Lin, Payroll Specialist

SUBJECT: Payroll Acceptance

City Council acceptance of the City payroll distributed December 14, 2018 is recommended. The Labor Summary report reflecting the total payroll amount of $1,509,903.66 for bi-weekly pay period ending December 9, 2018 by fund is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 001 - GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>$1,175,964.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 122 - SOLID WAIST/RECYCL.</td>
<td>1,710.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 201 - PARKS AND FACILITIES CAPITAL</td>
<td>42.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 203 - STREET IMPROVE. PROJECTS</td>
<td>8,110.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 611 - WATER FUND</td>
<td>70,365.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 621 - STORMWATER FUND</td>
<td>26,935.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 631 - WASTEWATER FUND</td>
<td>58,597.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 641 - CABLE TV FUND</td>
<td>100,210.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 701 - CENTRAL GARAGE</td>
<td>10,690.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 702 - FACILITY MAINT.FUND</td>
<td>32,285.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 707 - TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>18,201.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 711 - SELF INSURANCE</td>
<td>6,788.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,509,903.66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully Submitted,

Karlene Wang, for Keith
Accounting Manager
De Martini
Keith DeMartini, Finance Director

1/2/19
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Benjie Lin, Payroll Specialist

SUBJECT: Payroll Acceptance

City Council acceptance of the City payroll distributed December 28, 2018 is recommended. The Labor Summary report reflecting the total payroll amount of $1,525,846.62 for bi-weekly pay period ending December 23, 2018 by fund is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 001 - GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>$1,186,356.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 121 - FEDERAL/STATE GRANTS</td>
<td>6,721.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 122 - SOLID WAIST/RECYCL.</td>
<td>1,731.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 201 - PARKS AND FACILITIES CAPITAL</td>
<td>42.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 203 - STREET IMPROVE. PROJECTS</td>
<td>5,207.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 611 - WATER FUND</td>
<td>66,318.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 621 - STORMWATER FUND</td>
<td>23,470.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 631 - WASTEWATER FUND</td>
<td>65,831.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 641 - CABLE TV FUND</td>
<td>101,856.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 701 - CENTRAL GARAGE</td>
<td>11,386.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 702 - FACILITY MAINT. FUND</td>
<td>31,743.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 707 - TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>16,329.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund: 711 - SELF INSURANCE</td>
<td>6,850.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $1,525,846.62

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Accounting Manager DeMartini

Keith DeMartini, Finance Director Date 1/2/19
MINUTES
SAN BRUNO CITY COUNCIL
December 11, 2018
7:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: San Bruno Senior Center, 1555 Crystal Springs Road, San Bruno, CA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ROLL CALL/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - All Council Members present.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT ON AGENDA:
   The following member of the public spoke during Public Comment:
   • Ryan Mrsny – Request to pull items 5.f and 5.g from the Consent Calendar.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATIONS
   a. There will be no second City Council meeting in the month of December.

5. CONSENT CALENDAR:
   f. Adopt Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement with Professional Land Services for On-Call Surveying Services in an Amount Not to Exceed $50,000.
   g. Adopt Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement with Lotus Water for the development of the City’s Green Infrastructure Plan in an Amount Not to Exceed $135,672.
   h. Accept Resignation from Traffic Safety & Parking Committee Member Effective November 27, 2018 and Direct the City Clerk to Post a Notice of Vacancy in Accordance with State Law.
   i. Confirm Appointment of Irene O’Connell as Vice Mayor to Serve a One-Year Term.

Jovan Grogan, City Manager explained that a type in the resolution for item 5.e had been corrected to: Affordable Housing Fees and Commercial Linkage Fees (Municipal Code Ch.12.230) are collected on all residential ownership or rental developments of 5 units or more throughout the City.

Marty Medina, Council Member requested that item 5.h be pulled for discussion.
M/S Salazar/Davis to approve the Consent Calendar, excluding items 5.f, 5.g and 5.h. **Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

**Jimmy Tan, Public Works Director**, provided a brief report for item 5.f. M/S O'Connell/Salazar to approve item 5.f. **Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

**Jimmy Tan, Public Works Director**, provided a brief report for item 5.g. M/S O'Connell/Salazar to approve item 5.g. **Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

**Marty Medina, Council Member**, thanked outgoing Traffic Safety & Parking Committee Member Jessica Barnes-Lopez for her service on the Committee. M/S Salazar/Davis to approve item 5.h. **Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.**

**6. CONDUCT OF BUSINESS:**

a. **Adopt** Resolution Approving Design, Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Construction Contract with Casey Construction, Inc. for the Arbor Court Pressure Regulating Valve Replacement Project in the Amount of $369,060, Approving a Construction Contingency of $56,000, Appropriating $146,000 from the Water Fund, and Approving a Total Budget in the Amount of $546,060.

**Jimmy Tan, Public Works Director** presented the report.

There were no speakers for this item.

M/S Davis/Salazar to adopt a resolution approving design, authorizing the City Manager to execute a construction contract with Casey Construction, Inc. for the Arbor Court Pressure Regulating Valve Replacement Project in the amount of $369,060, approving a construction contingency of $56,000, appropriating $146,000 from the Water Fund, and approving a total budget in the amount of $546,060. **Motion carried unanimously by roll call vote.**

**7. STUDY SESSION:**

a. **Receive** the Draft San Bruno Development Impact Fee (DIF) Nexus Study and Provide Direction to Staff to Finalize the Nexus Study with Fees at the Staff Recommended Level and Bring the Fee Ordinance to City Council for their Consideration at a Future City Council Meeting.

**Keith DeMartini, Finance Director and Jason Mooney, Economic and Planning Systems,** both presented the report.

The following members of the public spoke regarding this item:

- Daniel Gregg
- Dennis Martin
- Jamie Choy

Discussion item only. **No motion taken.**

**8. COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS:**

- **Irene O'Connell, Council Member,** asked that residents take pictures of holiday lights and submit them to the Beautification Task Force.
- **Marty Medina, Council Member and Michael Salazar, Council Member,** wished everyone a Happy Holidays and a Happy New Year.
• **Rico Medina, Mayor** thanked outgoing **Vice Mayor, Laura Davis** for her service as Vice Mayor in 2018 and welcomed **Irene O’Connell** as Vice Mayor for 2019. Mayor Medina wished everyone a Merry Christmas and a Happy and safe New Year.

9. **ADJOURNMENT** - The meeting adjourned at 8:13 p.m.

The next Regular City Council Meeting will be held on January 8, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. at the Senior Center, 1555 Crystal Springs Road, San Bruno.

Minutes were prepared by Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, and are respectfully submitted for approval at the City Council meeting on January 8, 2019.

___________________________
Melissa Thurman, CMC
City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 - __

RESOLUTION APPROVING AMENDMENT #1 TO EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO AND MELISSA THURMAN, CITY CLERK

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno and Melissa Thurman entered into an employment agreement for City Clerk services on May 29, 2018; and

WHEREAS, Section 5 of the May 29, 2018 agreement provided for an annual base salary of $110,532, and Sections 5 authorize the City Council to adjust the City Clerk’s salary and benefits; and

WHEREAS, Section 5 of the May 29, 2018 agreement stated the City Clerk would be eligible for an increase in salary to Step 2 in six months after a satisfactory performance evaluation by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to provide the City Clerk with a raise in annual base salary to $116,340, retroactive to December 11, 2018.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of San Bruno hereby authorizes the Mayor to execute on behalf of the City, the attached Amendment #1 to the employment agreement between the City of San Bruno and Melissa Thurman dated May 29, 2018.

---oOo---

I hereby certify that foregoing Resolution No. 2019 - __ was introduced and adopted by the San Bruno City Council at a regular meeting on January 8, 2019, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers:

NOES: Councilmembers:

ABSENT: Councilmembers:

Vicky S. Hasha, Deputy City Clerk
AMENDMENT #1 TO EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO AND MELISSA THURMAN, CITY CLERK

1. This Amendment dated January 8, 2019 modifies the employment agreement between the City of San Bruno and Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, dated May 29, 2018.

2. Section 5 of said agreement is amended to reflect a raise to an annual base salary from $110,532 to $116,340, retroactive to December 11, 2018.

3. In all other respects, the agreement is affirmed.

City of San Bruno:

_________________________________
Rico E. Medina, Mayor

Employee:

______________________________
Melissa Thurman

Attest:

_________________________________
Deputy City Clerk
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Jimmy Tan, Public Works Director

SUBJECT: Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement for On-call Consultant Services with Woodard & Curran for Sanitary Sewer Hydraulic Modeling Support

BACKGROUND:

The City of San Bruno is responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the sanitary sewer collection system within its service area. In December 2010, the City Council approved an agreement with RMC Water and Environment (RMC) to update the City’s Sewer Master Plan which included development of the sewer hydraulic model. The benefits of the Sewer Master Plan were to identify cost-effective solutions to improve capacity issues, identify sewer system rehabilitation and replacement needs, address issues impacting both short-term and long-term sewer overflow risk, and reduce maintenance demands.

The Sewer System Master Plan, which was completed in February 2014, identified strategies for maintaining adequate capacity and service levels and evaluated system needs for a 20 year horizon by developing long range capital improvement program. The model analyzed the sewer pipeline capacity during both dry and wet seasons to determine the capacity deficient locations. The model also included the analysis of the sewer lift/pump stations.

As part of the entitlement and permitting process of substantial private development projects, the City requires developers to conduct sewer system analyses as a condition of approval to ensure adequate capacity is available and system impacts are identified and mitigated. As the City continues to see private development activities, it becomes necessary to run the model to confirm whether the assumptions made for the proposed collection system pipeline diameter meets its capacity and analyze the impacts of the new private development on the overall existing sewer system.

Although the City owns the model, staff does not have the specialized expertise in-house to update and run the model. Employing a full time staff person with this skill is unnecessary due to the sporadic and infrequent nature of these tasks, therefore, retaining a consultant to provide these specialized services would be the best recourse and the City will be reimbursed for the services provided under this contract that is required for private developments.
DISCUSSION:

Staff proposes continuing to utilize Woodard & Curran (formerly RMC) for the sewer hydraulic modeling support. Staff who were associated with the model and master plan updates are still employed at Woodard & Curran. This staff has the institutional knowledge of the model and the City’s sewer system. Woodard & Curran staff created the sewer hydraulic model used for the last sewer hydraulic model to prepare the 2014 Sewer System Master Plan and the firm has the experience and qualifications to provide the consultant services needed by the City.

This agreement is for as-needed consultant services and has the option to be renewed annually for a total possible five year term that can be terminated by the City at any time. Rates will be based on the consultant’s fee schedule. An annual adjustment in rates will be reviewed and negotiated as part of the renewal process.

Woodard & Curran has advised the City that as an initial step, the model will need to be converted to the current version of the model software. The older version of the model used for the 2014 study is no longer supported. The software migration will be for an amount not to exceed $5,000.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Sufficient funds are available in the Sewer Fund to appropriate $5,000 for the model software migration. The agreement for sewer hydraulic modeling support will be task order based. The consultant will prepare individual proposals for projects with scope of work identified on a time and expense not to exceed basis. The task orders will be funded by private developers for their various projects requiring sewer system analyses.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Do not execute the Agreement for Consultant Services.
2. Direct staff to seek other firms that have experience with performing sewer collection system hydraulic model.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution appropriating $5,000 from the Sewer Fund and authorizing the City Manager to execute an Agreement for Consultant Services with Woodard & Curran for sanitary sewer hydraulic modeling support.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution
2. Proposal
3. Fee Schedule

DISTRIBUTION:

None.
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 - ___

ADOPT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR ON-CALL CONSULTANT SERVICES WITH WOODARD & CURRAN FOR SANITARY SEWER HYDRAULIC MODELING SUPPORT

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno (“City”) is responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the sanitary sewer distribution infrastructure within its service area; and

WHEREAS, in December 2010, the City Council approved an agreement with RMC Water and Environment (now Woodward & Curran) to update the City’s Sewer Master Plan which included development of the sewer hydraulic model; and

WHEREAS, the benefits of the Sewer Master Plan were to identify cost-effective solutions to improve capacity issues, identify sewer system rehabilitation and replacement needs, address issues impacting both short-term and long-term sewer overflow risk, and reduce maintenance demands; and

WHEREAS, as part of the entitlement and permitting process of substantial private development projects, the City requires developers to conduct sewer system analyses as a condition of approval to ensure adequate capacity is available and system impacts are identified and mitigated; and

WHEREAS, as the City continues to see private development activities, it becomes necessary to update and run the model to confirm whether the assumptions made for the proposed collection system pipeline diameter meets its capacity and analyze the impacts of the new private development on the overall existing sewer system; and

WHEREAS, the City owns a sewer hydraulic model but staff does not have the specialized expertise in-house to update and run the model; and

WHEREAS, the sewer hydraulic model will need to be converted to the current version of the model software as an initial step as the older version of the model used for the 2014 study is no longer supported; and

WHEREAS, Woodward & Curran has the experience and qualifications to provide the consultant services needed by the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the San Bruno City Council hereby authorizes the City Manager to execute the Agreement for On-call Consultant Services with Woodward & Curran for sanitary sewer hydraulic modeling support.

Dated: January 8, 2019

ATTEST:

Melissa Thurman, City Clerk
I, Melissa Thurman City Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Bruno this 8th day of January 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: ________________________________

NOES: Councilmembers: ________________________________

ABSENT: Councilmembers: ________________________________
Background and Purpose of Project

This document describes the Woodard & Curran scope of work for providing hydraulic modeling support to the City of San Bruno (City) for tasks related to capacity planning for the City’s wastewater collection system. This work will be based on the hydraulic model developed for the Sewer Master Plan prepared for the City in 2014 (with model updates conducted in 2016 to support various sewer design projects). The hydraulic model of the system was created based on water use and flow monitoring data, and future land use and development plans available at the time. The City wishes to use the model for on-going evaluation of capacity-related issues, including assessing impacts of proposed new developments (“sewer studies”), evaluating “what-if” scenarios related to proposed new sewer pipelines, and updating the model and capacity assessment based on permanent changes.

Scope of Work

The tasks included in Woodard & Curran’s scope of services are described below.

Task 1 – Model Conversion

As the first task under this task order, Woodard & Curran will convert the City’s model from InfoWorks™ CS, the software version used for the 2014 study, to InfoWorks ICM, the current version of InfoWorks. The cost of Task 1 will not exceed $5,000.

Task 2 – Model Evaluations

Under this task, Woodard & Curran will run the model (or expand the model to include previously unmodeled sewers) as requested by the City to:

1) Assess the impact on sewer capacity of proposed development projects and determine where additional capacity would be required (e.g., increased pipe size or larger pump station capacity) if needed to handle increased flows caused by the new developments;

2) Evaluate “what-if” scenarios related to proposed new or improved sewer pipelines or pump stations; or

3) Update the model and capacity assessment based on permanent changes in the sewer system.
For each analysis, Woodard & Curran will prepare a brief technical memorandum (TM) summarizing the model assumptions and results, along with appropriate figures (e.g. model-generated hydraulic profiles or thematic maps showing potential surcharge).

**Deliverables:**
- Model run assumptions and results TM

**Assumptions:**
- The City will provide required data to conduct analyses. For proposed developments, this will include development location, proposed connection point to sewer system, and development details (e.g., number and type of dwelling units, square footage and type of commercial building floor space, etc.). For proposed system changes, this will include information such as alignment and size of proposed sewer pipelines or plans and operational specifications for pump station improvements.

**Task 3 – Project Management and Coordination**

Woodard & Curran will monitor project budget, prepare invoices, and communicate with the City by telephone and e-mail regarding project status and issues. Woodard & Curran will track costs under a separate subtask for each model evaluation so that the City can determine appropriate costs to be charged to development project proponent, if necessary. Alternately, if requested by City, Woodard & Curran will provide an estimate of the cost for development review studies (after receipt of the information listed under Task 2 Assumptions above) in advance of notice to proceed by City.

**Assumptions:**
- Any required meetings are assumed to be included as part of the model evaluations under Task 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Category</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer 1 (E1)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist 1 (S1)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologist 1 (G1)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner 1 (P1)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specialist 1 (TS1)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer 2 (E2)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist 2 (S2)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologist 2 (G2)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner 2 (P2)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specialist 2 (TS2)</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer 3 (E3)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist 3 (S3)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geologist 3 (G3)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner 3 (P3)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specialist 3 (TS3)</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer 1 (PE1)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Specialist 1 (PS1)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Geologist 1 (PG1)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planner 1 (PP1)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Technical Specialist 1 (PTS1)</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer 2 (PE2)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Specialist 2 (PS2)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Geologist 2 (PG2)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Planner 2 (PP2)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Technical Specialist 2 (TS2)</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager 1 (PM1)</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Manager 1 (TM1)</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager 2 (PM2)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Manager 2 (TM2)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project Manager (SPM)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Technical Manager (STM)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Technical Practice Leader (STPL)</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Practice Leader (NPL)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Business Unit Leader (SBUL)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineer 1 (SE1)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Engineer 2 (SE2)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer 1 (D1)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer 2 (D2)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer 3 (D3)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Software Developer (SSD)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Designer (SD)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Assistant (PA)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Assistant (MA)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Artist (GA)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accountant (SA)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Project Assistant</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing Manager (BM)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Manager (MM)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics Manager (GM)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The individual hourly rates include salary, overhead and profit. Other direct costs (ODCs) such as reproduction, delivery, mileage (as allowed by IRS guidelines), and travel expenses will be billed at actual cost plus 10%. Subconsultants will be billed as actual cost plus 10%. Woodard & Curran, Inc., reserves the right to adjust its hourly rate structure at the beginning of each year for all ongoing contracts.
DATE: January 8, 2019
TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
FROM: Jovan Grogan, City Manager
PREPARED BY: Jimmy Tan, Public Works Director
SUBJECT: Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute an Agreement for On-call Consultant Services with West Yost Associates for Water Hydraulic Modeling Support

BACKGROUND:

The City of San Bruno is responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the water distribution infrastructure within its service area. In January 2011, the City Council approved an agreement to retain West Yost Associates to update the water hydraulic model and prepare the City’s Water System Master Plan (Plan). As part of the development of the Plan, a hydraulic model of the City’s water distribution system was created to evaluate the existing system and identify improvements needed for future demands. The Plan was completed in November 2012 and identified strategies for maintaining and improving water system performance to meet existing and future water demands and addressed capacity, operational, and seismic reliability, and rehabilitation and replacement needs for existing and FY 2034-35 conditions.

As part of the entitlement and permitting process of substantial private development projects, the City requires developers to conduct water system analyses as a condition of approval to ensure adequate capacity is available and system impacts are identified and mitigated. As the City continues to see private development activities, it becomes necessary to run the model to confirm whether the assumptions made for the proposed distribution pipeline diameter meets both the potable and fire flow demands and analyze the impacts of the new private development on the overall existing water system.

Although the City owns the model, staff does not have the specialized expertise in-house to update and run the model. Employing a full time staff person with this skill is unnecessary due to the sporadic and infrequent nature of these tasks, therefore, retaining a consultant to provide these specialized services would be the best recourse and the City will be reimbursed for the services provided under this contract that is required for private developments.

DISCUSSION:

Staff proposes continuing to utilize West Yost Associates for the water hydraulic modeling support because this firm has the institutional knowledge of the model and the City’s water
distribution system. West Yost Associates created the hydraulic model used to prepare the 2012 Water System Master Plan and the firm has extensive experience and qualifications to provide the consultant services needed by the City.

This agreement is for as-needed consultant services and has the option to be renewed annually for a total possible five year term that can be terminated by the City at any time. Rates will be based on the consultant’s fee schedule. An annual adjustment in rates will be reviewed and negotiated as part of the renewal process.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This agreement for water hydraulic modeling support will be task order based. The consultant will prepare individual proposals for projects with scope of work identified on a time and expense not to exceed basis. The task orders will be funded by private developers for their various projects requiring water system analyses.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Do not execute the Agreement for Consultant Services.
2. Direct staff to seek other firms that have experience with performing water distribution system hydraulic model.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to execute an Agreement for Consultant Services with West Yost Associates for water hydraulic modeling support.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Resolution
2. Proposal
3. Fee Schedule

**DISTRIBUTION:**

None.
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 - ___

ADOPT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT FOR ON-CALL CONSULTANT SERVICES WITH WEST YOST ASSOCIATES FOR WATER HYDRAULIC MODELING SUPPORT

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno (“City”) is responsible for the construction, operation and maintenance of the water distribution infrastructure within its service area; and

WHEREAS, in January 2011, the City Council approved an agreement to retain West Yost Associates to update the water hydraulic model and prepare the City’s Water System Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, as part of the development of the Water Master Plan, a hydraulic model of the City’s water distribution system was created to evaluate the existing system and identify improvements needed for future demands; and

WHEREAS, as part of the entitlement and permitting process of substantial private development projects, the City requires developers to conduct water system analyses as a condition of approval to ensure adequate capacity is available and system impacts are identified and mitigated; and

WHEREAS, as the City continues to see private development activities, it becomes necessary to update and run the model to confirm whether the assumptions made for the proposed distribution pipeline diameter meets both the potable and fire flow demands and analyze the impacts of the new private development on the overall water system; and

WHEREAS, the City owns the water hydraulic model but staff does not have the specialized expertise in-house to update and run the model; and

WHEREAS, West Yost Associates has the experience and qualifications to provide the consultant services needed by the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the San Bruno City Council hereby authorizes the City Manager to execute the Agreement for On-call Consultant Services with West Yost Associates for water hydraulic modeling support.

Dated: January 8, 2019

ATTEST:

Melissa Thurman, City Clerk
I, Melissa Thurman City Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Bruno this 8th day of January 2019 by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AYES:</th>
<th>Councilmembers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOES:</td>
<td>Councilmembers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Councilmembers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 2 - Project Description and Scope of Services

As requested by the City of San Bruno (City), the following presents West Yost Associates’ (West Yost) proposed Scope of Services for planning and hydraulic modeling support on the City’s potable water system. Specific Task Orders will be developed in consultation with City staff as needed. The typical Scope of Work for each Task Order will be as follows. The following example Scope of Work may be modified as needed for each Task Order.

TYPICAL SCOPE OF WORK

The following tasks are typically included for each hydraulic evaluation:

1. Review Data and Update Hydraulic Model
2. Perform Hydraulic Evaluation
3. Develop Technical Memorandum

Task 1. Review Data and Update Hydraulic Model

West Yost will review plans and documents associated with the proposed development and confirm projected water demands with unit water use factors developed for the 2012 Water System Master Plan. West Yost will subsequently update the City’s water system hydraulic model, developed as part of the 2012 Water System Master Plan, with the proposed water demands.

West Yost will also review the City’s pipeline GIS data and update the hydraulic model to incorporate any pipeline improvements that have been made in the vicinity of the proposed development. If provided, new pipelines proposed for the development will also be updated in the hydraulic model.

Task 2. Perform Hydraulic Evaluation

The updated hydraulic model described in Task 1 will be used to evaluate the hydraulic impact of the proposed development on the City’s existing water distribution system. It is assumed that two existing demand conditions (maximum day plus fire flow and peak hour, as developed in the 2012 Water System Master Plan) will be hydraulically evaluated.

If minimum system pressures and/or flows cannot be maintained with existing infrastructure, then West Yost will determine the water system infrastructure or system modifications/improvements consistent with the adopted Water System Master Plan (and water system design criteria) that will be required to be funded and constructed to mitigate identified deficiencies.

No infrastructure cost estimates will be developed as part of this proposed scope of services. This proposed scope of services also excludes the evaluation of any phasing or identification of potential interim facilities.

Task 3. Develop Technical Memorandum

West Yost will prepare a Draft Technical Memorandum (TM) documenting the findings and recommendations from the hydraulic evaluation. West Yost will then conduct a conference call with City staff to review the findings and discuss comments to the Draft TM. After the conference call, West Yost will address City comments and finalize the Draft TM.
ATTACHMENT 2 - Project Description and Scope of Services

SCHEDULE

West Yost’s proposed schedule to complete each Task Order will be determined in consultation with City staff. West Yost will begin work for each Task Order upon notice to proceed and the receipt of all requested data.

PROPOSED BUDGET

West Yost’s proposed budget to complete each Task Order will be determined as needed. Services will be billed on a time-and-expense basis in accordance with our Billing Rate Schedule (provided in Exhibit B).
## 2019 Billing Rate Schedule
(Effective January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIONS</th>
<th>LABOR CHARGES (DOLLARS PER HR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal/Vice President</td>
<td>$298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Scientist/Geologist Manager I / II</td>
<td>$274 / $287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Engineer/Scientist/Geologist I / II</td>
<td>$249 / $264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Engineer/Scientist/Geologist I / II</td>
<td>$223 / $234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Engineer/Scientist/Geologist I / II</td>
<td>$194 / $208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer/Scientist/Geologist I / II</td>
<td>$157 / $182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Aide</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative I / II / III / IV</td>
<td>$79 / $100 / $120 / $133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Tech Manager I / II</td>
<td>$283 / $294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Tech Specialist I / II</td>
<td>$260 / $271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Tech Specialist I / II</td>
<td>$238 / $249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior GIS Analyst</td>
<td>$217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS Analyst</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Specialist I / II / III / IV</td>
<td>$151 / $173 / $195 / $216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD Manager</td>
<td>$173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD Designer I / II</td>
<td>$134 / $150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Construction Manager</td>
<td>$283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager I / II / III / IV</td>
<td>$170 / $182 / $195 / $246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Inspector (Prevailing Wage Groups 4 / 3 / 2 / 1)</td>
<td>$149 / $166 / $185 / $192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice Inspector</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM Administrative I / II</td>
<td>$73 / $97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hourly rates include Technology and Communication charges such as general and CAD computer, software, telephone, routine in-house copies/prints, postage, miscellaneous supplies, and other incidental project expenses.
- Outside Services such as vendor reproductions, prints, shipping, and major West Yost reproduction efforts, as well as Engineering Supplies, etc. will be billed at actual cost plus 15%.
- Mileage will be billed at the current Federal Rate and Travel will be billed at cost.
- Subconsultants will be billed at actual cost plus 10%.
- Expert witness, research, technical review, analysis, preparation and meetings billed at 150% of standard hourly rates. Expert witness testimony and depositions billed at 200% of standard hourly rates.
- A Finance Charge of 1.5% per month (an Annual Rate of 18%) on the unpaid balance will be added to invoice amounts if not paid within 45 days from the date of the invoice.

* This schedule is updated annually.

Continued on following page
## Equipment Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>BILLING RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Detector</td>
<td>$80/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant Pressure Gage</td>
<td>$10/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant Pressure Recorder, Standard</td>
<td>$40/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrant Pressure Recorder, Impulse (Transient)</td>
<td>$55/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimble GPS – Geo 7x</td>
<td>$220/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>$10/hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Flow Probe Meter</td>
<td>$20/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality Multimeter</td>
<td>$185/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Sounder</td>
<td>$30/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This schedule is updated annually

(Effective January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019)
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Jimmy Tan, Public Works Director

SUBJECT: Adopt Resolution Adopting the Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual for Professional Services on Federally Funded Transportation Projects

BACKGROUND:

The City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes a variety of transportation projects that consist of improvements to existing transportation infrastructure with the intent to create a safe and efficient environment for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. With limited funding, grant opportunities that provide additional funding to supplement local existing revenue is essential for project delivery. Staff has been successful in acquiring grant funding from the Federal-Aid Highway Program to fund the design and construction phases of various CIP transportation projects.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is tasked with ensuring various transportation projects approved for federal funding are consistent with applicable laws, regulations and policies. Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 172 (23 CFR 172) prescribes the requirements for the procurement, management, and administration of engineering and design related to consultant services on federally funded construction projects. Under 23 CFR 172, state transportation agencies shall prepare and maintain written policies and procedures in compliance with these requirements. Local agencies are required to either adopt the written policies and procedures of their state transportation agency or prepare their own written policies and procedures in compliance with federal regulations to be approved by their state transportation agency.

DISCUSSION:

If the local agencies were to prepare and adopt the policies and procedures in compliance with federal regulations 23 CFR 172, it requires the following items to ensure compliance with Federal and State laws and regulations:

- Preparing a scope of work and evaluation factors for the ranking/selection of a consultant;
- Soliciting interests, qualifications, or proposals from prospective consultants;
• Preventing, identifying, and mitigating conflicts of interest for employees of both the contracting agency and consultants and promptly disclosing in writing any potential conflict to the state transportation agency and FHWA, as specified in 2 CFR 200.112 and 23 CFR 1.33, and the requirements of this part.
• Verifying suspension and debarment actions and eligibility of consultants, as specified in 2 CFR part 1200 and 2 CFR part 180;
• Evaluating interests, qualifications, or proposals and the ranking/selection of a consultant;
• Determining, based upon State procedures and the size and complexity of a project, the need for additional discussions following RFP submission and evaluation;
• Preparing an independent agency estimate for use in negotiation with the selected consultant;
• Selecting appropriate contract type, payment method, and terms and incorporating required contract provisions, assurances, and certifications in accordance with §172.9;
• Negotiating a contract with the selected consultant including instructions for proper disposal of concealed cost proposals of unsuccessful bidders;
• Establishing elements of contract costs, accepting indirect cost rate(s) for application to contracts, and assuring consultant compliance with the federal cost principles in accordance with §172.11;
• Ensuring consultant costs billed are allowable in accordance with the federal cost principles and consistent with the contract terms as well as the acceptability and progress of the consultant’s work;
• Monitoring the consultant’s work and compliance with the terms, conditions, and specifications of the contract;
• Preparing a consultant’s performance evaluation when services are completed and using such performance data in future evaluation and ranking of consultant to provide similar services;
• Closing-out a contract;
• Retaining supporting programmatic and contract records, as specified in 2 CFR 200.333 and the requirements of this part;
• Determining the extent to which the consultant, which is responsible for the professional quality, technical accuracy, and coordination of services, may be reasonably liable for costs resulting from errors and omissions in the work furnished under its contract;
• Assessing administrative, contractual, or legal remedies in instances where consultants violate or breach contract terms and conditions, and providing for such sanctions and penalties as may be appropriate; and
• Resolving disputes in the procurement, management, and administration of engineering and design related consultant services.

The City’s existing purchasing policy dated December 1988 includes minimal procedures and guidelines for consultant contract procurement which lacks the level of detail required to be in compliance with federal regulations. The development of a consultant procurement policy for approval by the State with the level of detail required for federal compliance would be both resource and time intensive. As it is unknown how long it would take for this policy
to receive State approval, federal funding that has been allocated to the City may be jeopardized if the approval process delays the delivery of existing federally funded projects within the City. Rather than development of a new policy the City may adopt the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Consultant Procurement Manual which has been approved by the FHWA and adoption of this document by the City for professional services on federally funded transportation projects will prevent the loss of federal funding.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact with adopting the Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual for professional services on federally funded transportation projects.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Do not adopt the Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual for professional services on federally funded transportation projects. The City may no longer be eligible to receive federal funds for the reimbursement of professional services by consultants on transportation projects until a written policy and procedure for consultant procurement in compliance with federal regulations has been developed by the City and approved by the State.

2. Develop a consultant procurement policy in compliance with federal regulations for review and approval by the State. This is a resource and time intensive process that may result in delays to the delivery of existing federally funded projects within the City, therefore jeopardizing federal funding that has already been allocated to the City.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Resolution adopting the Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual for professional services on federally funded transportation projects

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Resolution
2. Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual

**DISTRIBUTION:**

None.
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 - ___

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE CALTRANS CONSULTANT PROCUREMENT MANUAL FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES ON FEDERALLY FUNDED TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes a variety of transportation projects that consist of improvements to existing transportation infrastructure with the intent to create a safe and efficient environment for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is tasked with ensuring various transportation projects approved for Federal funding are consistent with applicable laws, regulations and policies; and

WHEREAS, Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 172 (23 CFR 172) prescribes the requirements for the procurement, management, and administration of engineering and design related consultant services on federally funded contracts related to construction; and

WHEREAS, under 23 CFR 172, state transportation agencies shall prepare and maintain written policies and procedures in compliance with these requirements; and

WHEREAS, local agencies are required to either adopt the written policies and procedures of their state transportation agency or prepare their own written policies and procedures in compliance with federal regulations to be approved by their state transportation agency; and

WHEREAS, the State transportation agency (Caltrans) Consultant Procurement Manual has been approved by the FHWA and adoption of this document by the City for professional services on federally funded transportation projects will prevent the loss of federal funding.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the San Bruno City Council hereby adopt the Caltrans Consultant Procurement Manual for Professional Services on federally funded transportation projects.

Dated: January 8, 2019

ATTEST:

Melissa Thurman, City Clerk
I, Melissa Thurman City Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Bruno this 8th day of January 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: 

NOES: Councilmembers: 

ABSENT: Councilmembers:
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1.0 GENERAL

1.1 Introduction
This manual shall be followed for all locally administered transportation related projects that seek reimbursement for consultant services with state and/or federal funding. A local agency that prefers to use their own procurement process differing from this manual must obtain advance approval for its processes from the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) and/or the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) prior to solicitation for consultant services.

Agencies that have a consultant engineer on staff acting on behalf of the agency in a management role must submit a completed Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) Exhibit 10-U, Consultant in Management Position Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Statement, for approval by the FHWA prior to the federal-aid authorization request.

1.2 Definition of an Architectural and Engineering Consultant
A local agency may engage consultants to perform architectural, engineering, and related services needed to develop a federal-aid or state funded project. Those private consulting firms providing architectural, landscape architectural, engineering, environmental, land surveying, construction engineering, or construction project management services, with respect to a construction project, are termed Architectural and Engineering (A&E) Consultants. Local agencies requesting federal or state funds to reimburse A&E Consultants must follow the selection and contracting procedures detailed in this manual.

1.3 A&E Consultants
The provisions of the Brooks Act (40 United State Code, Section 1104) require local agencies to award federally funded engineering and design related contracts, otherwise known as A&E contracts, on the basis of fair and open competitive negotiations, demonstrated competence, and professional qualifications (23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 172) at a fair and reasonable price (48 CFR 31.201-3). Both federal regulation and California state law (Government Code 4525-4529 et al) require selection of A&E consultant services on the basis of demonstrated competence and professional qualifications.

Cost proposals submitted to the local agency, if above the small purchase procurement threshold, must be sealed and may not be included as a criterion for rating such consultants. After ranking, cost negotiations may begin with the most qualified consultant and only then will their cost proposal will be opened. Should negotiations fail or result in a price that the local agency does not consider fair and reasonable, negotiations must be formally terminated and the local agency must then undertake negotiations with the second most qualified consultant.

If the negotiations with the second most qualified firm are not successful, negotiations must be formally terminated and the local agency must then undertake negotiations with the third most qualified consultant, and so on, until the price is determined to be fair and reasonable by the local agency.

In selecting an A&E consultant, a detailed technical proposal or a statement qualification, and a proposed contract is required.
Depending upon the scope of work, the required contract provisions may need to include the California State Prevailing Wages (Federal Payment of Predetermined Minimum Wage applies only to federal-aid construction contracts). Prevailing wages will apply if the services to be performed will involve, but not limited to, land surveying (such as flag persons, survey party chief, rodman or chainman), materials sampling and testing (such as drilling rig operators, pile driving, crane operators), inspection work, soils or foundation investigations, environmental hazardous materials and so forth. California State Prevailing Wage information is available through the California Department of Industrial Relations websites below.

- DIR FAQ website: http://www.dir.ca.gov/OPRL/FAQ_PrevailingWage.html
- DIR Wage Determination website: http://www.dir.ca.gov/oprl/DPreWageDetermination.htm

1.4 Non-A&E Consultants

Consultants other than A&E consultants may be selected using cost, cost and qualifications (best value) or other critical selection criteria, based on local agency’s individual procurement process. The Brooks Act and the audit and review process described in Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process of this manual are optional for non-A&E Consultant contracts.

Non-A&E contract procurement for federal or state funded transportation projects must comply with 2 CFR Part 200, and California State Public Contract code 10301-10381. Refer to Section 9.0, Non-A&E Consultants of this manual for further guidance on Non-A&E procurement procedures.

1.5 Contract Life Cycle

A typical contract life cycle includes the following phases as shown below in Figure 1-1: A&E Contract Life Cycle Diagram. The Procurement Planning phase includes the selection of the project and deliverables to be contracted out to consultants, determination of the scope of work, contract type, and method of payment and preparation of an independent estimate of contract cost. The Procurement phase includes contract requirements and preparation of the solicitation document, evaluation and selection of consultant, contract negotiation and audit or review, and contract approval and execution. The Performance phase includes performance monitoring and progress payments, contract change approvals and amendments, and conflict resolution. And finally the contract Close-out phase.

**Figure 1-1: A&E Contract Life Cycle Diagram**
Figure 1-2: A&E Contract Procurement Overview Workflow Diagram

Figure 1-3: A&E Contract Administration and Closeout Overview Workflow Diagram
Figure 2-1: A&E Contract Procurement Planning Workflow Diagram
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2.1 Select Project

The local agency is responsible for selecting and initiating a federal-aid or state financed transportation project. The decision to begin project development is influenced by the project needs, its acceptability, the timing of studies, financing, and construction. The selected project includes deliverables which should define necessary resources, timeline, and project goals. The local agency must identify the project’s objectives including the general level of improvement or service, operating standards, maximum cost and the target date for project completion before commencing any consultant selection process. Once the deliverables, timeline, and goals for the project are defined, state and federal funding must be secured prior to starting reimbursable work done on the project.

2.2 Set Project Objectives

The local agency is responsible for setting project objectives, and determining what project development phases and deliverables are required. This information is critical and will assist the local agency decide what services are needed and which require consultant contracts. The scope of the consultant contract must reflect project objectives, and local agency should follow the scope carefully to ensure that it is met and that only work defined in the scope is undertaken. Work beyond that authorized in the scope is known as “scope creep” and it is unnecessary and expensive.

2.3 Determine Project Schedule

A schedule of all work and completion of the project should be developed. It should include sufficient time at the beginning to allow:

- Selecting the consultant
- Developing the consultant contract
- Completing the A&E consultant contract audit process
- Conducting meetings and project reviews

**TIP:**
All contracts must have a specified end date.

2.4 Obtain Federal Authorization to Proceed

The FHWA must give the local agency an Authorization to Proceed (E-76) with the work prior to the performance of any work for which federal reimbursement is to be requested (see LAPM Chapter 3, Project Authorization). For state funded projects see the Local Assistance Program Guidelines (LAPG) Chapter 23, Local Agency State Transportation Improvement Program Projects, for guidance as to when work may proceed. Although a consultant contract may be executed prior to authorization/allocation, only costs generated after the authorization/allocation will be reimbursed.

Copies of the Authorization to Proceed and the consultant contract must be retained in the local agency project files for future audit purposes.
2.5 Segment Project Work

After the project has been selected, the objectives set and a project schedule put in place, the project can be segmented appropriately. The extent of segmenting depends upon the type and complexity of the work. Segmenting the project helps to identify areas where consultants are required and what areas of work can be carried out by the agency. Segmenting also assists in setting the scope of work for the consultant.

2.5.1 Determine Project Development Phases

After the project has been selected, the objectives set, and a project schedule put in place, the project development phases have been determined appropriately. The extent of each project phase depends upon the type and complexity of the work. The scope of each project phase helps to identify areas where consultants are required and what areas of work can be carried out by the agency.

2.5.2 Subcontracted Services

The consultant is responsible for performing the work required under the contract in a manner acceptable to the local agency. The consultant’s organization and all associated consultants and subconsultants must be identified at the time of the technical proposal. If the consultant wishes to use a subconsultant not specified in the technical proposal, prior written approval must be obtained from the local agency. The subcontract must contain all required provisions of the prime contract.

2.5.3 Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest

In the procurement of contracts for engineering services by private consulting firms using federal-aid highway or state funds, local agencies must take all the steps necessary to prevent fraud, waste and abuse. The local agency must develop and maintain a written code of conduct governing the performance of its employees engaged in the award and administration of federal-aid highway funded contracts, including the prevention of conflicts of interest.

A conflict of interest occurs when a public official’s private interests and his or her public duties and responsibilities diverge or are not consistent. Conflicts of interest may be direct or indirect (e.g., as result of a personal or business relationship). Additionally, the appearance of a conflict of interest should be avoided as an apparent conflict may undermine public trust if not sufficiently mitigated.

Federal regulation governing conflict of interest (23 CFR 1.33) requires that:

- No contracting agency employee who participates in the procurement, management, or administration of federal funded contracts or subcontracts shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest in connection with such contract or subcontract.
- No person or entity performing services for a contracting agency in connection with a federal funded project shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest, other than employment or retention by the contracting agency, in any contract or subcontract in connection with such project.
- No person or entity performing services for a contracting agency in connection with a federal-aid highway project funded project shall have, directly or indirectly, any financial or other personal interest in any real property acquired for the project.
2.6 Identify Need for Consultant

The need for a consultant is identified by comparing the project’s schedule and objectives with the local agency’s capabilities, its staff availability of the required expertise, and its funding resources. If the local agency does not have sufficient staff capabilities, it may choose to solicit assistance from another agency, or use a qualified private consultant to perform the required work.

If the local agency determines that there is a need to solicit assistance from another local agency, or to use a consultant, the Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) should be notified if federal-aid or state funds are to be requested for the project segment to be contracted out.

2.6.1 Consultants Performing Work on Multiple Phases of Federal-aid Projects

Local agencies sometimes wish to hire the same consultant firm to perform construction engineering and/or inspection services on a project for which the firm also performed design services. This can result in project delivery efficiencies, as the design firm is well-suited to verify that the project is being constructed in accordance with the design and can resolve issues related to the design on behalf of the contracting agency. However, this may also pose a potential conflict of interest if the firm has a vested financial interest in failing to disclose deficiencies in its design work product and seeks to insulate itself from financial liability in subsequent phases of the project, such as minimizing or ignoring design errors and omissions, rather than serving the best interests of the contracting agency and the public. Procuring a different firm from the design firm to provide the necessary construction engineering and/or inspection services provides another level of review and reduces the risk of, or potential for, a conflict of interest.

Although federal regulations do not expressly prohibit the same firm from providing services on subsequent phases, the local agencies are responsible for ensuring the public interest is maintained throughout the life of a project and that a conflict of interest, direct or indirect, does not occur or is sufficiently mitigated by appropriate public agency controls. Prior to allowing a consulting firm to provide services on subsequent phases of the same project, the contracting agency must establish appropriate compensating controls in the form of policies, procedures, practices, and other safeguards to ensure a conflict of interest does not occur in the procurement, management, and administration of consultant services.

When design and construction phase services are procured under a single solicitation, the selection of the consulting firm must be based on the overall qualifications to provide both design and construction phase services, which require different skill sets, experience, and resources. Procuring these services under different solicitations may result in selection of a more qualified firm to perform services in each phase, as the most qualified firm to perform design phase services may not be the most qualified firm to provide construction phase services. Similarly, the qualifications and capacity of a firm may change over time. As such, it may not be appropriate to contract with a consulting firm to provide construction phase services.
at the outset of a design phase, knowing that these services may not be needed for an extended period of time until the preconstruction phase of the project is complete and construction funding authorized.

The contract with a consulting firm providing design phase services on a project may not be amended to include construction phase services unless the desired construction phase services were included within the original advertised scope of services and evaluation criteria of the solicitation from which a qualifications based selection was conducted.

All consultants acting in a management role (City or County Engineer) must complete LAPM Exhibit 10-U and retain it in the local agency files.

### 2.7 Appoint the Contract Administrator

The Contract Administrator is responsible for ensuring the quality of consultant contract products or services. The Contract Administrator is appointed as soon as the need for consultant services is identified. The Contract Administrator is involved throughout the development of the selection process and contract provisions, and in the administration of the consultant’s work. The Contract Administrator must be a qualified local agency employee, or have staff that is qualified to ensure the consultant’s work is complete, accurate, and consistent with the terms and conditions of the consultant contract. On federal-aid contracts, the Contract Administrator or staff members must be a full time employee and familiar with the work to be contracted out and the standards to be used. The Contract Administrator must also abide by the laws, regulations and policies required as part of accepting federal or state funding for their project. Non-compliance with the laws, regulations, and policies may result in loss of project funding.

The Contract Administrator’s duties include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Ensures all records, files and other documents related to contract procurement and management activities are retained in contract/project files
- Provides direction to ensure the proposed work is advertised properly
- Prepares and distributes the Request for Qualifications (RFQ), description of work, and Request for Proposals (RFP), if used
- Prepares the draft contract
- Arranges for preparation in advance of an independent estimate of the value of the work to be contracted out
- Ensures that the selection procedures are followed
- Analyzes the selected/best-qualified consultant’s cost proposal
- Ensures contract audit and review procedure is followed
- Ensures that fee/profit negotiation is conducted and records are kept
- Serves as the local agency’s primary contact person for the successful consultant
- Monitors the consultant’s progress and provides direction
- Reviews and approves the consultant’s invoices and/or progress payments to ensure that billings are in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract and correspond accurately to the work performed during the billing period
- Identifies other local agency staff for the consultant to contact, if needed
2.8 Segment Consultant Work

Consultant services are most effective when consultant work is segmented appropriately. The extent of segmenting depends upon the type and complexity of the work. Combining preliminary engineering tasks with the preparation of the required environmental analysis is normally desirable. Preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is more than simply writing a report. Assessment and impact reports include preliminary engineering needed to analyze project alternatives and produce an engineering and planning assessment. Initial project studies include only as much traffic and engineering analysis of alternatives as is needed to produce a sound EA or EIS (see LARM Exhibit 17-F: Final Report Utilization of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) and First-Tier Subcontractors).

Refer to Figure 2-2: Segmenting Consultant Work below, which illustrates several satisfactory ways to segment consultant activities.

2.9 Define Scope of Work for Consultant

The detailed scope of work or services describes what work will be required, what standards are followed for products and deliverables, and the quality, and performance assessment criteria. It also provides the obligation of both local agency and the consultant.
An effective scope of work is written in clear, unambiguous, and concise language. It contains provisions for determining the quality of the services or products delivered. Those preparing the scope of work should remember that it must communicate effectively with non-technical oriented people (administrators, attorneys, accountants) involved in the procurement process.

The scope of work is an integral part of contract development and procurement process. The scope of work may be developed from standardized tasks such as work breakdown structure, in accordance with project conditions and requirements. A multi-disciplined team should provide appropriate details for the tasks and activities in their field of expertise to complete the scope of work. Costly modifications, in terms of time and expenditures, can often be avoided with a well written scope of work, an accurate estimate and effective contract management.

The scope of work should also describe the minimum qualification of professional staff performing contract tasks. Specialized licenses, certification and qualification must be identified in order for consultant to assemble a team suitable to compete and once selected to conduct project activities.

### 2.10 Estimate Cost of Consultant Work

An independent estimate for cost or price analysis is needed for all consultant contracts to ensure that consultant services are obtained at a fair and reasonable price. The estimate is prepared in advance of requesting a cost proposal from the top-ranked consultant so the local agency’s negotiating team has a cost analysis of the project to evaluate the reasonableness of the consultant’s cost proposal. The estimate, which is specifically for the use of the local agency’s negotiating team, is to be kept confidential and maintained for records.

A good cost estimate can be prepared only if the scope of work is defined clearly. The scope of work must include a list of products or services which the consultant is required to deliver, and a time schedule of when they must be delivered.

It should be stressed that all work to be derived from the consultant services, such as preliminary design, environmental or final design, must be clearly identified in the solicitation of consultant services (RFQ or RFP) and included in the cost estimate. The addition of work to the original scope by amendment should be avoided whenever possible.

**TIP:**

Local Agencies must develop an independent cost estimate prior to review of cost proposals.

Some of the widely used cost estimating techniques are:

- **Analogous Estimating:** Analogous cost estimating is using the actual cost of a previous, similar contract as the basis for estimating the cost of the current contract. Analogous cost estimating is frequently used to estimate costs when there is a limited amount of detailed information about the project. Analogous cost estimating is generally less accurate and it is most reliable when previous projects are similar in fact, and not just in appearance, and it uses expert judgment.
• **Parametric Estimating**: Parametric estimating is a technique that uses statistical relationship between historical data and other variables to calculate a cost estimate for an activity resource. This technique can produce a higher level of accuracy depending upon the sophistication, as well as underlying resource quantity and the cost data. A cost example would involve multiplying the planned quantity of work by the historical cost per unit to obtain the estimated cost of the contract.

• **Bottom-up Estimating**: This technique involves estimating the cost for individual work in the contract with the lowest level of detail. This detailed cost is then summarized or rolled up to determine a total cost of contract. Cost detail should include estimated hours per task, labor hourly cost for professional and non-professional classifications, subconsultant costs, other project direct costs, and profit. Labor costs should be broken down to direct labor and indirect cost rates, if possible.

If more than one project or phase of work is to be developed within the consultant contract, separate cost estimates are required for each project or phase of work. Separate cost estimates are required for each milestone and portion of the work expected to be subcontracted.

For on-call (as-needed) contracts, the cost estimate/analysis should include at minimum, a historical analysis of annual needs for consultant work, professional labor cost and market analysis, and reasonable profit analysis.

2.10.1 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Participation

When administering federal-aid projects, federal regulations (49 CFR, Part 26) require a local agency to comply with the DBE program, and take necessary steps to ensure that DBE firms have the opportunity to participate in the projects. Such steps include the setting of goals to ensure DBE firms are considered by the proposing consultants and, when feasible, organizing the project schedule and task requirements to encourage participation in the contract by DBE firms. Local agencies should be fully aware of all of the subcontracting opportunities in their consultant contracts. For detailed information and requirements of the DBE Program, see LAPM Chapter 9, Civil Rights and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises.

The consultant must ensure that certified DBE firms have the opportunity to participate in the performance of the contract and must take all necessary and reasonable steps to facilitate participation by DBE firms for such assurance.

A DBE goal must be established by the local agency for each contract if there are subcontracting opportunities and available DBE firms. LAPM Exhibit 10-I: Notice to Proposers DBE Information (Exhibit 10-I) must be included in the RFQ or RFP if the proposed contract will include federal-aid funds. The consultant must meet the goal by using DBEs, or if not able to meet the DBE goal, document that a good faith effort was made to meet the contract goal. Good faith efforts must be documented by the consultant and approved by the local agency (see LAPM Exhibit 15-H: DBE Information—Good Faith Efforts (Exhibit 15-H)). Good Faith Effort on A&E solicitation measures the effort by the consultant to receive maximum number of DBE proposals since the selection process is based on “qualification”. If the consultant’s documented good faith efforts are found to be inadequate by the local agency, the consultant must be offered an opportunity for reconsideration.
If a DBE subconsultant is unable to perform its subcontracted services and the goal is not otherwise met, the consultant must make a good faith effort to replace it with another DBE subconsultant to the extent needed to meet the DBE goal. For more detailed information see Exhibit 10-I.

A contract provision for DBE Participation must be included in all consultant contracts with federal-aid funds. For sample contract clauses with and without specified DBE goals see LAPM Exhibit 10-R A&E: Sample Contract Language, Article XX Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Participation (Exhibit 10-R).

2.10.2 Reporting DBE Commitments and DBE Information

For Contracts with DBE Goals

If the local agency has set a DBE goal, LAPM Exhibit 10-O1: Consultant Proposal DBE Commitment (Exhibit 10-O1) must be included in the technical proposal or the statement of qualification package provided to the local agency by each (prime consultant) proposer. The purpose of Exhibit 10-O1 is to demonstrate the proposer’s commitment to meet the DBE goal set by the local agency.

LAPM Exhibit 10-O2: Consultant Contract DBE Information (Exhibit 10-O2) must be completed at the conclusion of cost negotiations, incorporated into the final agreement and a copy sent to the DLAE. The purpose of this form is to capture DBE participation in accordance with 49 CFR, Part 26. This form must include the names, addresses, and phone numbers of DBE firms that will participate with a complete description of work or supplies to be provided by each, and the dollar value of each DBE transaction. When 100 percent of a subcontracted item of work is not to be performed or furnished by the DBE firm, a description of the exact portion of work to be performed or furnished by that DBE must be included in the DBE commitment, including the planned location of that work. A proposer certified as a DBE firm must describe the work it has committed to be performed with its own forces, as well as any other work that it has committed to be performed by the DBE subconsultant, suppliers, and trucking companies.

The winning proposer must provide written confirmation from each DBE firm participating in the contract. A copy of a DBE’s quote will serve as written confirmation that the DBE is participating in the contract. If a DBE is participating as a joint venture partner, the proposer must submit a copy of the joint venture agreement.

For Contracts with No DBE Goals

For contracts with no DBE contract goal, Exhibit 10-O1 is not necessary and only Exhibit 10-O2 must be included in the award package and provided by the winning proposer.

Upon completion of the contract, a summary of the DBE final utilization must be prepared, certified correct, and submitted on Exhibit 17-F or equivalent to the local agency showing total dollars paid to each subconsultant and supplier. Exhibit 17-F is reviewed by the local agency and certified as complete and accurate.

The local agency must send the original, plus one copy, of the completed Exhibit 17-F with the final Consultant contract invoice to the DLAE within 30 days after completion of the contract.
2.11 Determine Type of Contract

Types of contracts to be used are described as follows:

- Project-specific contract is between the local agency and consultant for the performance of services and a defined scope of work related to a specific project or projects.
- Multi-purpose or Multi-phased contract is a project-specific contract where the defined scope of work is divided into phases which may be negotiated and executed individually as the project progresses.
- On-call contract is a contract for a number of projects, on an as-needed basis, and for an established contract period, under which task or work orders are issued for specific projects or scope of work. On-call contracts are typically used when a specialized service of indefinite delivery or indefinite quantity are needed for a number of different projects. Most common services used under an on-call contract are construction engineering, construction material testing, geotechnical studies and land surveying. Many agencies use these contracts to address peaks in workload of in-house engineering staff and/or to perform a specialized service which the agency does not have. On-call contracts shall specify a reasonable maximum length of contract, not to exceed 5 years, and a maximum total contract dollar amount (23 CFR 172). To maintain the intent of the Brooks Act (40 USC 1101-1104) in promoting open competition and selection based on demonstrated competence and qualifications, on-call consultant contracts established through the RFQ process must meet the following requirements:
  o Must define a general scope of work, complexity, and professional nature of services.
  o Specify a task order procedure the local agency uses to procure project specific work under the contract.
    ▪ No task order is valid unless the on-call contract is still in force. For example, if the on-call contract is expired, all task orders issued after the contract expiration date will become invalid.
  o If multiple consultants are to be selected and multiple on-call contracts awarded through a single solicitation for specific services:
    ▪ Identify the number of consultants that may be selected or contracts that may be awarded.
    ▪ Specify procedures in the contracts the local agency will use to award/execute task orders among the consultants:
      ▪ Either through an additional qualification-based selection process (see the Two-Step RFQ/RFP process later in this manual), OR
      ▪ On a regional basis whereby the region is divided into areas identified in the solicitation, and consultants are selected to provide on-call services for assigned areas only.

2.12 Determine Method of Payment

The method of payment for the contract must be specified in the original solicitation, the executed contract and any subsequent modification thereto. Four methods are permitted depending on the scope of services to be performed:
2.12.1 Actual Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee
The consultant is reimbursed for actual costs incurred and receives an additional predetermined amount as a fixed fee (profit). Federal regulations require that profit be separately negotiated from contract costs. The determination of the amount of the fixed fee shall take into account the size, complexity, duration, and degree of risk involved in the work. The fixed fee is not adjustable during the life of the contract. The fixed fee dollar amount must be clearly stated in the contract.

This method of payment is appropriate when the extent, scope, complexity, character, or duration of work cannot be precisely predicted. Fixed fees apply to the total direct and indirect costs. The contract shall specify a reasonable maximum length of contract period and a maximum total contract dollar amount (see Exhibit 10-H, Example #1 and Exhibit 10-R, Article V, Option 1 in this manual). The contract cost proposal must identify all key employees and/or classifications to be billed. New key employees and/or classifications must be approved by the local agency before they incur work on the contract or the costs can be questioned or disallowed.

2.12.2 Cost Per Unit of Work
The consultant is paid based on a specific item of work performed. The item of work must be similar, repetitious and measurable, such as geotechnical investigation and material testing. This method of payment is appropriate when the cost per unit of work can be determined with reasonable accuracy in advance; but the extent or quantity of the work is indefinite. Contract payment provisions must specify what is included in the price to be paid for each item. Any item of work not identified in the contract cost proposal is not eligible for reimbursement. New items of work (those not within the original scope of work) must be amended into the contract before work is performed. The contract shall also specify a reasonable maximum length of contract period and a maximum total contract dollar amount (see Exhibit 10-H, Example #3 and Exhibit 10-R, Article V, Option 2).

2.12.3 Specified Rates of Compensation
The consultant is paid at an agreed and supported specific fixed hourly, daily, weekly or monthly rate, for each class of employee engaged directly in the work. Such rates of pay include the consultant’s estimated costs and net fee (profit). Federal regulations require that profit be separately negotiated from contract costs. The specific rates of compensation, except for an individual acting as a sole proprietor, are to include an hourly breakdown, direct salary costs, fringe benefits, indirect costs, and net fee. Indirect cost
rate should be accepted prior to application and are generally valid for one accounting period, unless both parties to the contract agreed to fix it for the term of the contract. Other direct costs may be included, such as travel and equipment rentals, if not already captured in the indirect cost rate. Direct costs must be “actual”.

This method of payment should only be used when it is not possible at the time of procurement to estimate the extent or the duration of the work, or to estimate costs with any reasonable degree of accuracy. This method is recommended for on-call contracts for specialized or support type services, such as construction engineering and inspection, where the consultant is not in direct control of the number of hours worked, and it also requires management and monitoring of consultant’s level of effort and the classification of employees used to perform the contracted work. The contract shall also specify a length of contract period (which shall not exceed five years) and a maximum total contract dollar amount (see Exhibit 10-H, Example #2 and Exhibit 10-R, Article V, Option 3).

2.12.4 Lump Sum or Firm Fixed Price

The consultant performs the services stated in the contract for an agreed amount of compensation, including a net fee or profit. This method of payment is appropriate only if the extent, scope, complexity, character, duration, and risk of the work have been sufficiently defined to permit fair compensation to be determined and evaluated by all parties during negotiations (see Exhibit 10-H, Example #1 and Exhibit 10-R, Article V, Option 4).

Normally, a lump sum contract will be paid in full at the end of the contract when work is completed. However, a lump sum contract can be negotiated with progress payments, if feasible. The progress payment shall be based on percent of work completed or the completion of clearly defined milestones. The contract cost proposal shall document the agreed upon progress payment and include the necessary milestone costs, or the percent of work completed schedule.
3.0 CONSULTANT CONTRACT PROCUREMENT PROCESS  
(SOLICITATION, EVALUATION AND SELECTION, NEGOTIATIONS)

The consultant procurement process could be divided into these steps or phases: Solicitation and advertisement, evaluation and selection of the most qualified consultant, cost negotiations with selected consultant, and finally, the execution of the contract and issuance of the Notice to Proceed.

There are three methods normally used in soliciting for a consultant. They are:

- One-Step Request For Proposal (RFP)
- One-Step Request For Qualifications (RFQ)
- Two-Step RFQ/RFP

The method used depends upon the scope of work, the services required, the project's complexity, and the time available for selection of the consultant.

In addition, there are other methods used in special situations such as noncompetitive procurement and small purchases under $150,000. These methods are discussed in Section 8.0, Engineering Services Under $150,000 of this manual.

Beginning with Section 3.1, Consultant Selection Using the One-Step RFP Method of this manual, each of the selection methods is explained in detail. Regardless of the method used, the local agency shall retain all consultant selection documentation in their project files as required by 2 CFR Part 200.333. The local agency must ensure that consultant contract solicitation and advertising documents clearly specify that contracts shall not be awarded to a consultant without an adequate financial management and accounting system as required by 23 CFR Part 172, 48 CFR Part 16.301-3, 2 CFR Part 200, and 48 CFR Part 31. The local agency must ensure and document that the selected consultants have the adequate financial management systems as required by the applicable federal regulations.

All solicitations for A&E services shall be by public advertisement, or by any other public forum or method that assures qualified in-state and out-of-state consulting firms are given a fair opportunity to be considered for award of an A&E related services contract. Advertisement in a major local newspaper of general circulation, technical publications of widespread circulation, professional associations and societies, recognized DBE organizations, electronic communication boards or Internet web sites, or clearing houses known for posting government contract solicitations, such as Bidsync, or posting on the local agency’s or other widely used websites are all acceptable method of advertisement. To document website postings, the local agency should retain copies of screen shots displaying the posted “begin/end” dates.

TIP:
RFP/RFQ solicitations must be publicly advertised and can be published on an agency website or www.bidsync.com
One-Step RFP
The One-Step RFP method may be used for Project–specific contracts when the scope of work is well defined or for multi-phased contracts where the defined scope of work is divided into phases. Other considerations include when the consultant’s services are highly specialized and there are few qualified consultants.

One-Step RFQ
The most common selection process is the One-Step RFQ method. It is used when the requested services are specialized, or the scope of work is defined broadly and may include multiple projects. Typical services are land surveying, construction management, or any specialized services that are needed across many projects. This method or the two step selection process is used for procurement of on-call contract(s).

Two-Step (RFQ Followed by RFP)
The Two-Step RFQ/RFP method may be used when the scope of work is complex or unusual. This method also may be preferred by local agencies that are inexperienced about negotiations and procedures for establishing compensation. However, the Two-Step RFQ/RFP method is recommended for procurement of multiple on-call contracts, or pre-qualified list, through a single solicitation. This method requires substantially more work and time than the other two methods described above.

3.1 Consultant Procurement Using the One-Step RFP Method
The One-Step RFP method may be used for Project–specific contracts when the scope of work is well defined or for multi-phased contracts where the defined scope of work is divided into phases. Other considerations include when the consultant’s services are highly specialized and there are few qualified consultants.

Of the three methods discussed, this one is most easily modified for non-A&E consulting contracts. For non-A&E consulting contracts, a cost proposal may be part of the RFP and the selection criteria. For A&E contracts, the cost proposal is not requested until the consultants have been final ranked based upon their submitted technical proposal. See Section 9.0, Non-A&E Consultants in this manual for further guidance on non-A&E consultant procurement.

The following workflow chart describes the necessary steps and activities during the procurement of consultant contracts using the One-step RFP method.
Figure 3-1: Consultant Procurement Using One-Step RFP Method Flowchart
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3.1.1 Appoint Consultant Selection Committee

A consultant selection committee with a minimum of three members is appointed at the beginning of the consultant selection process. The committee reviews materials submitted by consultants, develops a shortlist of qualified consultants, and develops a final ranking of the most qualified technical proposals. Representation on the committee includes the Contract Administrator and subject matter experts from the project’s functional area. The members should be familiar with the project/segment to be contracted out and with the local agency standards that will be used in the contract. Participation by a Caltrans district representative is at the option of the agency and subject to availability of the DLAE staff. Caltrans participation on the interview panel does not relieve the local agency of its responsibility to ensure that proper procurement procedures are followed and all requirements are met.

The local agency Contract Administrator ensures that all committee members meet the conflict of interest requirements (23 CFR 172) by completing and signing a conflict of interest statement prior to selection process initiation. A sample conflict of interest form is provided in LAPM Exhibit 10-T: Panel Member Conflict of Interest & Confidentiality Statement (Exhibit 10-T).

Before the contract is advertised, the Contract Administrator completes a contract procurement schedule including key dates for consultant selection activities. The Contract Administrator should confirm key dates with all selection committee members before completing the schedule.

**TIP:**

It is essential the Selection Panel complete the Conflict of Interest Statement LAPM Exhibit 10-T.

3.1.2 Develop Criteria for Evaluation of RFP

The Contract Administrator is responsible for developing the technical criteria, and their relative importance which are used to evaluate and rank the consultant technical proposals.

The criteria and relative weights must be included in the RFP, and the same criteria and relative weights must be used on the evaluation sheets. Failure to include criteria and relative weights and to use the same criteria and weights during the evaluation will result in the contract costs being ineligible for federal or state reimbursement. LAPM Exhibit 10-B: Suggested Consultant Evaluation Sheet (Exhibit 10-B) is a recommended evaluation sheet with criteria and rating points for A&E consultants, where cost is not used as a rating factor. This format is not mandatory, but it is recommended in the interest of developing consistency among the hundreds of agencies and consultants operating in the state. The local agency should consult with the DLAE before making major changes to the suggested approach.

3.1.3 Prepare RFP

The information required in a RFP includes the following:

- Description of project
- Scope of work
- Schedule of work (including estimated start and end dates of the contract)
- Method of payment, and cost proposal requirements (The cost proposal is submitted in a separate sealed envelope. See Exhibit 10-H for sample cost proposal formats.)
• Contract audit and review process requirements (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process)
• Technical Proposal format and required items (see list below)
• Method, criteria and weighting for selection
• DBE contract goal specified (see Exhibit 10-I) if a federal-aid contract
• Protest procedures and dispute resolution process per 2 CFR Part 200.318 (k)

The RFP specifies the content of a technical proposal, the number of copies required, due date, mailing address, and a physical address where the submittals may be hand delivered if different from the mailing address. Two to four weeks is usually allowed between the time the RFP is published and time that technical proposals must be submitted. More time may be required for complex contracts or projects.

Items typically required in a technical proposal include:

• Work plan (specify what is to be covered)
• Organizational chart
• Schedule and deadlines
• Staffing plan
• Proposed team—complete for prime consultant and all key subconsultants
• Key personnel names and classifications—key team members identified in the original technical proposal/cost proposal shall not change (be different than) in the executed contract
• Staff resumes
• Names of consultant’s project manager and the individual authorized to negotiate the contract on behalf of the consulting firm
• Consultant DBE Commitment document, see Exhibit 10-O1
• References

3.1.4 Advertise for Consultants

The solicitation process for consultant services shall be by public advertisement, or by any other public forum or method that assures qualified in-State and out-of-State consultants are given a fair opportunity to be considered for award of contract.

Advertisement of the RFP in a major newspaper of general circulation, technical publications of widespread circulation, professional associations and societies, recognized DBE organizations, web hosting or clearing houses known for posting government contract solicitations, such as BidSync, or posting the RFP on the local agency’s or other widely used websites are all acceptable methods of solicitation. To document website postings, the local agency should retain copies of screen shots displaying the posted begin/end dates.

The advertisement of the RFQ may take one of two approaches. In one approach, the entire RFQ is published with all its requirements and submittal deadline. In the second approach, the advertisement specifies the availability of the RFQ. Interested consultant will be able to obtain RFQ at a location, request that RFQ to be mailed or simply download the electronic RFQ from web site after registration. This approach provides a registry for firms who received the RFQ and therefore facilitates the broadcast of any revisions or addendum to the RFQ, if necessary.
3.1.5 Issue RFP

The local agency shall publish the RFP online and also issue the RFP to all consultants responding to newspaper advertisement. The local agency shall keep a record of all consultants that have downloaded the RFP online as well as those receiving an RFP through other means, to ensure that any inquiry responses, addendums, or amendments to the RFP are given to all consultants that received the RFP.

TIP:
Selection criteria and specific weights (percentages) must be defined in the solicitation.

3.1.6 Conduct Proposer’s Conference or Answer Written Questions

The local agency may allow for clarification of the RFP by inviting submittal of written questions or by conducting a proposer’s conference, or by doing both. The local agency must publish or mail their responses to any written questions to all consultants receiving the RFP. No response should be given to verbal questions. It is important that all competing consultants receive the same information. If a proposer’s conference is to be held, the exact time and place must be specified in the RFP. Attendance at a proposer’s conference normally is not mandatory. However, consultants not attending the conference do not receive notes from the meeting unless they request the notes.

3.1.7 Receive and Evaluate Technical Proposals and Develop Shortlist

The Contract Administrator must verify that each technical proposal contains all of the forms and other information required by the RFP. If all required information is not provided, a technical proposal may be considered nonresponsive and rejected without evaluation. Late submittals, submittals to the wrong location, or submittals with inadequate copies are considered nonresponsive and shall be rejected. Submittal of additional information after the due date shall not be allowed. Documentation of when each technical proposal was received must be maintained in the project files. Copies of date stamped envelope covers or box tops are recommended.

The members of the consultant selection committee must evaluate each technical proposal according to the technical criteria listed in the RFP. A minimum of three technical proposals must be received and evaluated. The selection committee establishes a shortlist of consultants who are considered to be best qualified to perform the contract work. The shortlist includes enough qualified consultants to ensure that at least three consultants are interviewed.

If only two technical proposals are received, a justification must be documented to proceed with the procurement. If only one technical proposal is received, a Non-Competitive process must be justified and a Public Interest Finding (PIF) must be documented (LAPM Exhibit 12-F). In either case, the re-advertisement of the RFP should be considered as an option.

TIP:
Selection must be made using selection criteria and specific weights defined in the solicitation.
3.1.8 Interview Shortlist, Develop Final Ranking and Notify Consultants of Results

Interviews are to be structured and conducted in a formal manner. Each consultant to be interviewed is sent an invitation to the interview, with an agenda and timeline. A copy of the draft proposed contract, defining the standard contract language/boilerplate is also provided.

The selection committee must also evaluate reference checks and other information gathered independently. Reference checks shall be completed and other information gathered before the interviews are conducted. If necessary, the results of the reference checks or other information may be discussed with the highest ranked qualified consultants at the interviews.

Interviews are to be structured and conducted in a formal manner. Each consultant shall be allowed the opportunity to make a presentation if desired; however, a time limit should be specified. Interview questions are prepared in advance.

Two types of questions may be asked:

- Questions that are to be asked of all competing consultants
- Questions relating to each specific consultant, based upon the reference checks, and the strengths and weaknesses identified during evaluation of the SOQ

The agency can request competing consultants bring additional information or examples of their work to the interviews; if the additional information facilitates the interview or evaluation process.

Additional information requested should be kept at a minimum, that is, only information required to select the most qualified consultant for the contract. The selection committee or local agency shall not gather additional information concerning the consultants after the interviews are completed.

All consultants that submitted technical proposals must be informed about the final ranking of consultants. It is important that all competing consultants receive the same information. Most consultants will request information as to why they were not the highest ranked. Therefore, the selection committee should keep notes as to why a particular consultant was not selected. When a consultant requests a debriefing, the reasons for not being selected must be objective reasons. The consultant should not be compared to others, and should not be provided with information about other consultants during this debriefing. Normally, the Contract Administrator does the debriefing; however, any member of the selection committee may be designated to do the debriefing.

TIP:
Score sheets must be signed, dated, and retained in Local Agency files.

Conduct Scoping Meeting

The Contract Administrator meets with the first-ranked consultant’s project manager to review the project, and to ensure that the consultant has a complete understanding of the work that is required. The consultant is shown as much material as is available regarding the project. Any technical questions regarding the project are answered for the consultant.
3.1.9 Request Cost Proposal and Negotiate Contract with Top-Ranked Consultant

The first-ranked consultant is asked to provide a cost proposal to perform the work described in the draft contract and discussed at the scoping meeting. The work is to be performed according to the conditions described in the draft contract using the payment method described therein. Alternatively, if time is of the essence and it can be justified, sealed cost proposals may be requested from all of the consultants on the shortlist.

If the contract involves more than one project, the consultant must provide a separate cost proposal for each project in addition to a summary cost proposal for the total contract. If the contract involves milestones, the consultant must furnish a separate cost proposal for each milestone with a summary cost proposal for the total costs. If the contract involves subconsultants, the prime consultant must include a separate cost proposal for each subconsultant. Each subconsultant’s cost proposal must follow the same format as the prime consultant’s cost proposal.

Cost proposal (for both prime and all subconsultants) and contract audit and review documents, such as Exhibit 10-K and Exhibit 10-A, whichever applicable (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process), will be submitted in a separate sealed envelope.

After the top-ranked consultant submits a sealed cost proposal, the local agency reviews the cost proposal and enters into negotiations. The goal of negotiation is to agree on a final contract that delivers to the local agency the services or products required at a fair and reasonable cost. The independent cost estimate, developed by the local agency in advance of requesting a cost proposal from the top-ranked consultant, is an important basis and tool for negotiations.

Negotiations should commence with the most qualified consultant. If agreement on a fair and reasonable price cannot be reached, negotiations should then be formally terminated. Negotiations then proceed to the next most qualified consultant, and so on. Each consultant’s cost proposal must remain sealed until negotiations commence with that particular consultant. At the completion of successful cost negotiations, all remaining sealed envelopes containing cost proposals shall be returned to consultants.

A contract audit and review may be required (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process). The local agency Contract Administrator is responsible for the submittal of all required documentations to Caltrans A&I in a timely fashion, including all documents for a Conformance Review, if applicable. Negotiations may be completed after receipt of the Caltrans A&I Conformance Letter. An indirect cost audit may be performed within the record retention period of the contract.

Items typically negotiated include:

- Work plan
- Schedule and deadlines (for deliverables and final duration of contract)
- Products to be delivered
- Classification, wage rates, and experience level of personnel to be assigned
- Other Direct Cost items, and profit or fee

TIP:
Price/fee negotiations must be documented.
The consultant’s indirect cost rate (ICR) is not a negotiable item. A lower rate cannot be negotiated by the local agency.

The local agency and the consultant will agree on the final cost proposal and incorporate it into the final contract.

Before executing the consultant contract, the local agency must review the contract to ensure that all federal and state requirements have been met (see LAPM Exhibit 10-C: Consultant Contract Reviewers Checklist (Exhibit 10-C)), and all deficiencies identified in the Conformance Letter have been addressed and resolved, if applicable. The completed checklist is to be signed by the Contract Administrator and the original retained in the project file. One copy is to be sent to the DLAE (for review of completeness) and filing within 30 days after awarding the contract.

**TIP:**

Consultant Contract Reviewer Checklist *Exhibit 10-C* must be filled out by the Local Agency.
3.2 Consultant Procurement Using the One-Step RFQ Method

Figure 3-2: Consultant Procurement Using One-Step RFQ Method Flowchart

REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS (RFQ)

1. **(3.2.1) Appoint Consultant Selection Committee and Develop Schedule for Selection**

2. **(3.2.2) Develop Qualification Criteria for Evaluation of SOQ**

3. **(3.2.3) Prepare RFQ**

4. **(3.2.4) Advertise for Consultants**

5. **(3.2.5) Issue/Publish RFQ**

6. **(3.2.6) Conduct Proposer’s Conference or Answer Written Questions**

7. **(3.2.7) Receive Statements of Qualifications and Develop Shortlist**

8. **(3.2.8) Interview Shortlist, Develop Final Ranking and Notify Consultants of Results**

9. **(3.2.9) Negotiate Contract with Next Highest Ranked Consultant Until Successful**

10. **(3.2.9) Request Cost Proposal and Negotiate Contract with Top-Ranked Consultant**

11. **(4.0) Initiate A&E Consultant Audit Process**

12. **(5.0) Execute Contract**
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19. **(3.2.8) Interview Shortlist, Develop Final Ranking and Notify Consultants of Results**
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3.2.1 Appoint Consultant Selection Committee and Develop Schedule for Consultant Selection

A consultant selection committee with a minimum of three members is appointed at the beginning of the consultant selection process. The committee reviews and scores the Statement of Qualification (SOQ) submitted by consultants in response to the RFQ, develops a shortlist of qualified consultants, interviews those consultants, and develops a final ranking of the most qualified consultants. Representation on the committee includes the Contract Administrator and subject matter experts from the project’s functional area. The members should be familiar with the scope of work to be contracted out and with the local agency standards that will be used in the contract. Participation by a Caltrans district representative is at the option of the local agency and subject to the availability of the DLAE staff. Caltrans participation on the interview panel does not relieve the local agency of its responsibility to ensure that proper procurement procedures are followed and all requirements are met.

Local agency Contract Administrator ensures that all committee members meet the conflict of interest requirements (23 CFR 172) by completing and signing a conflict of interest statement prior to selection process initiation. A sample conflict of interest form is provided in Exhibit 10-T.

TIP:
It is essential the Selection Panel complete the Conflict of Interest Statement LAPM Exhibit 10-T.

3.2.2 Develop Criteria for Evaluation of SOQ

The Contract Administrator is responsible for developing the technical criteria and their relative importance which are used to evaluate and rank the consultant qualifications. The criteria and relative weights must be included in the RFQ, and the same criteria and relative weights must be used in the evaluation sheets. Failure to include criteria and relative weights and to use the same criteria and weights during the evaluation will result in the contract costs being ineligible for federal or state reimbursement. Exhibit 10-B is a recommended evaluation sheet with criteria and rating points for A&E consultants, where cost is not used as a rating factor. This format is not mandatory, but it is recommended in the interest of developing consistency among the hundreds of agencies and consultants operating in the state. The local agency should consult with the DLAE before making major changes to the suggested approach.

Before a contract is advertised, the Contract Administrator completes a contract procurement schedule including key dates for consultant selection activities. The Contract Administrator should confirm target dates with all selection committee members before completing the schedule.

3.2.3 Prepare RFQ

As a minimum, the RFQ generally includes the following:

- description of the services or project(s)
- Scope of work
- Schedule of work (including contract begin and end dates)
- Method of payment and cost proposal requirements (The cost proposal is submitted in a separate sealed envelope. See Exhibit 10-H for sample cost proposal formats.)
• Contract audit and review process requirements (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process)
• SOQ format and required items to be submitted (see list below)
• Method, criteria and weights for selection
• Specified DBE contract goal, if a federal-aid contract (See Exhibit 10-I)
• Protest procedures and dispute resolution process per 2 CFR Part 200.318 (k)

The RFQ specifies the content of the SOQ, the number of copies required, due date, mailing address, and a physical address where the submittals may be hand delivered if different from the mailing address. Two to four weeks is usually allowed between the time the RFQ is published and the time that SOQs must be submitted. More time may be required for complex contracts or scope of work.

Items typically required in a SOQ include:

• Qualifications of key personnel proposed for the contract, including consultant project manager (Key team members identified in the original technical proposal/cost proposal shall not change or be different than in the executed contract)
• Staff resumes
• Related projects that key personnel have worked on
• Qualifications/experience of the firm
• Organizational chart
• Forecast or schedule of work
• Consultant DBE Commitment document (See Exhibit 10-O1)
• References

3.2.4 Advertise for Consultants

The solicitation process for consultant services shall be by public advertisement or any other public forum or method that assures qualified in-State and out-of-State consultants are given a fair opportunity to be considered for award of contract. The RFQ must contain sufficient information regarding project work or the specialized services being sought, so that interested consultants can submit an appropriate SOQ.

Advertisements of the RFQ in a major newspaper of general circulation, technical publication of widespread circulation, professional associations and societies, recognized DBE organizations, web hosting or clearing houses known for posting contract solicitations such as BidSync, or posting the RFQ on local agency’s or other widely used websites are all acceptable methods of solicitation. To document website postings, the local agency should retain copies of screen shots displaying the posted begin/end dates.

The advertisement of the RFQ may take one of two approaches. In one approach, the entire RFQ is published with all its requirements and submittal deadline. In the second approach, the advertisement specifies the availability of the RFQ. Interested consultant will be able to obtain RFQ at a location, request that RFQ to be mailed or simply download the electronic RFQ from web site after registration. This approach provides a registry for firms who received the RFQ and therefore facilitates the broadcast of any revisions or addendum to the RFQ, if necessary.
3.2.5 Issue RFQ
The local agency shall publish the RFQ online and also issue the RFQ to all consultants responding to newspaper advertisement. The local agency shall keep a record of all consultants that have downloaded the RFQ online as well as those receiving an RFQ through other means, to ensure that any inquiry responses, addendums, or amendments to the RFQ are given to all consultants that received the RFQ.

TIP:
Selection criteria and specific weights (percentages) must be defined in the solicitation.

3.2.6 Conduct Proposer’s Conference or Answer Written Questions
The local agency may allow for clarification of the RFQ by inviting submittal of written questions or by conducting a proposer’s conference, or by doing both. The local agency must publish or mail their responses to any written questions to all consultants receiving the RFQ. No response should be given to verbal questions. It is important that all competing consultants receive the same information. If a proposer’s conference is to be held, the exact time and place must be specified in the RFQ. Attendance at a proposer’s conference normally is not mandatory. However, consultants not attending the conference do not receive notes from the meeting unless they request the notes.

3.2.7 Receive and Evaluate Statements of Qualifications and Develop Shortlist
The first step in the evaluation process is to determine that each SOQ contains all forms and other information required by the RFQ. Otherwise, the submittals may be considered nonresponsive and rejected without evaluation. Late submittals, submittals to the wrong location, and submittals with inadequate copies are considered nonresponsive and shall be rejected. Submittal of additional information after the due date shall not be allowed. Documentation of when each SOQ was received must be maintained in the project files. Copies of date stamped envelope covers or box tops are recommended.

Minimum of three SOQ must be received and evaluated. If only two SOQ are received, a justification must be documented to proceed with the procurement. If only one SOQ is received, a Non-Competitive process must be justified and a Public Interest Finding (PIF) (LAPM Exhibit 12-F) must be documented. In either case, the re-advertisement of the RFQ should be considered as an option.

The consultant selection committee reviews the submitted SOQ according to the published evaluation criteria and weighting factors. The committee makes an independent random check of one or more of the consultant’s references. This check also applies to major subconsultants. The committee establishes a shortlist of consultants who are considered to be the best qualified to perform the contract work. The shortlist includes enough qualified consultants to ensure that at least three consultants are interviewed.

All consultants that submitted an SOQ must be notified of the results of the review. The notification also identifies those consultants (shortlisted) that will be requested to attend interviews. Most consultants will request information as to why they were not placed on the shortlist. Therefore, the selection committee should keep notes why a particular consultant was not selected for the shortlist. When a consultant requests a debriefing, the reasons given for not being selected must be objective reasons. Consultants should not be compared with each other during the debriefing. Normally, the
Contract Administrator does the debriefing; however, any member of the selection committee may be designated to do the debriefing.

TIP:
Selection must be made using selection criteria and specific weights defined in the solicitation.

3.2.8 Interview Shortlist, Develop Final Ranking and Notify Consultants of Results

Each consultant to be interviewed is given a copy of the draft of the proposed contract, defining the detailed scope of work, and/or description of required services, and other information. This should be sent with the initial notification of the interview.

Between the time of the notification of the shortlist and interviews, the local agency may answer any questions concerning the scope of work to be contracted out, if not done earlier during the solicitation. In addition, the local agency may conduct additional reference checks for each consultant to be interviewed. Consultants should submit their questions about the RFQ and receive their answers from the local agency in writing. It is important that all consultants on the shortlist receive the questions and answers and are given the same information.

The committee should evaluate reference checks and other information that is gathered independently. Reference checks shall be completed and other information gathered before the interviews are conducted. If necessary, the results of the reference checks and other information may be discussed with the consultant at the interview.

Interviews are to be structured and conducted in a formal manner. Each consultant shall be allowed the opportunity to make a presentation if desired; however, a time limit should be specified. Interview questions are prepared in advance.

Two types of questions may be asked:

- Questions that are to be asked of all competing consultants
- Questions relating to each specific consultant, based upon the reference checks, and the strengths and weaknesses identified during evaluation of the SOQ

The agency can request competing consultants bring additional information or examples of their work to the interviews; if the additional information facilitates the interview or evaluation process.

Additional information requested should be kept at a minimum, that is, only information required to select the most qualified consultant for the contract. The selection committee or local agency shall not gather additional information concerning the consultants after the interviews are completed.
3.2.9 Request Cost Proposal and Negotiate Contract with Top-Ranked Consultant

The cost proposal (for both Prime and all Subconsultants), contract audit, and review documents, such as LAPM Exhibit 10-K: Consultant Certification of Costs and Financial Management System (Exhibit 10-K) and LAPM Exhibit 10-A: A&E Consultant Audit Request Letter and Checklist (Exhibit 10-A), whichever applicable (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process), should be submitted in a separate sealed envelope. Typically, the cost proposals are submitted by the short listed consultants only, at time of interview. However, if time is of the essence and it can be justified, or if no interviews are planned, the cost proposal can be requested from all consultants with their technical proposal.

The cost proposal for the most qualified consultant will be opened and used to begin negotiations. If agreement cannot be reached, then negotiation proceeds to the next most qualified consultant. Each consultant’s cost proposal must remain sealed until negotiations commence with that particular consultant. The goal of negotiations is to agree on a final contract that delivers the services, or products required at a fair and reasonable cost to the local agency. At the completion of successful cost negotiations, all remaining sealed envelopes containing cost proposals shall be returned to consultants.

The independent cost estimate, developed by the local agency in advance of requesting a cost proposal from the top-ranked consultant, is an important basis and tool for negotiations or terminating unsuccessful negotiations with the most qualified consultant. It can be revised, if needed, for use in negotiations with the next most qualified consultant.

A contract audit and review may be required (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process in this manual). The local agency Contract Administrator ensures that all required documentation is provided to Caltrans Audits and Investigations (A&I) in a timely fashion, including all documents for a Conformance Review, if applicable. Negotiations may be completed after receipt of the Caltrans A&I Conformance Letter. An indirect cost audit may be performed within the record retention period of the contract.

The items typically negotiated include:

- Work plan
- Staffing plan
- Schedule (including contract begin and end dates)
- Products to be delivered
- Classification, wage rates, and experience level of personnel to be assigned
- Other direct cost items, and profit or fee

TIP:
Score sheets must be signed, dated, and retained in local agency files.
The consultant’s ICR is not a negotiable item. A lower rate cannot be negotiated by the local agency.

TIP:
Price/fee negotiations must be documented.

For on-call contracts, typically a price agreement is reached based on specific rate of compensation for the term of the contract. The subsequent task orders (or mini agreements for individual project work) is negotiated based on actual cost plus fee or lump sum which is derived from the wage rates agreed upon earlier for the on-call contract.

Before executing the consultant contract, the local agency must review the contract to ensure that all federal and state requirements have been met (see Exhibit 10-C), and all deficiencies identified in the Conformance Letter have been addressed and resolved, if applicable. The completed checklist is to be signed by the Contract Administrator and the original retained in the project file. One copy is to be sent to the DLAE (for review of completeness) and filing within 30 days after awarding the contract.

TIP:
Consultant Contract Reviewer Checklist Exhibit 10-C must be filled out by the Local Agency.
3.3 Consultant Selection Using the Two-Step RFQ/RFP Method

Figure 3-3: Consultant Procurement Using Two-Step RFQ/RFP Method Flowchart
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Local agencies may use this method to develop and maintain a file/list of consultant firms by specific work categories or areas of expertise. This data file or interest list can be updated annually or every two years, upon issuance of a RFQ.

Development of a pre-qualified list of consultants using the Two-Step RFQ/RFP method requires combining certain steps from each of the other two methods previously described. The consultants are rated based upon both their qualifications and their technical proposals.

The initial step in this method (up to the development and notification of the pre-qualified list) is the same as the One-Step RFQ method. Once the pre-qualified list is established, project-specific RFPs may be issued to the consultants from the list. The next step is the same as the One-Step RFP method.

The Two-Step RFQ/RFP is also well suited for procuring multiple on-call contracts through a single solicitation. The outcome of the RFQ will be multiple on-call contracts with qualified consultants with cost/price agreements. The subsequent project work will be procured through individual competition or mini-RFPs amongst the on-call consultants. The mini-RFP or the task order will be negotiated with the first ranked firm from each competition. Task order cost will be based on wage rates established in the master on-call contract, and the time and deliverable requirements in the task order.

Because it is a combination of the One-Step RFQ and One-Step RFP methods, this method of consultant selection requires more work and time than the other two methods. Consequently, the combined RFQ/RFP method is recommended for use when the scope of work is very complex or unusual.

3.3.1 Categorize work

Descriptions of the categories of work, deliverables and the minimum qualification standards for each category must be clearly identified.

The local agency may prequalify consulting firms in the following (or more) categories:

- Roadway Design
- Bridge Design
- Bridge Inspection
- Traffic Engineering
- Environmental Services
- Roadway Construction Inspection and Administration
- Landscape Architecture
- Land Surveying
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)
- Federal-aid Highway Project Development Support Services

3.3.2 Establish Minimum Qualifications

In an effort to ensure quality performance and results, a consultant should be required to meet certain minimum qualifications to be eligible for consideration in the pre-qualification process.

General criteria guidelines should be established for consultant selection for a pre-qualified list. The criteria may be established by an individual or a panel of subject matter experts for the specific task of developing the criteria. Some agencies also establish appropriate weights for each criterion. It may be
necessary to modify the criteria to fit specific cases. When a RFQ is published, it should state the criteria that will be used in the selection process.

Criteria for evaluating statements of qualifications, may include but are not limited to:

- Special expertise and experience of the firm’s key employees
- Proposed staffing (include number of licensed and specialized staff) for the project and previous experience of those identified
- Experience of the firm and their personnel on previous projects similar to the one under consideration
- Location of the firm’s office where the work will be done
- Consultant DBE Commitment document (see Exhibit 10-O1)
- Professional references by the firm with the local agency
- Understanding of the project by the firm as demonstrated by their approach to organizing and management of the work
- Current workload of the firm and their ability to meet the proposed project schedule
- Quality of previous performance by the firm with the local agency
- Use of sub-consultants to accomplish work on the project
- Equipment the firm has available and proposes to use as compatibility with Computer-Aided Drafting and Design (CADD) and other equipment proposed to be used in accomplishing the work
- Familiarity with federal, state, and local codes, requirements, standards, and procedures

Examples of minimum qualifications for work categories above are provided here based on Caltrans best practices.

### 3.3.3 Issue RFQ

The need for services of a consulting firm may be advertised in appropriate national, state, and local publications and web sites. Notices can also be sent to firms known to be qualified to do specific work, to professional societies, and to recognized Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) organizations. The advertisements and notices seek statements of interest and qualifications from consultants who are interested in the project.

The SOQ should list consulting firm details, names of principals, office locations, personnel by discipline, project experience and examples, current workload, types of service the firms are qualified to perform, and previous performance. Also, resumes of key persons, specialists, and other associates that may be assigned to the project or projects should be included. This information should be the basis for evaluating and placing a consulting firm on a general pre-qualification list.

Both state and federal regulations require that any procedures related to pre-qualifying consultant cannot restrict competition.

Pre-qualification of consultants may be allowed as a condition for submitting a technical proposal for a contract only if the period between the date of the issuance of the RFP and the deadline for submitting a technical proposal affords sufficient time to enable a consultant to obtain pre-qualification status.

Another practice is to qualify consultants on a project-by-project basis. This is accomplished for some agencies by advertising or publishing notices in national, state, and local publications for needed services.
for specific, individual projects. These notices include a precise project location, a defined preliminary scope of services to be performed, a specific schedule within which the work is to be completed, and a list of products and deliverables to be provided by the consultant. Specific project advertisements usually are published when the proposed project is large and complex, in-house resources are not available, special expertise is required, or the objectivity of an outside authority is desired.

Appropriate Federal-aid requirements should be complied with on Federal-aid projects.

### 3.3.4 Set-Up Evaluation Process

The first step in the evaluation process is to determine that each SOQ contains all forms, qualifications and other information required by the RFQ. Otherwise, the submittals may be considered nonresponsive and rejected without evaluation. Documentation of when each SOQ was received must be maintained in the project files. Copies of date stamped envelope covers or box tops are recommended.

If all required information is not provided, a SOQ may be considered nonresponsive and rejected without evaluation. Late submittals, submittals to the wrong location, or submittals with inadequate copies are considered nonresponsive and shall be rejected. Submittal of additional information after the due date shall not be allowed.

Local agency must establish a process by which SOQs are evaluated and consultants who are deemed meeting the minimum qualifications are accepted and placed on a per-qualified list. Whether the Local agency has a “committee” of experts evaluating the SOQs or individuals responsible for the evaluation, the process must be well defined, open and transparent. The pre-qualification process must also allow for consultants to be re-evaluated in cases of denials. The local agency must specify how long the pre-qualified list last, not to exceed two years. Federal regulation recommend refreshing the SOQs on an annual basis.

Local agency Contract Administrator ensures that all committee members meet the conflict of interest requirements (23 CFR 172) by completing and signing a conflict of interest statement prior to selection process initiation. A sample conflict of interest form is provided in Exhibit 10-T.

### 3.3.5 Evaluate Qualifications and Add Firm to List

All SOQs received should first be reviewed for completeness. Each response must contain all required forms and any other information requested in the advertisement. The response may be considered incomplete and rejected without further evaluation if all required information is not provided or if the submittal is late.

The qualifications of all responding firms are then reviewed according to established evaluation criteria or factors. The agency then establishes a short list of at least three consultants that are determined to be the most highly qualified to perform the required work. Firms not selected should be notified in writing.

### 3.3.6 Maintain List

Pre-qualification of a consultant expires in two years. Pre-qualified consultants must renew their pre-qualification status every two years. Firms can apply to be on the list at any time. After a period of two years, firms should re-apply (repeat the process of submitting SOQs) to be on the list. In addition to the required two-year renewal process, the consultant should also be required to update the firm’s
organizational structure within one year when there is a corporate/affiliate change, ownership control, type of work expertise, capacity, or any other major change.

If the consultant does not meet the minimum requirements and their SOQ is rejected, the committee must respond to the consultant explaining the reason for their rejection. The consultant is allowed to reapply to be on the list again provided the reasons for rejection are corrected.

The list of qualified firms can be maintained online through the agency’s website. Firms can also apply to be on the list through the agency website for ease of operation.

3.3.7 Issue RFP to Pre-Qualified Consultants on List
An RFP is sent to the short-listed firms. The RFP should indicate the content of the technical proposal, technical review procedures, anticipated schedule of activities, scope of work, project description, where the technical proposals are to be delivered, the number of copies required, and the due date.

Some agencies receive the technical proposal orally as part of an interview conducted for this purpose. In these cases, written documentation may not be required.

Items typically required in a technical proposal include:
- Work plan
- Organization plan
- Schedule for meeting time frame
- Available computer equipment and programs
- Staffing plan and resumes including sub-consultants
- Pre-award audit/financial package information (if deemed appropriate)
- Examples of similar work previously completed
- Sub-consultants, DBE, their proposed participation, and other related information

3.3.8 Conduct Proposer’s Conference or Answer Written Questions
The local agency may allow for clarification of the RFP by inviting submittal of written questions or by conducting a proposer’s conference, or by doing both. The local agency must publish or mail their responses to any written questions to all consultants receiving the RFP. No response should be given to verbal questions. It is important that all competing consultants receive the same information. If a proposer’s conference is to be held, the exact time and place must be specified in the RFP. Attendance at a proposer’s conference normally is not mandatory. However, consultants not attending the conference do not receive notes from the meeting unless they request the notes.

3.3.9 Receive and Evaluate Technical Proposals
The Contract Administrator must verify that each technical proposal contains all of the forms and other information required by the RFP. If all required information is not provided, a technical proposal may be considered nonresponsive and rejected without evaluation. Late submittals, submittals to the wrong location, or submittals with inadequate copies are considered nonresponsive and shall be rejected. Submittal of additional information after the due date shall not be allowed. Documentation of when each technical proposal was received must be maintained in the project files. Copies of date stamped envelope covers or box tops are recommended.
A consultant selection committee with a minimum of three members is appointed at the beginning of the consultant selection process. The members of the consultant selection committee must evaluate each technical proposal according to the technical criteria listed in the RFP. A minimum of three technical proposals must be received and evaluated.

If only two technical proposals are received, a justification must be documented to proceed with the procurement. If only one technical proposal is received, a Non-Competitive process must be justified and a Public Interest Finding (LAPM Exhibit 12-F) must be documented. In either case, the re-advertisement of the RFP should be considered as an option.

The committee must also evaluate reference checks and other information gathered independently. Reference checks shall be completed and other information gathered before the interviews are conducted. If necessary, the results of the reference checks or other information may be discussed with the highest ranked qualified consultants at the interviews.

3.3.10 Develop Final Ranking and Notify Consultants of Results

The selection committee discusses and documents the strengths and weaknesses of each technical proposal, interviews the three or more highest ranked consultants (shortlisted), and develops a final ranking of the highest ranked consultants. All consultants that submitted technical proposals must be informed about the final ranking of consultants. It is important that all competing consultants receive the same information.

Most consultants will request information as to why they were not the highest ranked. Therefore, the selection committee should keep notes as to why a particular consultant was not selected. When a consultant requests debriefing, the reasons for not being selected must be objective reasons. The consultant should not be compared to others, and should not be provided with information about other consultants during this debriefing. Normally, the Contract Administrator does the debriefing; however, any member of the selection committee may be designated to do the debriefing.

3.3.11 Request Cost Proposal and Negotiate Contract with Top-Ranked Consultant

The first-ranked consultant is asked to provide a cost proposal to perform the work described in the draft contract and discussed at the scoping meeting. The work is to be performed according to the conditions described in the draft contract using the payment method described therein. Alternatively, if time is of the essence and it can be justified, sealed cost proposals may be requested from all of the consultants on the shortlist.

If the contract involves more than one project, the consultant must provide a separate cost proposal for each project in addition to a summary cost proposal for the total contract. If the contract involves milestones, the consultant must furnish a separate cost proposal for each milestone with a summary cost proposal for the total costs. If the contract involves subconsultants, the prime consultant must include a separate cost proposal for each subconsultant. Each subconsultant’s cost proposal must follow the same format as the prime consultant’s cost proposal.

Cost proposal (for both prime and all subconsultants) and contract audit and review documents, such as Exhibit 10-K and Exhibit 10-A, whichever applicable (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process), will be submitted in a separate sealed envelope.
After the top-ranked consultant submits a sealed cost proposal, the local agency reviews the cost proposal and enters into negotiations. The goal of negotiation is to agree on a final contract that delivers to the local agency the services or products required at a fair and reasonable cost. The independent cost estimate, developed by the local agency in advance of requesting a cost proposal from the top-ranked consultant, is an important basis and tool for negotiations.

Negotiations should commence with the most qualified consultant. If agreement on a fair and reasonable price cannot be reached, negotiations should then be formally terminated. Negotiations then proceed to the next most qualified consultant, and so on. Each consultant’s cost proposal must remain sealed until negotiations commence with that particular consultant. At the completion of successful cost negotiations, all remaining sealed envelopes containing cost proposals shall be returned to consultants.

A contract audit and review may be required (see Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process). The local agency Contract Administrator is responsible for the submittal of all required documentations to Caltrans A&I in a timely fashion, including all documents for a Conformance Review, if applicable. Negotiations may be completed after receipt of the Caltrans A&I Conformance Letter. An indirect cost audit may be performed within the record retention period of the contract.

Items typically negotiated include:

- Work plan
- Schedule and deadlines (for deliverables and final duration of contract)
- Products to be delivered
- Classification, wage rates, and experience level of personnel to be assigned
- Other Direct Cost items, and profit or fee

The consultant’s ICR is not a negotiable item. A lower rate cannot be negotiated by the local agency.

The local agency and the consultant will agree on the final cost proposal and incorporate into final contract.

Before executing the consultant contract, the local agency must review contract to ensure that all federal and state requirements have been met (see Exhibit 10-C), and all deficiencies identified in the Conformance Letter have been addressed and resolved, if applicable. The completed checklist is to be signed by the Contract Administrator and the original retained in the project file, one copy is to be sent to the DLAE (for review of completeness) and filing within 30 days after awarding the contract.

TIP: Consultant Contract Reviewer Checklist Exhibit 10-C must be filled out by the Local Agency.
4.0  A&E CONSULTANT AUDIT AND REVIEW PROCESS

This section outlines the audit and review process for A&E contracts that at any time use state or federal funds. All proposed A&E contracts and supporting documents are subject to audit or review by Caltrans’ Audits and Investigations (A&I), other state audit organizations, or the federal government. Not all proposed contracts will be audited or reviewed; rather, they will be selected on a risk-based approach. Figure 4-2: A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process, shows an overview of the audit and review process.

4.1 Applicable Standards

The state and federal requirements listed below, as well as specific contract requirements, serve as the standards for audits and reviews performed. The local agencies, consultants, and subconsultants are responsible for complying with state, federal and specific contract requirements. Local agencies are responsible for determining the eligibility of costs to be reimbursed to consultants. Applicable standards include, but not limited to:

- Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual
- Project Program Supplemental Agreements
- 23 CFR, Chapter 1, Part 172 – Administration of Engineering and Design Related Service Contracts
- 48 CFR, Federal Acquisitions Regulation Systems (FAR), Chapter 1 FAR, Part 31- Contract Cost Principles and Procedures
- 48 CFR, Chapter 99 – Cost Accounting Standards, Subpart 9900
- 2 CFR Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards
- 23 USC, Part 112 – Letting of Contracts
- United States Government Accountability Office, Government Auditing Standards (GAS)
- Proposed contract terms and conditions

See Section 12.0, References of this manual for links to above referenced standards.

4.2 Audit Guidance Available

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Uniform Audit & Accounting Guide (AASHTO Audit Guide) or (http://audit.transportation.org/Documents/UAAG-3%20FINAL.pdf), which is referred to frequently in this section, is an invaluable tool to guide local agencies, consultants and certified public accountants (CPAs) through the requirements for establishing, and audits of, Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) compliant cost rates. The AASHTO Audit Guide is used extensively as an industry guide in the audit and review process.

The local agency may seek financial and accounting assistance from its own internal audit staff.
The consultant may also seek professional guidance in selecting its independent CPA. See also the *AASHTO Audit Guide, Chapter 2.5 C, Selection of CPA Firm as Overhead Auditor* for guidance in the selection process.

Training is also offered by FHWA’s National Highway Institute (see [http://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/default.aspx](http://www.nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/default.aspx)). Courses offered include:

- Using the AASHTO Audit Guide for the Procurement and Administration of A&E Contracts (FHWA-NHI-231028)
- Using the AASHTO Audit Guide for the Development of A&E Consultant Indirect Cost Rates (FHWA-NHI-231029)
- Using the AASHTO Audit Guide for the Auditing and Oversight of A&E Consultant Indirect Cost Rates (FHWA-NHI-231030)

### 4.3 Contracts and Consultants Selected for Audit or Review

A proposed contract or consultant selected for audit or review through A&I’s risk-based approach is dictated by the dollar thresholds of the proposed contract, and other risk factors listed below.

Dollar thresholds for audits or reviews are stratified as follows:

- Less than $150K – no audit or review is required, but is optional
- Between $150K and $1M (Case 1)
- Between $1M and $3.5M (Case 2)
- $3.5M and above (Case 3)

Specifics of Cases 1, 2, and 3 are outlined later in this section.

Risk factors considered include, but are not limited to, the consultant’s:

- History of satisfactory performance
- Prior FAR compliant history and audit frequency
- Financial stability
- Conformance to terms and conditions of previous contracts
- General responsiveness and responsibility
- The approximate dollar amount of all A&E contracts awarded to the consultant by Caltrans or a local agency in California within the last three calendar years
- The number of states in which the consultant does business
- The type and complexity of the consultant’s accounting system
- The relevant professional experience of any CPA performing audits of the consultant’s indirect cost rate
- Responses to internal control questionnaire (ICQ), see *AASHTO Audit Guide, Appendix B*
• Changes in the organizational structure

If audited or reviewed, contracts, cost proposals, and ICR(s) shall be modified to conform to audit and review recommendations that address requirements. Local agencies are responsible for ensuring contracts, cost proposals, and ICR(s) are modified to conform to audit and review recommendations as necessary, and to ensure that audit findings and review deficiencies are resolved in a timely manner.

The local agency may be subject to the sanctions outlined in LAPM Chapter 20: Deficiencies and Sanctions if the state or federal government determines that any reimbursements to the consultant are the result of the lack of proper contract provisions, unallowable charges, unsupported activities, or an inadequate financial management system.

4.4 Subconsultant Impacts

Subconsultants are required to follow all the federal, state, and contract requirements outlined above in Section 4.1, Applicable Standards. In addition, all subconsultants are required to:

• Certify their contract costs and financial management system (Exhibit 10-K) when the total contract between the prime consultant and the local agency is $150K or more. (23 U.S.C. 112(b)(2)(B)). Reminder: The contract is between the local agency and the prime consultant. Subconsultants, as parties to the contract, must also adhere to this requirement.

• Use the accrual basis of accounting when developing their ICRs.

• Have an adequate job costing system.

Subconsultants’ cost proposals also must be submitted along with the prime consultants’ cost proposals through the request for audit process (see Exhibit 10-A) when the total (prime plus subs) proposed contract is $1M or more.

4.5 Cognizant Letters of Approval

Cognizant audits and reviews have been developed to assign primary responsibility for an ICR audit to a single entity (the cognizant agency) to avoid duplication of audit work performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards. The objective of these audits and reviews is to obtain reasonable assurance that claimed costs are in accordance with the FAR cost principles. A cognizant agency may be the home state Department of Transportation (DOT) (the state where the consultant’s financial records are located), a federal agency, or a non-home state DOT to whom the home state has transferred cognizance. When providing cognizant ICR approval the cognizant agency may either perform an ICR audit themselves, or they may review and rely on the work/workpapers related to an ICR audit performed by a CPA. The desired outcome of a cognizant audit or CPA Workpaper Review is for the cognizant agency to issue a Cognizant Letter of Approval so that the ICR can be relied upon on future contracts with the consultant for a given year and for reliance by other state agencies using the same consultant.

A&I will accept a consultant’s cognizant approved ICR for the applicable one-year accounting period, if rates are not under dispute. The consultant is responsible for providing documentation of its cognizant approved ICR and Cognizant Letter of Approval.
4.6 Most Common Audits and Reviews to be Performed

Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) Audits

During an ICR audit, the auditors (A&I or independent CPAs) will examine the consultant’s proposed ICR for the applicable one-year accounting period on the proposed contract to ensure that unallowable costs have been removed from the overhead, that allowable costs have been correctly measured and properly allocated, and that the ICR has been developed in accordance with the FAR cost principles (as specified in 23 USC 112(b)(2)(B), 23 CFR 172.7(a), and 48 CFR Part 31). As a result of the audit, the local agency will work with the consultant to adjust the ICR where disallowed costs are identified based on audit recommendations.

ICR Audits apply to Case 1 and Case 2 contracts (see Case descriptions below) selected for audit. Cognizant Letters of Approval are issued with ICR Audits.

For guidance regarding the existing policies and procedures set forth in the Federal Regulations, and acceptable samples of ICR schedules, refer to the AASHTO Audit Guide, Chapter 5.

The review program in the AASHTO Uniform Audit Guide, Appendix A, should be used as a guide in performing ICR audits. This review program will be used for reviews of CPA audited ICR workpapers.

IMPORTANT NOTE FOR CPAs: Contracts receiving state or federal funds are highly scrutinized. Materiality levels tend to be lower and more testing required. Strict use of the AASHTO Audit Guide cannot be stressed enough.

CPA Audited ICR Workpaper Reviews

During a CPA Audited ICR Workpaper Review, A&I will review the CPA’s workpapers of its ICR audit to determine whether it is appropriate to issue a Cognizant Letter of Approval. The Workpaper Review is conducted to determine whether: (a) the CPA’s audit was conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS), (b) the CPA adequately considered the auditee’s compliance with FAR 48 CFR Part 31 and related laws and regulations, and (c) the audit report format is acceptable. Chapter 11 of the AASHTO Audit Guide includes a recommended format for the audit report and required disclosures.

CPA Audited ICR Workpaper Reviews apply to Case 3 contracts (see Case descriptions below) selected for review. Cognizant Letters of Approval are issued with CPA Workpaper Reviews.

The review program in the AASHTO Uniform Audit Guide, Appendix A, will be used as a guide in performing CPA Workpaper Reviews.

IMPORTANT NOTE FOR CPAs: Contracts receiving state or federal funds are highly scrutinized. Materiality levels tend to be lower and more testing required. Strict use of the AASHTO Audit Guide cannot be stressed enough.

4.7 Other Audits and Reviews That May be Performed

Contract Audits and Reviews

During a Contract Audit or Review, auditors will review contracts and the consultants’ financial management system to determine if:
• The consultants’ accounting system is adequate to accumulate and segregate costs
• Proposed costs are reasonable
• The contract contains all necessary fiscal provisions and the provisions are sufficient in content
• Proper state and federal procurement requirements were followed
• Direct labor costs are compliant
• Other audits/reviews of the contract is necessary

Risk Assessments
During a Risk Assessment, auditors may require an ICQ and certification of the ICRs and may perform a certain level of analytical reviews of the ICRs. They may review the contract provisions, ICQ, ICR, and/or cost proposal(s) to determine if:
  • The required fiscal provisions are in the proposed contract
  • The ICR and/or cost proposal(s) are mathematically accurate and in the proper format
  • The ICR and/or cost proposal(s) contain questionable costs

Incurred Cost Audits
During an Incurred Cost Audit, auditors will review contracts to determine if costs claimed are:
  • Adequately supported
  • Reasonable in nature
  • Allowable, allocable, and reasonable
  • In compliance with state and federal laws and regulations
  • In compliance with the fiscal provisions stipulated in the contract

Financial Management System Review
During a Financial Management System Review, auditors will determine whether:
  • The accrual basis of accounting was used to prepare the ICR
  • There is a job cost accounting system adequate to accumulate and segregate allocable and allowable project costs
  • The consultant complied with 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart E, Cost Principles

4.8 CASE 1: Proposed A&E Consultant Contracts of $150,000 or More

Consultants
Prime consultants with a proposed contract totaling $150,000 or more, and any subconsultants listed on the contract, must certify the accuracy of their contract costs and adequacy of their financial management systems (see Exhibit 10-K). The certification is to be submitted to the local agency who in turn will forward a copy to A&I.
Components include certification that:

- All costs included in the proposed contract to establish final ICR are allowable in accordance with the cost principle of the FAR, 48 CFR, Part 31.
- The proposed contract does not include any costs which are expressly unallowable under the cost principles of the FAR, 48 CFR, Part 31.
- All known material transactions or events that have occurred affecting the firm’s ownership, organization, and ICRs have been disclosed.
- The consultant’s financial management system meets the standards for financial reporting, accounting records, internal and budget controls set forth in the 2 CFR Part 200.302.
- The consultant has provided the approximate dollar amount of all A&E contracts awarded by Caltrans or a California local agency to the consultant within the last three calendar years, and for all state DOT and local agency contracts, and the number of states in which the firm does business.
- All direct costs included in the proposed contract are reasonable, allowable, and allocable in accordance with FAR 48 CFR, Part 31, in compliance with applicable accounting principles, and in compliance with the terms of the proposed contract.

Consultants must also ensure their ICRs are prepared in the acceptable ICR scheduled format, see AASHTO Guide, Chapter 5 tables.

Local Agencies

Local agencies are to forward copies of the consultant and subconsultant certifications, if any, (Exhibit 10-K) to A&I. See bottom of this section for A&I’s Email or mailing address. All supporting documentation must be retained in the project files for the required retention period in the event an audit or review is performed.

Case 1 consultants and contracts may be selected for audit or review through a risk based approach described earlier in this section. Potential audits or reviews can be, but are not limited to:

- Contract Audits
- Incurred Cost Audits
- Financial Management System Review
- ICR Audits
- Risk Assessments

4.9 CASE 2: Proposed A&E Consultant Contracts of $1M or More

Local agencies and consultants with a proposed contract totaling between $1M and $3.5M must comply with all the requirements outlined in Case 1 above.

In addition, local agencies must send copies of the proposed contract and additional supporting documentation to A&I for review in conformance with requirements outlined in this section and LAPM.
Chapter 10.3. Once the proposed contract and additional supporting documentation are reviewed, A&I will issue a Conformance Letter noting any deficiencies, if any. A&I will issue the Conformance Letter within 30 business days of receipt of a complete packet.

A complete packet consists of the documents listed below. Local agencies are required to provide these documents to A&I (see Exhibit 10-A):

1. Proposed contract between the local agency and consultant
2. Cost proposal(s) for prime consultant and all subconsultants
3. Names, mailing addresses, phone numbers and email addresses for prime consultant and subconsultants
4. Name of local agency contact person, phone number, mailing addresses and email addresses
5. Prime consultant generated ICR schedule prepared in accordance with applicable CFRs
6. A completed ICQ (see AASHTO Audit Guide, Appendix B), including all applicable attachments, for the prime consultant
7. Exhibit 10-K for the prime and all subconsultants

And one of the following, if available:

- A copy of the prior fiscal year, and most recently completed fiscal year cognizant approved ICR and approved state DOT Cognizant Letter of Approval.
- A copy of the prior fiscal year, and most recently completed fiscal year, ICR Schedules and audited report by an independent CPA. If a CPA audited ICR is available for the appropriate fiscal year (applicable one-year accounting period), then the consultant must use the audited ICR, or a lower ICR (see 23 CFR 172.7(b) for guidelines).
- A copy of the prior and most recently completed fiscal year ICR(s) evaluation or audit report on a prior Caltrans or local agency contract, and any other governmental agency report/review/attestation.

Through A&I’s risk-based approach, consultants may be selected for an ICR or other contract audits or reviews. If an ICR Audit is performed and the consultant’s ICR is in compliance with the FAR principles, a Cognizant Letter of Approval will be issued. See bottom of this section for A&I’s Email or mailing address.

4.10 CASE 3: Proposed A&E Consultant Contracts of $3.5M or More

Local agencies and consultants with a proposed contract totaling $3.5 million or more must comply with all the requirements in Case 1 and 2 above. Also, consultants must provide the following to the local agency who in turn will forward a copy to A&I:

- A state DOT’s approved ICR schedule and the Cognizant Letter of Approval
  OR
- CPA Audited ICR Audit Report and a copy of the CPA audited financial statements, if any

Through A&I’s risk-based approach, CPA Audited ICR Workpaper Reviews may be performed. Local agencies are responsible for ensuring both the Consultant and its CPA provide full access to the CPA’s
workpapers, including making copies upon request. Failure to do so may be considered a breach of contract. If a review is performed and the CPA’s work is in compliance with the FAR principles, a Cognizant Letter of Approval will be issued. See bottom of this section for A&I’s Email or mailing address.

**Requirements for a Conformance Letter**

A complete packet is required to begin a conformance review. See Case 2: Proposed A&E Consultant Contracts of $1M or More above for elements of a complete packet.

Requirements for a Conformance Letter include:

- **Exhibit 10-A** and all applicable items listed.
- Cost proposal(s) presented in the applicable format for the method of payment for the prime consultant and all subconsultants in the proposed contracts (see Determine Method of Payment in Section 2.13, and **Exhibit 10-H** for required formats and example cost proposals).
- ICRs prepared using the accrual basis of accounting for both the prime and subconsultants.
- An adequate financial accounting system (job cost system) for both the prime and subconsultants.
- The required fiscal provisions specified below must be included **verbatim** in the proposed contract (see **Exhibit 10-R** for sample language and requirements):
  1. Performance Period (begin and end date) (Article IV)
  2. Allowable Costs and Payments (Article V)
  3. Termination (Article VI)
  4. Cost Principles and Administrative Requirements; (Article VII)
  5. Retention of Records/Audit; (Article VIII)
  6. Audit Review Procedures, (Article IX)
  7. Subcontracting (Article X)
  8. Equipment Purchase (Article XI)
  9. State Prevailing Wage Rates (Article XII)
  10. Conflict of Interest (Article XIII)
  11. Rebates, Kickbacks or other Unlawful Consideration (Article XIV)
  12. Prohibition of Expending Local Agency State or Federal Funds for Lobbying (Article XV)

A Conformance Letter will be issued within 30 business days of receipt of a complete packet.

Contracts cannot be executed until the Conformance Letter is issued and noted deficiencies that address requirements are corrected. Corrected deficiencies, however, do NOT need to be cleared through A&I before executing the contract. Any supporting documentation addressing Conformance Letter deficiencies along with the executed contract shall be retained in the project file.
A&I email address:  conformance.review@dot.ca.gov  
A&I mailing address:

Department of Transportation  
Audits and Investigations, MS 2  
Attention: External Audit Manager  
P.O. Box 942874  
Sacramento, CA  94274-0001

**Figure 4-1: Summary of Contracts to be Audited or Reviewed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Purchase Procedure</strong> Less than $150K</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Audit/review not required</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case 1. Between $150K and $1M</strong></td>
<td>• Certification by Prime and Subconsultants (<em>Exhibit 10-K</em>)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>May be selected for Audit or Review.</td>
<td>If Indirect Cost Rate (ICR) Audit is performed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Case 2. Between $1M and $3.5M**             | • Certification for Prime and Subconsultants (*Exhibit 10-K*)  
• Cost proposals for Prime and Subconsultants  
• All other applicable documents listed on *Exhibit 10-A* | Yes                          | May be selected for ICR or Contract Audit, or other Review.         | Yes                                                                 |
| **Case 3. $3.5M or greater**                  | • Certification for Prime and Subconsultants (*Exhibit 10-K*)  
• Cost proposals for Prime and Subconsultants  
• All other applicable documents listed on *Exhibit 10-A*  
AND  
CPA Audited ICR or cognizant approval. | Yes                          | May be selected for Review of CPA’s workpapers of audited ICR or Contract Audit, or other Review | Yes                                                                 |
*NOTE:* For A&E consultant contracts of $1M or more, local agency may begin, but not conclude cost negotiations with the best qualified firm until a Conformance Letter is received from A&I.
5.0 EXECUTE CONTRACT

Figure 5-1: Execute Contract Flow Chart

5.1 Develop the Final Contract

The Contract Administrator requests a revised cost proposal from the consultant after:

1. Negotiations have been completed,
2. The local agency and consultant have agreed to a fair and reasonable price, and
3. A Conformance Letter, if applicable, is released by Caltrans A&I and identified issues have been resolved.

The Contract Administrator should review the revised cost proposal to ensure that all items and changes discussed during negotiations were included. This revised cost proposal then becomes the final cost proposal and is attached to, and made part of, the consultant contract. For informational purposes, sample contract language and format have been included as Exhibit 10-R.

The Contract Administrator has the responsibility to ensure that the final negotiated contract is complete and has verified that all required backup documents have been provided. Copies of the contract are sent to the consultant for signature first.

5.1.1 Review and Approval of Contracts

Proposed contracts for consultant services (including subcontracted work) exceeding $150,000, must be reviewed by the local agency to verify that:

- Compensation is fair and reasonable and includes prevailing wage rates, if applicable
- Work activities and schedules are consistent with the nature and scope of the project
- DBE goal is included if there are subcontracting opportunities and available DBE firms
- Exhibit 10-K (for Prime and Subs), and Exhibit 10-A and all required supporting documents, if applicable, have been submitted to Caltrans A&I
- The issues identified in the Conformance Letter have been addressed.
• Contract modification language entitling the local agency to retroactively adjust ICRs within the document retention period has been included in the contract (see Exhibit 10-R, Article IX, paragraph D)

**Exhibit 10-C** must be used to ensure that required documentation has been provided. A cost proposal (see Exhibit 10-H) must include the cost of materials, direct salaries, payroll additions, other direct costs, indirect costs, fees, and supporting calculations.

Before approving a contract for consulting services, the Contract Administrator must be satisfied that the consultant’s organization:

• Is qualified to perform the services required
• Is in a position, considering other work commitments, to provide competent and experienced personnel to perform the services in the time allowed
• Is fully aware of all applicable federal and state laws including implementing regulations, design standards, specifications, previous commitments that must be incorporated into the design of the project, and administrative controls including those of Caltrans and FHWA
• Has an adequate financial management system as required by the applicable federal regulations

The contract must provide for a defined level of acceptability and a statement to the effect that the consultant may be required to modify its work, as necessary, to meet that level of acceptability as defined in the contract. The contract shall provide for local agency reviews at appropriate stages during performance of the work to determine if any changes or other actions are warranted.

The contract shall also provide that the consultant establish a working office at a place acceptable to the local agency. The contract shall provide that the consultant and subconsultants shall maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records, and other information pertaining to costs incurred. Such materials must be available for inspection and audit by federal, state, and local agency authorized representatives, and copies thereof shall be furnished, if requested.

Following final settlement of the contract accounts with the FHWA or state, such records and documents may be archived at the option of the local agency, but in any event shall be retained for a three-year period after processing of the final voucher by the FHWA or state.

### 5.1.2 Retention Clauses

At the option of the local agency, a retention clause may be included in the consultant contract. The usual retained amount is five percent; appropriate securities on deposit may be substituted for the retention. A retention clause in the consultant contract is recommended (see Exhibit 10-R, Article XXXI).

### 5.1.3 Review of Local Agency Actions

Issues identified in the Conformance Letter must be resolved before the local agency executes the contract.

Federal-aid or state reimbursement is contingent on meeting the federal or state requirements and can be withdrawn if these procedures are not followed and documented. The local agency files are to be maintained in a manner to facilitate future FHWA or Caltrans process reviews and audits.
As specified in the Review and Approval of Contracts above, the Contract Administrator must review the proposed consultant contract before execution. *Exhibit 10-C* is to be completed and signed. A copy shall be sent to the DLAE within 30 days of contract execution. This signed document must be retained in the local agency project files.

### 5.2 Execute Contract and Issue Notice to Proceed to Consultant

The Contract Administrator sends the consultant a fully executed copy of the contract with an original signature and issues a notice to proceed. Funds may not be used to reimburse the agency for any work or costs incurred before the Authorization to Proceed is issued, or for consultant costs incurred prior to the execution of the consultant contract. Local agency consultant selection and contract execution costs may be reimbursable.

For on-call contracts, a fully executed copy of the contract with original signatures will be sent to the consultant. Each subsequent task order (for individual project) will be accompanied by a copy of the signed task order and a Notice to Proceed, once it is negotiated and approved.
6.0 ADMINISTER THE CONTRACT

Project work begins as specified in the contract after the notice to proceed is issued to the consultant. Thereafter, the local agency manages and administers the contract to ensure that a complete and acceptable product is received on time, within standards, and within budget and terms of the contract.

Contract administration activities help to ensure that contractual obligations are completed satisfactorily. Generally, these activities include:

- Monitoring project progress and compliance with contract requirements
- Receiving, reviewing and assessing reports, plans and other required products/deliverables
- Receiving and reviewing state prevailing wages, see Department of Industrial Relations websites below:
  - DIR FAQ website: [http://www.dir.ca.gov/OPRL/FAQ_PrevailingWage.html](http://www.dir.ca.gov/OPRL/FAQ_PrevailingWage.html)
  - DIRWageDetermination website: [http://www.dir.ca.gov/oprl/DPreWageDetermination.htm](http://www.dir.ca.gov/oprl/DPreWageDetermination.htm)
- Reviewing invoices to ensure costs claimed are in accordance to the method of payment and contract cost proposal, and approving payments
- If new consultant personnel are added or substituted, labor rates must be verified prior to approving invoices
- Record keeping and reporting
- Controlling costs
- Identifying changes to the scope of work and preparation of amendments (must ensure that any changes to the scope is within the constraints of the original RFP/RFQ)
- Completing the consultant performance evaluations (see LAPM Exhibit 10-S: Consultant Performance Evaluation (Exhibit 10-S))

6.1 Substitution of Consultant Personnel and Subconsultants

After contract execution the consultant should not substitute key personnel (project manager and others listed by name in the cost proposal) or subconsultants without prior written approval from the local agency. To do so can result in the costs being ineligible for federal or state reimbursement. The consultant must request and justify the need for the substitution and obtain approval from the local agency prior to use of a different subconsultant on the contract. The proposed substituted person must be as qualified as the original, and at the same or lower cost.

For engineering types of consultant contracts, the consultant’s project manager must be a registered engineer in the State of California.

6.2 Invoicing (or Progress Payments)

The frequency and format of the invoices/progress payments are to be determined by the contract. Program Supplement Agreements (see LAPM Chapter 4, Agreements) need to have been prepared prior
to any payments being requested. Payments to the consultant are to be in arrears. In other words, the consultant must have actually incurred and paid the costs before invoicing the local agency.

For federal or state reimbursement of consultant costs on a project, the local agency must submit the following to the DLAE for each consultant or consulting firm used on the project (failure to do so will result in the consultant’s invoices for reimbursement being returned to the agency unprocessed):

- Copy of Executed Consultant contract
- Exhibit 10-C
- Exhibit 10-O1 (federally funded projects only)
- Exhibit 10-O2 (federally funded projects only)

The DLAE must confirm that the local agency has submitted copies of Exhibit 10-K (for prime and subconsultants) to Caltrans A&I.

Caltrans A&I maintains a list (spreadsheets) of all local agency consultant contracts that have submitted Exhibit 10-K’s. The spreadsheets list contracts by fiscal year, local agency contract number, and federal project ID.

The DLAE must confirm that the local agency consultant contract is listed (meaning that Caltrans A&I has received all Exhibit 10-Ks for the contract) prior to processing the invoice for reimbursement of consultant expenditures.

Invoices should include the following:

- Prepared on the consultant’s letterhead
- Signed by the consultant’s project manager
- Have a unique invoice number
- Appropriate documentation attached
- If the contract involved milestones, each milestone should be invoiced separately
- If the contract involved subconsultants, a separate invoice for each subconsultant should be attached in the same format as the prime consultant’s invoice and should be included in the summary of the prime consultant’s invoice

The following are requirements associated with each invoice that the local agency should include:

- A summary of the reimbursements to-date and a summary of the funds remaining in the contract. This should be compared to the local agency’s own record of reimbursements to-date and a summary of the funds remaining in the contract.
- A summary of all payments to-date and funds remaining in the contract for each subconsultant.

The local agency is to follow the procedures given in LAPM Chapter 5, Invoicing, to obtain reimbursement of federal or state funds.
6.3 Contract Amendments

Contract amendments are required to modify the terms of the original contract for changes such as extra time, added work, or increased costs. Only work within the original advertised scope of services shall be added by amendment to the contract. The addition of work outside the original advertised scope will make that work ineligible for federal or state reimbursement (see Q&As: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/172qa_01.cfm).

There is no prescribed format for contract amendments. They may take the form of letter-type agreements meeting the legal requirements of the local agency, clearly outlining the changes and containing a mutually agreed upon method of compensation. Such agreements must conform to the requirements of this manual with regard to payment.

A consultant contract may be amended at any time prior to the expiration date of the original contract. The most common amendment is to extend the ending date of the contract. All contract amendments must be fully executed before the ending date of the contract. Failure to amend a contract prior to the ending date will make the subsequent costs ineligible for federal and state reimbursement.

For on-call consultant contracts, the amendment is restricted to the work (task order) that has already been started by the consultant and cannot include any new work.

All contract amendments must be in writing and fully executed by the consultant and local agency before reimbursable work begins on the amendment. If an emergency exists of such magnitude that a delay cannot be tolerated, the local agency and the consultant may agree on an amendment initiating the work, so that reimbursable work may begin. The initiating amendment is then followed by a final amendment once the full scope of the emergency work is known and agreed to by both parties. In both cases, sufficient funding should be included in the amendments to pay for all work to be performed by the consultant. The final amendment must be executed as quickly as possible. Failure to fully comply with this section may result in the loss of local agency funding.

If an amendment increases the contract to over $1M then the procedures in either Case 2 or Case 3 under Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process of this manual, shall apply to the entire contract, and must be completed prior to execution of the contract amendment.
7.0 CONTRACT CLOSEOUT

7.1 Final DBE Utilization

Upon completion of the contract, a summary of the DBE final utilization must be prepared, certified correct, and submitted on LAPM Exhibit 17-F: Final Report-Utilization of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) And First-Tier Subcontractors (Exhibit 17-F) or equivalent to the local agency showing total dollars paid to each subconsultant and supplier. Exhibit 17-F is reviewed by the local agency and certified as complete and accurate.

The local agency must send the original, plus one copy of the completed Exhibit 17-F with the final invoice to the DLAE within 30 days after completion of the contract.

7.2 Performance Evaluation

Pursuant to 23 CFR §172.9(d) agencies are required to prepare an evaluation of the consultant when the project has been completed. The Contract Administrator evaluates the consultant’s performance after the consultant’s final report has been submitted, and the Contract Administrator has conducted a detailed evaluation with the consultant’s project manager. See Exhibit 10-S for a suggested format for use by the local agency.

7.3 Project Records

Federal-Aid Highway Program funding recipients and sub-recipients must maintain adequate and readily accessible project performance and financial records, supporting documents, and other records considered pertinent to the grant agreement and in compliance with federal laws and regulations. These records shall be maintained for a minimum of three (3) years following issuance of the final voucher from FHWA (forwarded by Caltrans) and the closure of all other pending matters.

For audit purposes, project records and documentation shall be kept for three (3) years after payment of the final federal or state voucher. Among the records to be retained are as follows (not an all-inclusive list):

- Copies of RFPs and RFQs, changes, addendums, etc. and bidder’s list
- Documentation of DBE participation (including Exhibit 10-O1 and Exhibit 10-O2)
- Solicitation and advertisement records
- Identification of selection committee members
- Record of receiving technical proposals, or SOQs
- Evaluation and ranking records such as original score sheets from all panel members, shortlist questions and other documentation (see Exhibit 10-B)
- Independent cost estimate (prepared in advance of receipt of RFPs and RFQs)
- Record of negotiations (to include a separate negotiations of profit in accordance with federal guidelines)
- Conformance and Cognizant Agency Letters, when applicable
• CPA-audited ICR Audit Report or Approved State DOT Cognizant Indirect Rate Letter, if any
• Consultant Certification of Costs and Financial Management (Exhibit 10-K) for contracts over $150,000
• Conformance Review Letter from A&I, if applicable (Document the resolution of deficiencies that were identified in the conformance letter)
• A&E Consultant Audit Request Letter and Checklist (Exhibit 10-A) for contracts over $1,000,000, and all supporting documentations
• Executed consultant contracts, cost proposals and amendments (see Exhibit 10-R and Exhibit 10-H)
• Contract oversight and progress meeting documents
• Progress and final payments, and supporting documentation
• Performance evaluation (see Exhibit 10-S)
• Consultant contract checklists (see Exhibit 10-C)
• Report of DBE Utilization (see Exhibit 17-F)
• Accounting records documenting compliance with State and federal administrative requirements
• Certifications and Conflict of Interest forms (Exhibit 10-T, Exhibit 10-U and LAPM Exhibit 10-Q: Disclosure of Lobbying Activities, as appropriate)
8.0 ENGINEERING SERVICES UNDER $150,000

The procurement of consultant services by Small Purchase Procedures is in accordance with 23 CFR §172. Local agencies should be fully aware that consultant services costing in aggregate (including sub-contracts) no more than $150,000 per contract (48 CFR 2.101) may be obtained through a relatively simple and informal method of procurement. This informal method must be sound and appropriate for the consulting services procured and the project files must contain justification for the selection. The method of procurement shall be an open and competitive process in selecting consultants and shall consider a minimum of three different consultants whenever possible. A formal RFQ process is not required. The reasons for selecting a firm needs to be thoroughly documented.

The local agency must prepare a well-defined scope of work and an independent cost estimate done prior to seeking technical/cost proposals.

The Brooks Act and the consultant audit process described in Section 4.0, A&E Consultant Audit and Review Process of this manual do not apply to consultant service contracts under $150,000. Although this method of procurement is informal, it must still comply with Sections 1.0, General, 2.0, Procurement Planning, 7.0, Contract Closeout, and 11.0, Miscellaneous Considerations, of this manual.

Project splitting should not be used to take advantage of the small purchase procedure in order to circumvent the Brooks Act.

### Summary of Required/Non-Required Activities for Small Purchase Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Not Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Competitive process (collect three bids)</td>
<td>• No RFP/RFQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conflict of interest determination</td>
<td>• No Selection/Evaluation Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assigned Contract Administrator</td>
<td>• No evaluation criteria disclosure requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defined scope of work/schedule of deliverables/start and end dates for contract</td>
<td>• No record of costs/profit negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defined deliverables/prime and subconsultant responsibilities</td>
<td>• No audit and review requirement of contract (no Exhibit 10-K)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DBE goal for contract; Exhibits 10-01, Exhibit 10-02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Price or rate quotation may be considered in the selection of A&E consultants on contracts below $150,000 and must be documented in the project files. DBE requirements apply to all contracts. Qualified small business firms shall be considered for selection on federal-aid and state reimbursed contracts. Additionally, on federal-aid contracts, qualified DBE firms shall be considered for selection, and the appropriate federal contract language shall be included.

The full amount of any contract modification or amendment that would cause the total contract amount to exceed the federal simplified acquisition threshold (currently established at $150,000) would be ineligible for federal funding. Also, FHWA reserves the right to withdraw all federal-aid funding from a contract if it is modified or amended above the applicable established simplified acquisition threshold. All small purchase contracts shall have a start and end date.

8.1 Personal Services Contracts

A personal services contract is characterized by the employer-employee relationship created between the local agency and the contract personnel who essentially perform similar duties as the employees. When personal engineering services less than $150,000 or non-engineering consultant or vendor services for non-infrastructure programs are needed and federal or state reimbursement will be sought, these services may be obtained through Small Purchase Procedures up to a limit of $150,000 each.

The $150,000 is a cumulative limit for services provided by any individual consultant or consulting firm. Such services must be under the direction and control of a full-time employee of the local agency in responsible charge. Compensation for construction engineering services should be based on actual costs incurred, plus a fixed fee, or in the case of individual compensation, on an agreed-upon hourly or daily rate. Lump sum payments should not be used for construction engineering services.

For personal service contracts, the following information must be documented by the local agency and retained in the project files:

- Explanation of the services needed, and why they cannot be provided by the local agency
- Name and qualification of the consultant, who provided the services
- Documentation of the fees showing how the fee was calculated, and that it is reasonable by comparative standards
- Any other records needed to show compliance with federal-aid program regulations
9.0 NON-A&E CONSULTANTS

9.1 Definition

Services and planning studies that are not included in the definition of A&E related services or are not directly related to a construction project may be considered non-A&E. These services include Right-of-Way appraisal and acquisition activities, conducting public outreach during environmental clearance or construction, and Active Transportation Program educational and outreach activities.

The determining factor for the required use of competitive negotiation/qualifications based selection procedures is whether the services being procured are related to a specific construction project and whether the services require work to be performed, provided by, or under the direction of a registered engineer or architect. If a planning study is to determine the need for improvements within a corridor, to conduct travel demand studies, or to obtain information on costs for planning and programming processes, the consultant may not need to be procured under a qualifications based selection process.

9.2 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Projects

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) means electronic, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system. ITS projects are those that in whole or in part, funds the acquisition of technologies or systems of technologies that provide significant contributions to the provision of one or more ITS user services.

The federal-aid procurement regulations identify three possible contract procurement procedures for ITS projects including engineering and design related services (or A&E), construction, and non-engineering/non-architectural (or Non-A&E).

If ITS projects include physical installation of field devices and/or communications infrastructure, such as new traffic signals, new controller cabinets, changeable message signs, radio and computers, vehicle detectors, and conduits for cabling in the roadway, then that work and required equipment usually meets the definition of construction. The construction contract must be procured based on competitive bidding.

If the ITS project involves considerable software development, system integration, hiring engineers and specialists for ITS design and installation support, inspection, design documentation, training and deployment, it would be considered an engineering services contract and the contract must be procured as an A&E consultant contract.

However, if an ITS project does not meet either the definition of construction or engineering and design services, then the contract may be considered to be a Non-A&E service contract. Examples of Non-A&E service contracts are:

- The procurement of service patrol vehicles and hardware and software associated with incident management system
- Software systems for arterial and freeway management systems
- Operating the 511 traveler information service
- Nonprofessional services for system support such as independent validation and verification, testing and specification development, and development of a concept of operations
For more information regarding procurement requirements for ITS projects, refer to LAPG, Chapter 13 - ITS.

9.3 Non-Infrastructure Projects

Non-infrastructure (NI) projects are those transportation-related projects that do not involve either engineering design, Right-of-Way acquisition, or the eventual physical construction of transportation facilities. Examples of non-infrastructure projects include:

- Public awareness campaigns and outreach
- Traffic Demand Management (TDM)
- Traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety
- Freeway service patrol
- Ridesharing activities
- Commuter incentives
- Purchase of alternative-fueled vehicles

Procurement of these types of contracts must follow Non-A&E contract procurement procedures. For more information on NI projects, refer to LAPM Chapter 3 Project Authorization.

9.4 Procurement

Local agencies must use their own documented procurement procedures which reflect applicable state, local, and tribal laws and regulations, provided that the procurements conform to applicable federal laws and regulations (2 CFR Part 200). Compliance with the Brooks Act and qualification based selection is optional for non-A&E consultant procurement.

All non-A&E procurements for federal-aid funded projects must be conducted by competitive proposals in a manner providing full and open competition consistent with federal and state standards. Refer to California State Public Contract Code 10335-10381 for more information.

a. Request for proposals must be publicized and all evaluation factors and their relative importance identified
b. Proposals must be solicited from an adequate number of qualified sources (no less than three)
c. Local agency must have a written procedure for evaluating proposals
d. Consultants other than A&E consultants may be selected using cost or cost and qualifications (best value)
e. Contract audit and review process described in Section 4.0 of this manual is optional for non-A&E contracts
f. Public agencies contracting with other public agencies to perform work need an executed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or interagency agreement
g. A consultant firm that was instrumental or listed in the application process for projects, such as ATP, is not entitled to be awarded a contract for its implementation without a competitive procurement. All federal/state funded contracts must be competitively solicited.

9.5 Determining Need for Consultant

To identify if a non-A&E professional services contract is needed, consider the following:

- Types of services needed
- Special licensing (not considered A&E)
- How necessary are the services
- When are the services needed
- One-time or on-going services
- Routine or extraordinary/unique
- Scope of Work

9.6 Preparing the Request for Proposal

An RFP for professional services should be as detailed and precise as possible and include minimum qualification requirements, solicitation and award time frames, term of agreement, scope of work, evaluation criteria and process, and technical proposal and performance specifications.

Be sure to attach complete scopes of work outlining local agency and consultant responsibilities and all special provisions for the work/services needed, and have all funding approved. Local agency contacts, or the Contract Administrator should be identified in the RFP.

An example RFP is provided on the Local Assistance Website at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/AE/index.htm and may be modified.

9.7 Scope of Work

Clear and concise scopes of work are critical elements of service contracts. SOWs must be detailed and specific and be organized in a logical manner. Sort work details by similar actions or requirements. Clearly define roles and responsibilities of consultant and local agency. Agency Contract Administrator should write SOWs to indicate what qualifications are required to perform the work and to express when, where, and how the work/service is to be performed.

9.8 Technical Proposal

The Technical proposal should include the following information:

1. Consultant Project Manager – qualifications, roles and responsibilities.
2. Methodology - description of work and overall approach, specific techniques that will be used and specific administrative and operations expertise to be used.
3. Workplan and Work Schedule - the technical proposal should include activities and tasks, and their delivery schedule.
4. Personnel - List of personnel who will be working on the project, and their resumes.
5. Facilities and resources (If applicable) - Explanation of where the services will be provided and what type of equipment is needed to perform services.
6. **Sub-contracts** - Identify all sub-contracts that are to be used, description of each and the work by each sub-consultant/sub-contractor. No work shall be subcontracted unless listed in the technical proposal. Sub-consultant resumes should be provided.

7. **References** - The technical proposal should provide at least three (3) clients for whom the proposer has performed work of similar nature to the request.

**9.9 Cost Proposal Worksheet**

The RFP should provide a standard format for cost proposal that all proposers must include in their technical proposal. The cost proposal format can be broken down by specific tasks, showing hourly labor rates, level of effort and material, and/or by milestones and deliverables.

**9.10 DBE Consideration**

DBE consideration is required on all federal-aid funded contracts including non-A&E. Zero DBE goals must be approved by the DLAE prior to contract execution.

**9.11 Solicitation and Award of Contracts**

Advertisement for RFPs may be through the local agency website, local publications, and national publications. Minimum solicitation time is 14 calendar days.

The solicitation should inform potential bidders that questions must be submitted in writing to the Agency Contract Manager/Administrator by a specified date and time. All pertinent technical information and answers to bidder’s questions shall be provided to all potential bidders. Written responses to all questions will be collectively compiled and provided as an addendum.

Contracts may be modified or amended only if the contracts so provide. Amendments must be requested and executed prior to the termination date of the most recently approved original or amended contract. All records of contract activities shall be kept for three years after federal final voucher E-76 or state final voucher for State-Only funds.

Costs are reimbursable after state allocation by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and/or the issuance of the federal E-76. The per diem rate shall not exceed the state rate. Contract Managers are responsible for monitoring expenditures on all contracts and verifying categories of work that require prevailing wage. A person in Responsible Charge of contract management is required for all federally funded projects.

**9.12 Evaluation Criteria**

Review all eligible proposals (i.e., those filed on time and in the manner prescribed) to determine which ones meet the format requirements and the standards specified in the RFP. Proposals meeting the minimum standards and format requirements can then be rated or scored. Those proposals shall be submitted to an agency evaluation committee. The evaluation committee will evaluate and score proposals using the methods specified in the RFP. The contract must be awarded to the responsible proposer whose proposal is given the highest score by an evaluation committee.

The Contract Administrator must verify that each proposal contains all of the forms and other information required by the RFP. If all required information is not provided, a proposal may be
considered nonresponsive and rejected without evaluation. Proposals without information regarding, or not meeting, the required DBE utilization goal or without a Good Faith Effort documentation, late submittals, submittals to the wrong location, or submittals with inadequate copies are considered nonresponsive and shall be rejected. Submittal of additional information after the due date shall not be allowed. Documentation of when each proposal was received must be maintained in the project files. Copies of date stamped envelope covers or box tops are recommended.

Note that all criteria to be used to evaluate the technical proposals must have a logical foundation within the scope of work or within other technical requirements contained in the RFP. Each criterion must have a weight or level of importance, and it is recommended that total possible score for the evaluation criteria be one hundred (100) points. The proposed cost should be at least thirty percent (30%) of total points in evaluation criteria.

To establish effective competition, a minimum of three proposal must be evaluated. If only two proposals are received, a justification must be documented to proceed with the procurement. If only one proposal is received, a Non-Competitive process must be justified and a Public Interest Finding (PIF) (LAPM Exhibit 12-F) must be documented. In either case, the re-advertisement of the RFP should be considered as an option.

The committee must also evaluate reference checks and other information gathered independently. Reference checks shall be completed and other information gathered before the interviews are conducted. If necessary, the results of the reference checks or other information may be discussed with the highest ranked qualified consultants at the interviews.

9.13 Oral Presentations

Oral presentations are optional. The evaluation criteria must include factors/sub-factors and weights used to score the proposers performance at the oral presentation. The evaluation committee will only be able to score each proposer based upon this criteria.

The Contract Manager/Administrator should develop a set of questions related to the scope of work or the project to be asked during the evaluation committee question and answer (Q & A) section of the oral presentations. All proposers are asked the same questions for consistency.

9.14 Debriefing

The committee chairperson or designee will complete a final evaluation criteria scoresheet that will become part of the contract file. It can later be used during debriefing of unsuccessful proposer(s) to point out deficiencies and weaknesses for each criterion.

9.15 Protest/appeals/reinstatement procedures

Both state and federal regulations require well-defined protest/reinstatement procedures. It is essential that the procedures include a reasonable opportunity for the prospective consultant to present his/her case. The appeals procedures strengthens the process by which the contracting agency reaches its ultimate goal and helps defends its action against a claim of lack of due process. A termination clause and a provision for settlement of contract disputes are required. Protest procedures and dispute resolution processes should be in accordance with 2 CFR 200.318(k).
10.0 RETAINING CONSULTANT AS AGENCY ENGINEER OR MANAGEMENT ROLE

A consultant acting in a management role may be defined as a consulting firm or individual representative of a firm acting on the contracting agency’s behalf to perform inherently governmental functions or fulfilling a program or project administration role typically performed by the contracting agency. This could include providing oversight of a program element on behalf of the contracting agency or serving as a general engineering consultant (GEC) to manage and provide oversight of a major project, series of projects, and/or the work of other consultants and contractors on behalf of a contracting agency.

A local agency may retain qualified consultants on its staff in professional capacities such as agency consultant engineers, architects, or public agency officials in a management role such as City Engineer (or equivalent). The agency consultants can be an individual or a firm providing professional or management services.

The use of a consultant in a management role should be limited to unique or very unusual situations. These situations require a thorough justification as to why the local agency cannot perform the management. Consultants used in management roles must be selected using the same procedures as those for other consultants specified in this manual.

Eligibility for federal or state reimbursement for local agency engineering (or equivalent) services requires the following:

- Compliance with the selection procedures specified in this manual.
- Existence of a contract between the local agency and the consultant specifying the local agency engineering services to be performed.
- Written designation by the local agency of the responsibilities and authority of the consultant as an agency engineer.
- For a state funded or federal-aid project, completion of Exhibit 10-T by all members (both consultants and employees) prior to participating in the A&E selection panel pertaining to the specific selection process and the firms being considered.

For a state funded or federal-aid project, a local agency consultant in a management role shall not:

- Participate in, or exercise authority over the A&E selection process, if that consultant’s firm is one of the proposing firms, or subconsultant to a proposing firm.
- Participate in, or exercise authority over management of work performed by the consultant’s firm, or to a consultant’s firm of which the local agency consultant firm is a subconsultant. This would include, but not be limited to, managing or directing the work, approving changes in the schedule, scope, or deliverables, and approving invoices.
- Apply for or receive reimbursement of federal-aid funds for the local agency’s federal-aid project if either of the foregoing has occurred. However reimbursement for the construction contract portion of the project will still be allowed provided all other federal-aid requirements have been met.
- Where benefiting more than a single federal-aid project, allocability of consultant contract costs for services related to a management role shall be distributed consistent
with the cost principles applicable to the contracting agency in 2 CFR Part 200 Subpart E Cost Principles.

- For a state funded or federal-aid project, completion of *Exhibit 10-U* by all consultant engineering staff in management positions.

- A completed *Exhibit 10-U* shall be submitted to FHWA for approval prior to execution of the contract for which federal or state funds are being sought. Local agencies must submit an approved *Exhibit 10-U* prior to seeking federal or State reimbursement.

- Selection of consultants for A&E management positions shall be by the use of qualification based selection procedures on an open and competitive basis resulting in a contract with defined beginning and ending dates not to exceed five (5) years.

All consultants acting in a management role must complete *Exhibit 10-U* and retain it in the local agency files.

If engineering services for a project are within the scope of the services described in the retained consultant’s contract, these services may be performed by the person or firm designated as an agency engineer. If the services are not within the scope, eligibility for federal or state reimbursement for these services require a new consultant contract to be developed using the selection procedures in this manual. Retained consultants involved in the preparation of the RFP or RFQ shall not be considered in the selection of consultants for the resulting project specific work.

When engineering or architectural consultants are procured with federal-aid funds, the local agency (subgrantee) shall fully comply with the following:

- Subparagraph of 2 CFR §200.318 (c)(1) “The non-Federal entity must maintain written standards of conduct covering conflicts of interest and governing the actions of its employees engaged in the selection, award and administration of contracts. No employee, officer, or agent may participate in the selection, award, or administration of a contract supported by a Federal award if he or she has a real or apparent conflict of interest. Such a conflict of interest would arise when the employee, officer, or agent, any member of his or her immediate family, his or her partner, or an organization which employs or is about to employ any of the parties indicated herein, has a financial or other interest in or a tangible personal benefit from a firm considered for a contract. The officers, employees, and agents of the non-Federal entity may neither solicit nor accept gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value from contractors or parties to subcontracts. However, non-Federal entities may set standards for situations in which the financial interest is not substantial or the gift is an unsolicited item of nominal value. The standards of conduct must provide for disciplinary actions to be applied for violations of such standards by officers, employees, or agents of the non-Federal entity.”

- Subparagraph of 23 CFR §172.7 (b)(5)(i) Consultant services in management support roles. “When FAHP funds participate in a consultant services contract, the contracting agency shall receive approval from FHWA, or the recipient as appropriate, before utilizing a consultant to act in a management support role for the contracting agency; unless an alternate approval procedure has been approved.”

- Liability insurance should normally be required from the consultant (errors and omissions, etc.).
11.0 MISCELLANEOUS CONSIDERATIONS

11.1 Noncompetitive Negotiated Contracts (Sole-Source)

Procurement by noncompetitive proposals may be used only when the award of a contract is infeasible under small purchase procedures, sealed bids or competitive proposals.

FHWA considers these types of contracts as Sole Source contracts and should be used only in very limited circumstances. A Public Interest Finding prepared by the local agency and approved by Caltrans is required before establishing these services also see LAPM Exhibit 12-F: Request for Approval of Cost-Effectiveness/Public Interest Finding (Exhibit 12-F).

Conditions under which noncompetitive negotiated contracts may be acceptable include:

- Only one organization is qualified to do the work
- An emergency exists of such magnitude that cannot permit delay
- Competition is determined to be inadequate after solicitation of a number of sources

The local agency shall:

- Follow its defined process for noncompetitive negotiation
- Develop an adequate scope of work, evaluation factors, and cost estimate before solicitation
- Conduct negotiations to ensure a fair and reasonable cost

If only two proposals have been received, the contracting agency shall analyze the solicitation to determine if it contained conditions or requirements which arbitrarily limited competition. By calling prospective proposers or firms who obtained the advertisement documents or downloaded electronic version of the solicitation, determine if re-advertisement will result in improved competition. If the administering agency determines that the outcome of the solicitation will not change, the agency may proceed with the procurement process with two proposers.

If the contracting agency receives only one proposal, the local agency must re-advertise. Prior to re-advertising, the local agency should thoroughly review the solicitation and advertisement document and remove any restrictive requirements or conditions that may limit possible responses.

Generally speaking, if the re-advertisement for the same contract yields only one response, this may be justification for a non-competitive procurement. The local agency must carefully document details of the special conditions, obtain Caltrans approval on a Public Interest Finding and retain all documents in the project files for future Caltrans’ or FHWA’s review.

A Public Interest Finding (see Exhibit 12-F) is not required for a local agency to be reimbursed for contract administration activities associated with non-infrastructure type projects such as many Safe Routes to School or Transportation Alternatives Program projects. However, an indirect cost allocation plan must be approved in order to be reimbursed for this work (see http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/policy/indirectcost.htm).
11.2 Construction Engineering Services

Under federal-aid regulations and state policy, the primary responsibility for general supervision of construction must remain with the local agency. The local agency must also ensure that the work is performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications by employing or retaining as a consultant a registered engineer for construction engineering services on the project.

All construction engineering activities performed by a consultant must be under the overall supervision of a full-time employee of the agency who is in responsible charge. These activities may include preparation of contract change orders, construction surveys, foundation investigations, measurement, and computation of quantities, testing of construction materials, checking of shop drawings, preparation of estimates, reports, and other inspection activities necessary to ensure that the construction is being performed in accordance with the plans and specifications. The construction engineering consultant’s contract defines the relative authorities and responsibilities of the full-time employee of the local agency in charge of the project and the consultant’s construction engineering staff.

If a technical inspection consultant is to provide professional assistance to the local agency, a formal consultant contract must be executed which follows this manual’s requirements. The contract shall provide for reviews at appropriate stages during performance of the work to determine if any changes or other actions are warranted. These reviews are to be made by the local agency.
12.0 REFERENCES

- **23 CFR, Part 172** – Procurement, Management, and Administration of Engineering and Design Related Service Contracts
  http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?rgn=div5&node=23:1.0.1.2.3

- **40 USC, Section 1104** – Brooks Act
  http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/121205.cfm
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  http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title41/41tab_02.tpl
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  http://law.oneclcl.com/uscode/41/index.html

- **23 USC, Section 112** – Letting of Contracts
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  https://www.acquisition.gov/far/html/FARTOCP15.html

- **Title 48, Part 16** – Types of Contracts

- **48 CFR 27, Subpart 27.3** – Patent Rights under Government Contracts
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- **48 CFR, Chapter 99** – Cost Accounting Standards, Subpart 9900
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- **49 CFR, Part 26** – Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Department of Transportation Financial Assistance Programs
  http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title49/49cfr26_main_02.tpl
- **American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Uniform Audit and Accounting Guide**
  http://audit.transportation.org/Pages/default.aspx

- **Caltrans Division of Procurement and Contracts Website**
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/dpac/index.html

- **California Labor Code, Section 1775**
  http://law.onecle.com/california/labor/1775.html

- **Government Auditing Standards (GAS) issued by the United States Government Accountability Office**
  http://www.gao.gov/yellowbook/overview

- **Government Code Sections 4525 through 4529.5**
  http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=gov&group=04001-05000&file=4525-4529.5

- **OMB Circular A-110** – Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements With Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations
  https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars_a110

- **Standard Environmental Reference (SER)**
  http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Sandeep Krishnamurthy, Cable Director
              Tami Yuki, Assistant City Manager

SUBJECT: Adopt Resolution Amending the City Classification Plan by Adopting Position Description and Salary Range for Headend Technician

BACKGROUND:

The Headend is the central location where San Bruno Municipal Cable downlinks television signals and operates the central hubs for data as well as voice services. San Bruno Cable’s Headend is physically located at 140 Arbor Ct, San Bruno. The position of Headend Technician for San Bruno Municipal Cable was approved in the 2018-2019 Budget. The assignment of Headend Technician job duties were previously included in the functions of the CATV Technician I/II/III job description. The Cable Department is recommending a stand-alone job description due to the evolution of Headend-related duties leading to a unique role for the Headend Technician with critical contribution to the operations of the Cable Enterprise. The role of Headend Technician is a reclassification and upgrade of an existing role and would not be an addition to the headcount at San Bruno Municipal Cable.

One of the major responsibilities of the Personnel Board is to review the City’s classification plan and review proposed or revised job descriptions for recommendation to the City Council for final approval. The Personnel Board reviewed the new Headend Technician job description at their November 28, 2018 meeting and recommended its final approval with revisions.

DISCUSSION:

Historically, the Headend Technician job duties were performed by a CATV Technician I/II/III under the relevant job description. The new reclassification and upgrade to the Headend Technician position is a direct outcome of the Headend evolving into a complex operating environment. This role is consistent with other cable system operations and in line with industry practice. Staff is recommending a separate
Headend Technician job description to reflect the unique nature and full scope of the job duties and the required education and experience for the position.

With the rollout of fiber technology in 17% of San Bruno Municipal Cable’s footprint, the role of the Headend Technician has greatly increased in scope and importance as it pertains to effective management of two headend technologies – one to service fiber and the other to service hybrid fiber coaxial cable (HFC). The Headend Technician position manages the Cable Enterprise’s headend hardware and software, obtains and maintains technical certifications as well as licenses to ensure that the Cable Enterprise headend is in compliance with current Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and state regulations. In addition to working with CATV Technicians, the Headend Technician interacts with the Cable Enterprise’s programming management to add, delete and change TV channels as required. If an issue arises as it relates to headend equipment, the Headend Technician works with the Cable Enterprise’s Field Supervisor and the Department’s available resources to navigate towards resolution. The Headend Technician also leads training efforts with the goal of educating the Enterprise’s technician team. Although the main duty is headend maintenance and operation, the Headend Technician also investigates system outages and equipment testing for potential upgrades at the direction of Enterprise management.

The proposed Headend Technician job description includes minimum requirements designed to accommodate two “tracks” of experience with specific headend technologies – fiber and hybrid fiber coaxial (HFC). Both technical tracks are accommodated in the 5 year cable experience requirement, with at least two years having been vested directly in the operation of cable headends. This is in line with current practice within the Cable TV industry as it migrates technologically away from HFC and towards fiber rollouts.

In an effort to provide opportunities for applicants who have demonstrated experience per stated requirements but may not have earned the appropriate certifications in one or both technologies (fiber or HFC), the job description allows for acquisition of certifications within a 12 month probationary period. This change will allow for a larger applicant pool and provide an opportunity for technically qualified, but uncertified candidates to apply for the Headend Technician position.

The Headend Technician is a position senior to a CATV Technician I/II/II position but junior to a CATV Field Supervisor position and serves as the Cable Enterprise’s subject matter expert in all matters connected to the headend. The position will work a 40 hour work week, is required to recommend hardware and software changes, replacements and upgrades while remaining current on Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and state regulations relating to TV, internet and voice transport through the San Bruno Cable TV headend. Based on the level of job duties, it is therefore recommended that the salary be assigned a level 10% higher than the current CATV Technician III Step 5 position ($7,198 per month in 2018 and $7,414 effective January 2019). The additional
cost has been budgeted in the 2018-2019 Cable Enterprise Budget with the recommended salary range.

The Personnel Board reviewed the Headend Technician job description and with some revisions, now included in the job description, recommended its final approval at the November 28, 2018 Personnel Board meeting. The Board’s recommended revisions to the job descriptions were to clarify Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) exempt/non-exempt requirements. The Union has also received copies of the proposed position description and agreed to its content.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The new position at the recommended salary will add an additional salary expense of $741.40 per month. The role has been appropriately budgeted in the 2018-2019 Cable Enterprise Budget with the recommended salary range.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Do not approve the new job description or salary range for Headend Technician.
2. Direct changes to the job description or salary range.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt Resolution Amending the City Classification Plan by Adopting Position Description and Salary Range for Headend Technician

**DISTRIBUTION:**

1. Teamsters Union

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Resolution
2. Headend Technician Job Description
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 -

ADOPT RESOLUTION AMENDING THE CITY CLASSIFICATION PLAN BY ADOPTING POSITION DESCRIPTION AND SALARY RANGE FOR HEADEND TECHNICIAN

WHEREAS, that pursuant to Rule IV, Section I through 6 of the Personnel Rules and Regulations of the City of San Bruno, Resolution No. 1958-148, as amended, the Classification Plan of said Personnel Rules and Regulations is amended by immediately adopting the Headend Technician job description.

WHEREAS, the Headend Technician job description was presented to the Personnel Board for their review and recommendation to the City Council for adoption;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the description of typical duties and responsibilities, training, experience and other qualifications required for said positions, more particularly set forth in Exhibit A, attached, is made a part hereof, and are hereby approved and adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the San Bruno City Council hereby approves following monthly salary for the position of Headend Technician as shown below (effective January 2019):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STEP 1</th>
<th>STEP 2</th>
<th>STEP 3</th>
<th>STEP 4</th>
<th>STEP 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6646</td>
<td>6995</td>
<td>7362</td>
<td>7748</td>
<td>8155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dated: January 8, 2019

ATTEST:

Melissa Thurman, City Clerk

I, Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Bruno this 8th day of January 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS:__________________________
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS:__________________________
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS:__________________________
Position Description

HEADEND TECHNICIAN

DEFINITION

Under the general supervision of the Cable management team, the Headend Technician is responsible for the day-to-day technical management of headend reception and transmission equipment. This is a Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) non-exempt position.

SUPERVISION RECEIVED

The Headend Technician works under the general supervision of the Field Supervisor, System Engineer, or other Cable management team designee.

SUPERVISION EXERCISED

May provide operational and technical guidance to other technicians who perform headend-related duties.

ESSENTIAL DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES (Illustrative Only)

Responsible for maintaining existing CATV transmission/reception equipment within multiple headend sites.

Perform technical installation of strategic headend equipment at a system-wide level.

Respond to outages and other issues relating to equipment within the headend(s) and serve as second-level technical support for escalated headend issues.

Ensure software upgrades are done timely and in accordance with current standards.

Implement new headend technologies, new headend licenses for software and firmware, and new headend system-level technical equipment to enhance technical effectiveness.

Perform Internet Protocol (IP) mapping for entire system.

Recommend headend equipment alteration and upgrades.

Train other technical personnel in headend procedures and troubleshooting.
Responsible for implementation of all Federal Communications Commission (FCC) requirements relating to the transmission and reception of CATV/Internet signals.

When circumstances demand, work with other members of the technical staff to troubleshoot, install and maintain the cable network outside of the headend.

Support other technical and administrative staff who work on the headend

Maintain ongoing training in overall network and video technologies, not limited to Arris Video/Internet (Digital Access Controller) Headend technologies, Cisco networking equipment (Cisco CCNA courses), and Calix/GPON (Calix Academy) optical technologies, or equivalent technologies.

Perform other duties, as assigned.

**MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS**

**Knowledge of:**

The operation and basic maintenance of a variety of motorized equipment; methods, tools and equipment used in cable television and fiber optic cable facilities construction, operation, repair and maintenance; safe work methods and practices; mathematical and related techniques used to estimate material needs and their costs; relevant regulatory requirements.

**Ability to:**

Effectively and timely complete assigned programs and projects; prepare and maintain accurate written reports and records; operate and maintain equipment and tools; work effectively with those contacted in the course of work including the public; engage in a broad range of CATV field and cable plant maintenance, operations and construction functions; communicate effectively both orally and in writing; and provide quality control for the cable plant and headend.

**EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE**

Graduation from high school or equivalent.

Minimum of five (5) years cable experience, with two (2) years of direct experience in the operation of cable headends, and the maintenance, installation and repair of cable headend equipment, including, but not limited to, Arris Digital Access Controllers (DAC), Cisco Routers/Switches, Calix headend equipment, Arris Cable Modem Access Equipment (CMTS) and CAP 1000/APEX equipment, or equivalent current technologies.
**SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS**

Possession of, and ability to maintain, a valid California Driver’s License.

Certification as Gigabit Passive Optical Network (GPON) Specialist, Active Ethernet (AE) Specialist, and Copper Access Specialist, or equivalent current certifications, by completion of 12-month probationary period.

Certification as Society of Cable Telecommunications Engineers (SCTE) or National Cable Television Institute (Jones/NCTI) Certifications, or equivalent current certifications similar to CATV Technician III, by completion of 12-month probationary period.

**TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT USED**

Motorized vehicles and equipment, common hand and power tools, wrenches, detection devices, monitors and electronic test equipment, computer, mobile radio and phone.

**PHYSICAL DEMANDS**

The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.

While performing the duties of this job, the employee is regularly required to use hands to finger, handle, feel or operate objects, tools, or controls, and reach with hands and arms. The employee may be required to push and pull cable through conduit. The employee frequently is required to talk, hear, smell, stand, walk, sit, climb, balance, stoop, kneel, crawl. The employee may work in confined spaces. The employee must be able to climb ladders, utility poles, and towers, which may exceed a height of forty feet (40’) on a regular basis.

The employee must lift and/or move up to 50 pounds. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision, distance vision, color vision, peripheral vision, depth perception, and the ability to adjust focus, especially as it relates to visual acuity sufficient to distinguish full-color spectrum and minute details on monitors and test equipment. The employee must possess a level of hearing sufficient to troubleshoot audio problems.

**WORK ENVIRONMENT**

The work environment characteristics described here are representative of those an employee encounters while performing the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.
While performing the duties of this job, the employee may be required to work in outside weather conditions. The employee frequently works near moving mechanical parts and can be exposed to wet and/or humid and/or dusty and damp conditions and vibration.

The employee may be required to work in high, precarious places as well as enclosed, confined areas. While wearing appropriate safety gear, the employee is occasionally exposed to fumes or airborne particles, toxic or caustic chemicals, and risk of electrical shock. The employee must be able to walk over different types of terrain and in a variety of weather conditions.

The noise level in the work environment is moderate in the office setting, relatively high in the headend, and variable in the field.

**SELECTION GUIDELINES**

Formal application, rating of education and experience; oral interview and reference check; job-related tests may be required.

The duties listed above are intended only as illustrations of the various types of work that may be performed. The omission of specific statements of duties does not exclude them from the position if the work is similar, related or a logical assignment to the position.

The job description does not constitute an employment agreement between the employer and employee and is subject to change by the employer as the needs of the employer and requirements of the job change.

Effective Date:  
Resolution Number: 2019-
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Joanne Magrini, Community Services Director

SUBJECT: Adopt Resolution Accepting the Fire Station 52 Reroofing Project as Complete, Authorizing the Filing of a Notice of Completion with the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office

BACKGROUND:

Fire Station 52 is in the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for future replacement. At present, the timeline for full replacement of the facility is uncertain due to a lack of funding. However, the FY 2018-19 CIP budget includes $1,000,000 for a project to develop a plan for replacement of the facility and its conceptual design. Work on this project is scheduled to begin in the first quarter of 2019. In recognition that the full replacement of Station 52 will take some time, staff requested and the City Council approved the Fire Station 52 Facility Improvements Project in the FY 2018-19 CIP budget. This project includes $200,000 for short-term improvements to add a gender neutral restroom, roof repairs/replacement, and a kitchen remodel. In prior years, the roof and the facility has sustained damage and water intrusion, and this portion of the project is being advanced ahead of the restroom and kitchen upgrades.

Staffing transitions as well as the discovery that the bid process was informal, as opposed to a formal solicitation of bids as required by San Bruno’s Municipal Code and Public Contract Code Section 20160, resulted in this project being delayed. Unfortunately, given the impending rains, there was not sufficient time to undertake the formal bidding process. As such, in order to prevent further water damage to Fire Station 52 and to avoid a possible impact to essential public services, staff requested that the City Council waive the competitive bid process for roof repairs at Fire Station 52 by authorizing the City Manager to execute a contract with Izmirian Roofing and Sheet Metal to complete the project.

DISCUSSION:

On October 9, 2018, the total project cost of $50,728 was approved by the City Council which included the contract to Izmirian Roofing and Sheet Metal in the amount of $41,440, project contingency of $8,288 and submittal review and inspection amount of $1,000.

During construction, Izmirian Roofing and Sheet Metal encountered unanticipated construction issues which were addressed through Change Order No. 1 in the amount of $1,733. Due to existing dry rotted plywood at the north edge of the roof and over the locker.
room area, it was necessary for the contractor to furnish and install 10 sheets of plywood. Change Order No. 2 in the amount of $350 was issued to include the replacement of one white acrylic, double domed, non-operable skylight over the locker room. City Staff purchased materials to prime and paint the new plywood, gutters, and downspouts. The amount for these incidentals totaled $757. The total project cost including the 2 change orders was $44,280. This project was delivered under budget by $6,448.

Izmirin Roofing and Sheet Metal has completed the project within the final approved budget. There are no unresolved stop notices or outstanding construction claims. Staff recommends that the City Council accept the construction project as complete and authorize filing the Notice of Completion with the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The FY 2018-19 Capital Improvement Program budget includes appropriations for the Fire Station 52 Improvements Project. The current available balance allocated to this project from the General Fund Capital Reserve is $200,000. The balance of $155,720 will be available for the remaining short-term improvements of the restroom and kitchen upgrades at Fire Station 52.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Do not accept the construction contract as complete and do not authorize filing of a Notice of Completion.

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt resolution accepting the Fire Station 52 Reroofing Project as complete, authorizing the filing of a Notice of Completion with the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office.

DISTRIBUTION:

None

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution
2. Project Acceptance Information Form

DATE PREPARED:

December 12, 2018
RESOLUTION NO. 2019 - ___

RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE FIRE STATION 52 REROOFING PROJECT AS COMPLETE AND AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF A NOTICE OF COMPLETION WITH THE SAN MATEO COUNTY RECORDER’S OFFICE

WHEREAS, the FY2018-19 Capital Improvement Program Budget, Capital Improvement Program No. 51010 funded a project to repair the roof at Fire Station 52; and

WHEREAS, the project consisted of removing and replacing the whole roof at Fire Station 52; and

WHEREAS, on October 9, 2018, the City Council waived the competitive bid process and awarded the construction contract for the Fire Station 52 Reroofing Project to Izmirian Roofing and Sheet Metal in the amount of $41,440, project contingency of $8,288, and submittal review and inspection amount of $1,000; and

WHEREAS, all construction work as part of this contract has been completed to the satisfaction of the City with two change orders to replace existing dry rotted plywood and the skylight; and

WHEREAS, the construction contract requires the filing of a Notice of Completion of this project with the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council hereby accepts the Fire Station 52 Reroofing Project as complete and authorizes the filing of a Notice of Completion with the San Mateo County Recorder’s Office.

ATTEST:

Melissa Thurman, City Clerk

-000-

I, Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Bruno this 8th day of January, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: __________________________________________________________

NOES: Councilmembers: __________________________________________________________

ABSENT: Councilmembers: ______________________________________________________
As of December 13, 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Name:</th>
<th>Fire Station 52 Reroofing Project (#51010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager:</td>
<td>Joanne Magrini/Community Services Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contractor:</td>
<td>Izmirian Roofing and Sheet Metal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description:</th>
<th>This project consisted of removing and replacing the whole roof on Fire Station 52 located at 1999 Earl Avenue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract Award:</td>
<td>October 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Construction:</td>
<td>October 22, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Change Orders:</td>
<td>$2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Completion:</td>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Completion:</td>
<td>December 13, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of Completion:</td>
<td>Scheduled for filing on January 31, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PROJECT</strong></td>
<td>$50,728</td>
<td>$44,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>$41,440</td>
<td>$41,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$8,288</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Orders</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$2,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Staff Hours and Materials</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>$757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-House Submittal Review and Inspection</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

SUBJECT: Adopt Resolution Approving the Declaration of a Homeless Shelter Crisis in connection to the County of San Mateo’s Homeless Emergency Aid Program

DISCUSSION:

Homelessness is multifaceted problem that requires a partnership among Federal, State, local, regional and non-profit agencies. Services that address homelessness include a wide range of programs including, but not limited to rental assistance, medical support services, meal services, warming centers, permanent supportive housing and the development of affordable housing. Because no single agency can effectively provide these myriad services alone, the City of San Bruno partners with neighboring municipalities, non-profits and the County of San Mateo to support individuals and families that are experiencing homelessness or are on the verge of being homeless.

According to the last Biennial Point In Time Homeless Count (conducted by San Mateo County), on January 25, 2017, there were 1,253 persons within the County of San Mateo were experiencing homelessness, including 637 without shelter (including 30 in the unincorporated areas of the county) and 616 residing in temporary shelter programs. Included in these totals are 26 persons that were homeless and living without shelter in the City of San Bruno, which is a 225% increase since the 2015 count.

The County’s Human Services Agency (HSA) serves as the Homeless Continuum of Care (CoC) lead agency for the County and the twenty cities within the County. As the lead agency for the Continuum of Care, HSA intends to apply for a $4.9 million grant to the State Homeless Coordinating and Financing Council (State Council) by the end of December 2018. The State Council oversees disbursement of Homeless Emergency Aid Program (HEAP) grants.

HEAP grants were established by statute to provide localities with flexible block grant funds to address their immediate homelessness challenges. Eligible activities for funding are as follows:

- Homeless Services
• Emergency Housing Vouchers
• Rapid Rehousing
• Capital Improvements

A shelter crisis declaration is required for all cities and counties within a CoC that wish to receive HEAP funds, except for CoCs with fewer than 1,000 homeless people, based on the 2017 Point in Time count. Each incorporated city must declare a shelter crisis pursuant to Chapter 7.8 (commencing with Section 8698) of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code. Counties may declare a shelter crisis only for the unincorporated areas of the county. The declaration is a resolution that must be adopted by the governing body of a jurisdiction or jurisdictions within a CoC.

In recognition of the homeless issues affecting the San Bruno community and to facilitate the County’s application and use of State Homeless Emergency Aid Program funds, staff recommends that the City Council consider and adopt Declaration of a Homeless Shelter Crisis in San Bruno.

Declaration of a Homeless Shelter Crisis by a local municipality provides for the following, as per California Government Code (§ 8698.1):

1. A city is immune from liability for ordinary negligence that may arise in providing emergency housing.
2. For additional public facilities opened pursuant to the crisis, state and local regulations that hinder efforts to mitigate the effects of the shelter crisis regarding housing, health, or safety are suspended. In their place, cities may enact municipal health and safety standards to protect public health and safety.

State code also allows cities to limit the geographic location of the declaration (CA Gov Code § 8698.2(a)(2)). Given the geographic incidents of homelessness that are present in San Bruno, staff also recommends that the Declaration of a Homeless Shelter Crisis be geographically limited to the following areas:

• Within 300ft of the San Bruno BART Station
• Within 300ft of the San Bruno Caltrain Station
• Within 100ft of Interstates 280 and 380 in San Bruno

This action does not impact the City of San Bruno’s prior action to identify the M-1 Industrial Zoning district as the designated zoning district for emergency shelters as mandated by Senate Bill 2.

Specific programs and projects that may be funded by HEAP funds have not been determined at this time. Staff will work with the County’s Human Services Agency to define the use of such funds, if the grant is awarded.
FISCAL IMPACT:
Facilitate the County of San Mateo’s application and proportionate use of a potential $4.9 million Homeless Emergency Aid Program grant to address homelessness within the City of San Bruno. The City of San Bruno is not the direct recipient of the grant funds. Per State guidelines, the funds go to and are expended by the regional Homeless Continuum of Care agency, which is County’s Human Services Agency.

ALTERNATIVES:
1. Do not approve Declaration of Shelter Crisis, which could mean that HEAP grant funds cannot be used within San Bruno.

RECOMMENDATION:
Adopt Declaration of a Homeless Shelter Crisis in San Bruno.

DISTRIBUTION:
None

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Resolution

DATE PREPARED:
December 11, 2018
ADOPT RESOLUTION APPROVING THE DECLARATION OF A HOMELESS SHELTER CRISIS IN CONNECTION TO THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO’S HOMELESS EMERGENCY AID PROGRAM

WHEREAS, The City of San Bruno of the County of San Mateo, State of California declares a shelter crisis pursuant to SB 850 (Chapter 48, Statutes of 2018 and Government Code § 8698.2).

WHEREAS, California's Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. and the members of the California Legislature have recognized the urgent and immediate need for funding at the local level to combat homelessness;

WHEREAS, The Governor and Legislature have provided funding to local governments under the Homeless Emergency Aid Program as part of SB 850 and the 2018-19 Budget Act (Chapter 48, Statutes of 2018);

WHEREAS, The Governor and Legislature require jurisdictions seeking an allocation through the Homeless Emergency Aid Program to declare a Shelter Crisis to all or a portion of the jurisdictions’ boundary pursuant to Government Code §8698.2;

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno has developed a homelessness plan and undertaken multiple efforts at the local level to combat homelessness;

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno finds that 26 persons (a 225% increase since the City’s 2015 count), within the City of San Bruno are homeless and living without shelter;

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno finds that the health and safety of unsheltered persons in the City of San Bruno may in certain circumstances be threatened by a lack of shelter;

WHEREAS, the City of San Bruno affirms the City's commitment to combatting homelessness and creating or augmenting a continuum of shelter and service options for those living without shelter in our communities;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA, that a shelter crisis pursuant to Government Code §8698.2 exists in San Bruno within 300 feet of the San Bruno BART Station, 300 feet of the San Bruno Caltrain架
Station, 100 feet of Interstates 280 and 380; and authorizes the agency’s participation in the Homeless Emergency Aid Program.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of San Bruno, County of San Mateo, State of California at the meeting of City of San Bruno held on the 8th day of January 2019 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

________________________________________
Rico E. Medina, Mayor

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Melissa Thurman, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

________________________________________
Marc Zafferano, City Attorney
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Melissa Thurman, City Clerk

SUBJECT: Receive Report and Confirm Appointment of City Councilmembers:
- To City Council Subcommittees; and
- As Liaisons to the City’s Citizen Advisory Commissions, Boards and Committees; and
- As Representatives and Alternates to San Mateo County and other Regional Agencies

BACKGROUND:

Each calendar year the City Council confirms assignment of each City Councilmember to serve on City Council Subcommittees, as liaisons to Citizen Advisory Commissions, Boards and Committees (CBC), and as representatives to San Mateo County and other regional agencies.

Under State Law (Brown Act), the City Council may establish subcommittees consisting of less than a quorum of the full City Council to review and discuss City business in two ways:
1. A temporary advisory subcommittee, or “ad hoc” subcommittee may be established to serve a limited, or single purpose. A temporary advisory subcommittee may meet more than one time, but is expected to be dissolved once the specific task is completed. Such a subcommittee is not subject to the Brown Act’s requirements for public notice, and the opportunity for public participation.
2. A subcommittee which is assigned a continuing subject matter jurisdiction is considered by the Brown Act to be a “standing committee”. The Brown Act’s requirements for public notice of meetings and the opportunity for public participation apply to standing subcommittees, even if the subcommittee is comprised of less than a quorum of the full Council.

The City Council has previously established subcommittees consisting of two Councilmembers each to support a variety of City Council policy issues, and to provide review and recommendations on issues that will be presented to the City Council for action. These ad hoc City Council subcommittees meet on an as-needed, and in most cases, infrequent basis. As discussed below in this report, the City Council has also previously established four standing subcommittees that meet on an as-needed basis on recurring topics of City Council business.

City Council liaison assignments were previously established to support coordination between the citizen advisory bodies and the City Council in the establishment and implementation of City Council policy. The schedule of City Council liaison assignments rotates annually, as originally established the City Council in 2006.
As City Council representatives serve on San Mateo County and other regional Agency Boards, City Councilmembers actively participate in the formation of local policy and implementation of projects that have a region/county wide impact.

The San Bruno Municipal Code section 2.04.120(A) calls for the Mayor to make all appointments to and removals from Commissions, Boards and Committees, subject to the approval of the City Council.

**DISCUSSION:**

An updated list of the City Councilmember liaison assignments is included as an attachment to this report.

The City Council previously established three standing subcommittees on: Utilities; Surface Infrastructure; and Cable. Subcommittees have continued to have regular business and have met a few times each year. The attached list shows Mayor Medina’s updated assignments of Councilmembers to the standing subcommittees.

The attached list also shows all of the regional agencies to which the City has an assigned representative. Some of the regional agency assignments are not made directly at the City’s discretion. These non-San Bruno appointed positions are listed separately in the attachment.

Staff is recommending that the City Council review and confirm the rotational liaison assignments, City Council Subcommittee assignments and the San Mateo County and regional Agency Board assignments.

In order to assist with the continuing need for periodic involvement of a City Council subcommittee on various topics, staff recommends that the City Council also continue the City’s long-standing practice of the Mayor’s appointment of two Councilmembers to ad-hoc subcommittees as needed throughout the year.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct or anticipated fiscal impact of the proposed action to confirm City Councilmember liaison, subcommittee, county and regional assignments.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Do not continue the standing subcommittees or liaison process.
2. Make changes to the standing subcommittees or the City Councilmember Liaison assignments.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Receive report and confirm appointment of City Councilmembers:
- To City Council Subcommittees;
- As liaisons to the City’s Citizen Advisory Commissions, Boards and Committees; and
- As representatives and alternates to San Mateo County and other regional agencies
ATTACHMENTS:

1. Updated City Councilmember Standing Committee, Regional Agency and Liaison Assignments

DISTRIBUTION:

None

DATE PREPARED:

December 17, 2018
COUNCIL STANDING COMMITTEES:
- Cable: Salazar/O’Connell
- Surface Infrastructure: M. Medina/R. Medina
- Utilities: O’Connell/Davis

2019 COUNTY & REGIONAL AGENCIES:
- Advanced Life Support – Joint Powers Board (ALS) – Meet as scheduled
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell
- Airport Community Roundtable – Meet 1st Wednesday of the month
  Representative: Council Member Medina  Alternate: Mayor Medina
- Airport Land-Use Committee (ALUC) – Meet 2nd Thursday of the month
  Representative: Council Member Davis  Alternate: Mayor Medina
- Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) (Regional) – Meet Quarterly
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell
- City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) – Meet 2nd Thursday of the month
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell  Alternate: Mayor Medina
- Colma Creek Flood Control District (Regional) (Citizen Representative) – Meet Quarterly
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell (appointment through March 2021)
- Grand Boulevard Initiative Task Force (SamTrans) – Meet Quarterly
  Representative: __________________
- Home for All – Meet as scheduled
  Representative: __________________
- League of California Cities/Peninsula Division (Regional) – Meet as scheduled
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell
- Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG) (CalTrain) – Meet 4th Thursday of the month
  Representative: Mayor Medina  Alternate: Council Member Salazar
- Peninsula Clean Energy Advisory Committee (County) – Meet 4th Thursday of the month
  Representative: Council Member Medina  Alternate: Mayor Medina
- San Mateo County Mosquito Abatement District (Regional) (Citizen Representative) – Meet as scheduled
  Representative: Robert Riechel (appointment through December 2020)
- San Mateo County Council of Cities – Meet 4th Friday of the month
  Voting Representative: Mayor Medina
- San Mateo County Operational Area Emergency Services Council – *Meet Quarterly*
  Representative: Mayor Medina  Alternate: Council Member Salazar

- Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment Policy Advisory Committee (County) – *Meet as scheduled*
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell

**2019 COUNTY & REGIONAL AGENCIES- NOT APPOINTED BY THE CITY:**

- Advanced Life Support – Joint Powers Board Executive Committee – *Meet as scheduled*
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell

- City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee – *Meet last Monday of the month*
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell

- City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Legislative Committee – *Meet 2nd Thursday of the month*
  Representative: Vice Mayor O’Connell

- San Mateo County Transportation Authority – *Meet 1st Thursday of the month*
  Representative: Mayor Medina
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Advisory Committee</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Commission</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Citizens Advisory Board</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Arts Commission</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Board</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Crime Prevention Committee</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Preparedness Committee</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic, Safety &amp; Parking Committee</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
<td>M. Medina</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>Salazar</td>
<td>O’Connell</td>
<td>R. Medina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotations Occur Each Year in December
DATE: January 8, 2019
TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager
Marc Zafferano, City Attorney
PREPARED BY: Keith DeMartini, Finance Director
SUBJECT: Adopt Resolution Increasing the Expenditure Authority of the City Manager and City Attorney from $25,000 to $75,000

BACKGROUND:
The City’s purchasing policies and procedures require all expenditures that exceed $25,000 in total value be approved by the City Council. The $25,000 threshold was originally set in 1988 for the City Manager. In 2000, the City Attorney was authorized to settle claims for up to $15,000, or up to $25,000 with City Manager approval. These authorizations limits have not been updated since those dates. In 2002, the City Council adopted Resolution 2002-50, which authorized the City Attorney to expend up to $50,000, or up to $100,000 with the City Manager’s concurrence, to mitigate damages involving “health and safety” issues such as sewer overflows.

Since then, the cost of services, materials, supplies, technology and claims has increased by inflation and other economic factors. Expenditures of $25,000 are a very small fraction of department budgets, yet all expenditures in excess of this amount require City Council approval. This has resulted in the need to request City Council authorization for budgeted expenditures that are now considered routine and basic operations, and is out of step with other cities in San Mateo County.

DISCUSSION:
The cost of goods and services has increased substantially in recent years. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) tracks the cost increases using the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and it is defined as follows: “The CPI is a measure of the average change over time in the prices paid by urban consumers for a market basket of consumer goods and services.” Since 1988, the average CPI cost increase has been 2.6% each year. Applying the average to the yearly CPI cost increase to the $25,000 contract and claim threshold would result in $53,138 in 2018, based on 8 months of actual CIP data in 2018. In other words, the cost-adjusted value of $25,000 in 1988 is approximately $53,000 in 2018.

A City Manager contract authority survey was conducted in July of 2017 for cities in San Mateo County. Of the 19 cities who responded to the survey, the City Manager’s contract authority ranged from as low as $20,000 (Woodside) to as high as $100,000 (San Mateo), with any contract amount greater than the City Manager threshold requiring City Council approval. San Bruno’s City Manager contract threshold of $25,000 is tied for second to lowest with Portola...
Valley. Both Woodside’s and Portola Valley’s annual budget and volume of contracts executed is significantly lower than San Bruno’s.

Below is a table listing the City Manager contract authority limit for the 19 cities that participated in the 2017 survey (ranked from highest to lowest authority) including the population and limit per capita. Of the 19 respondents, San Bruno’s population is the fifth highest and has the lowest per capita limit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>CM Contract Authority</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Limit Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>30,148</td>
<td>$3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>103,426</td>
<td>$0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colma</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>1,506</td>
<td>$49.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Carlos</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>29,311</td>
<td>$2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>65,451</td>
<td>$1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>109,287</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>$66,687</td>
<td>35,670</td>
<td>$1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>85,601</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>23,168</td>
<td>$2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>27,594</td>
<td>$1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacifica</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>38,124</td>
<td>$1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>12,591</td>
<td>$2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atherton</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>7,148</td>
<td>$4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>11,753</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>33,225</td>
<td>$0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Palo Alto</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>30,340</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portola Valley</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>4,707</td>
<td>$5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Bruno</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,295</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.55</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodside</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>5,666</td>
<td>$3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasing the dollar threshold will likely result in staff time savings. Drafting, reviewing, obtaining approval and presenting staff reports, resolutions and supplementary materials requires dedicated staff time. Generally, it takes staff about one to two weeks to generate a staff report for a public works project, sometimes longer for a more complex project. Staff reports are internally reviewed by other departments, including Finance, the City Attorney and City Manager. Council presentations require review and iteration as well. The entire process to prepare documents and presentations takes up to 4 weeks. During this time, delays may occur for a project or program. In addition, by not producing staff reports and presentations for contracts and services under $75,000, staff would be able to shift focus on managing other aspects of project delivery, including procuring contractors to begin and complete services more quickly, if able to reduce even a handful of City Council staff reports.

Increasing the dollar threshold of contracts requiring City Council approval will likely result in fewer contract approval items on City Council agendas. Between the October 10, 2017 and September 25, 2018 City Council meetings, 33 contract approval items were included in either the Consent Calendar or Conduct of Business City Council agendas. Of those, 10 contracts were under $75,000, which would result in 30% fewer items on the City Council agendas.
Staff does not believe increasing the dollar threshold will limit or reduce any opportunity for guidance and feedback provided by the City Council or members of the public. During the annual operating and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget process, current and proposed, capital and other projects are brought before the City Council for consideration and gathering feedback at multiple meetings. Also, City Council meeting agenda items for accepting projects that are completed will continue to be agendized. During the quarterly financial projection reports brought before the City Council, staff plan to develop comprehensive project dashboard reports in order to provide status updates of active projects and key metrics, including project status, overall budget, spending to date, remaining balance, estimated completion date and other issues. The proposed increase in expenditure authority will continue to be exercised within all approved budget constraints.

Similarly, changing the City Attorney’s settlement authority from $25,000 to $75,000 will not affect the City Council’s opportunity to hold closed sessions to discuss settlement of significant claims. Since 2013, there has only been one claim settled for an amount between $25,000 and $75,000.

The City’s purchasing policy and administrative procedures were last updated on December 6, 1988. Staff have written a new purchasing policy that includes updated guidance in the following administrative areas in line with the requested City Manager approval threshold:

1. Procurement activities in line with the adopted budget appropriation;
2. Bidding procedures for qualifying public projects;
3. Executing contracts for purchases of services, supplies, equipment and technology;
4. Executing purchase orders with vendors;
5. Receiving of goods;
6. Invoicing from vendors, and reviewing and approving invoices for payment;
7. Petty cash procedures;
8. The use and controls of credit and business account cards by staff; and

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact to adopting this resolution. The increase in expenditure authority will be exercised within the limits established by the budget approved by the City Council. If adopted, there will likely be a reduction in staff costs and time associated with the preparation of staff reports.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Consider increasing the expenditure authority for the City Manager and/or City Attorney to a different dollar threshold.
2. Do not change expenditure authority for the City Manager and/or City Attorney.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt resolution increasing the expenditure authority of the City Manager and City Attorney from $25,000 to $75,000.
DISTRIBUTION:

None.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution

DATE PREPARED:

December 20, 2018
RESOLUTION NO. 2019-__

RESOLUTION INCREASING THE EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY OF THE CITY MANAGER
AND CITY ATTORNEY FROM $25,000 TO $75,000

WHEREAS, the City’s purchasing policies and procedures require all expenditures that exceed $25,000 in total value be approved by the City Council, and those limits, applicable to the City Manager and City Attorney were originally set in 1988 and 2000, respectively; and

WHEREAS, these authorizations limits have not been updated since those dates; and

WHEREAS, In 2002, the City Council adopted Resolution 2002-50, which authorized the City Attorney to expend up to $50,000, or up to $100,000 with the City Manager’s concurrence, to mitigate damages involving “health and safety” issues such as sewer overflows; and

WHEREAS, since then, the cost of services, materials, supplies, technology and claims has increased by inflation and other economic factors. Expenditures of $25,000 are a very small fraction of department budgets, yet all expenditures in excess of this amount require City Council approval. This has resulted in the need to request City Council authorization for budgeted expenditures that are now considered routine and unremarkable, and out of step with other cities in San Mateo County; and

WHEREAS, increasing the dollar threshold will likely result in staff time savings resulting from not having to draft, review, obtain approval and present staff reports, resolutions and supplementary materials, which requires dedicated staff time; and

WHEREAS, during this time, delays may occur for a project or program. Relieved of these unnecessary inefficiencies, staff would be able to shift focus on managing other aspects of project delivery, including procuring contractors to begin and complete services more quickly, if able to reduce even a handful of City Council staff reports; and

WHEREAS, increasing the dollar threshold for contracts and claims requiring City Council approval will likely result in fewer contract approval items on City Council agendas, but would not limit or reduce opportunity for guidance and feedback by the City Council or members of the public; and

WHEREAS, the City’s purchasing policy and administrative procedures were last updated on December 6, 1988. Staff have written a new purchasing policy that includes updated guidance in the following administrative areas in line with the requested City Manager approval threshold:

1. Procurement activities in line with the adopted budget appropriation;
2. Bidding procedures for qualifying public projects;
3. Executing contracts for purchases of services, supplies, equipment and technology;
4. Executing purchase orders with vendors;
5. Receiving of goods;
6. Invoicing from vendors, and reviewing and approving invoices for payment;
7. Petty cash procedures;
8. The use and controls of credit and business account cards by staff; and
9. Employee expense reimbursements; and
WHEREAS, there is no fiscal impact to adopting this resolution because the increase in expenditure authority will be exercised within the limits established by the budget approved by the City Council, and if adopted, there will likely be a reduction in staff costs and time associated with the preparation of staff reports.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of San Bruno that the expenditure authority of the City Manager and City Attorney is increased from $25,000 to $75,000, and that with respect to the City Attorney, Resolution No. 2002-50 will remain in effect.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2019-__ was duly adopted by the San Bruno City Council at a regular meeting held January 8, 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEMBERS:
NOES: COUNCILMEMBERS:
ABSENT: COUNCILMEMBERS:

___________________ Melissa Thurman, City Clerk
DATE: January 8, 2019

TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council

FROM: Jovan D. Grogan, City Manager

PREPARED BY: Darcy Smith, Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Professional Consultant Services Agreement with WRT for the Development of the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan in an Amount not to Exceed $125,000 and Appropriating Funds in the Adopted FY2018-19 Budget in the Amount of $125,000 from the City’s General Fund

BACKGROUND:

San Bruno downtown is located along a half-mile long stretch of San Mateo Avenue, between San Bruno Avenue and El Camino Real. The Downtown is characterized by short blocks, a pedestrian-friendly environment and architecturally unique buildings. The City’s 1987 Downtown Design Guidelines and the 2000 Downtown Improvement Plan provide architectural guidance for new and existing structures in the city’s downtown that stretches along San Mateo Avenue, as well as an overall urban design strategy for the area. However, these guidelines are dated in today’s context and more focused on building façade design. The existing design guidelines fail to provide specific design recommendations for streetscape elements such as street lights, pavements, trees, other plantings, benches, bike racks, public art pieces, the Posy Park foundations, etc.

The San Bruno General Plan, adopted in 2009, envisions to promote San Mateo Avenue as a symbolic heart of the city. This vision is outlined through various implementation policies in the city’s General Plan. Particularly, the Land Use and Urban Design policies, seek to improve the visibility of the downtown, expand the streetscape amenities, place clearly marked crosswalks and upgrade the appearance of the downtown through combined efforts of the City, merchants and property owners. Similarly, the Economic Development and Transportation implementation policies mention to improve the image of San Mateo Avenue in Downtown as an appealing commercial street to shop, dine, and conduct business.

In 2013, building upon the implementation policies of the General Plan, the City adopted the Transit Corridors Plan (TCP) which articulates the community’s vision for revitalized commercial corridors in proximity to the San Bruno Avenue Caltrain Station. The vision includes fostering dynamic architecture and welcoming gateways, convenient
transportation connections, pedestrian-oriented “green” streets, and additional housing, jobs, retail, and restaurants, while maintaining a sense of the City's history. The TCP identifies San Mateo Avenue - the Central Business District/Downtown, one of the five character areas for public realm improvements. The other character areas are Station Area, El Camino Real, Huntington Avenue and Civic Center as designated in the Transit Corridors Plan. The TCP also identifies San Mateo Avenue Streetscape improvements as a short-term implementation project to enhance the Central Business District. While San Mateo Avenue has experienced vitality in recent years with new cafes and increased restaurant patronage, it remains an underutilized focal point within the city.

The proposed City Council action would approve a contract for the preparation of the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan (Streetscape Plan) and associated California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) clearance. The overall project area will encompass south San Mateo Avenue, which is comprised of the public right-of-way on San Mateo Avenue between San Bruno Avenue at the Caltrain Station to the north and the El Camino Real intersection to the south. The Streetscape Plan for the San Mateo Avenue will serve to create an inviting and cohesive downtown street that links pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders and motorists. The Streetscape Plan project area has a 60-foot right-of-way, with sidewalks approximately eight to ten foot wide, eight foot wide bulb outs at intersections, parallel parking on both sides of the street, and 12-foot vehicle travel lanes. Extending from Huntington Avenue to the north to El Camino Real to the south, San Mateo Avenue stretches approximately 0.65 miles. At the northern entrance to downtown is the Caltrain Station and adjacent is the newly renovated Posy Park. Both these entrances to Downtown San Bruno offer great design opportunities as prominent and inviting gateways to downtown San Bruno. Land uses on San Mateo Avenue are dominated by a vast variety of locally-owned and culturally diverse stores, retail and services such as restaurants, grocery stores, cafes, religious organizations, a private indoor swimming school, a large children’s amusement center, Posy Park, and a large casino towards the northern end of the downtown.

**DISCUSSION:**

The goal of this Streetscape Plan is to re-enforce San Mateo Avenue as a vital commercial street that serves the needs and priorities of the community. A streetscape plan is typically prepared for a limited geographic area within a city and is an articulation of the community's vision of the street governed by the neighboring uses, economic activities, modes of transportation and safety. Today, San Mateo Avenue has many assets such as a comfortable pedestrian scale, distinctive architecture, density, convenient location, proximity to the transit hubs, and an eclectic mix of uses, however, it lacks a cohesive identity and has inconsistent streetscape elements. Unified streetscape improvements helps to build a strong identity and create safer pedestrian conditions that encourages positive activity and economic development along the street.

The San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan will develop complete design standards for all the street features and re-imagine the use of public spaces, such as Posy Park, to create more of a destination. The outcome of the Streetscape Plan will be an enhanced street
with safer and green sidewalks; well-marked and decorative crosswalks; widened sidewalks at some locations; improved signage and way finding including to public parking lots; integrated and attractive modern street furniture; and roadways that accommodate multiple modes of transportation such as bicycles, pedestrians and automobiles. The Streetscape Plan will also provide design recommendations to improve pedestrian safety and comfort, increase the amount of usable public space in the neighborhood, and support environmentally-sustainable storm water management. Incorporating improved and safer design features such as traffic calming strategies, efficient lighting, clear sight lines, improvements at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue and El Camino Real and strong connections to the nearby transit stations, San Mateo Avenue can become a healthier and vibrant public realm where people want to go and spend their time. As this project will likely make modifications to existing infrastructure but make negligible or no expansion of the existing use, it is anticipated that this project will qualify for a Categorical Exemption under section 15301 of the CEQA guidelines, which applies to minor alterations of existing infrastructure within public right-of-way.

**Consultant Selection:**

The City issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) in September 2018 for professional consulting services and also distributed it to ten firms that specialize in urban design and planning. The City received 11 proposals from these firms: WRT, Gates + Associates, RHAA, Callander Associates, Toole Design, Tanaka Design, CD+A, April Philips Design Works, TS Studio, CMG and Land Design. Staff reviewed the 11 proposals and developed an evaluation matrix based on all the requirements outlined in the request for proposal document. Four staff members including the Community Development Director, the Senior Planner, an Associate Engineer and an Associate Planner provided their comments and feedback on all the proposals. Three firms - WRT, Gates + Associates and RHAA, were short-listed and interviewed for further assessment. All three short-listed proposals shared a similar scope of work and approach for the preparation of the Streetscape Plan. The budgets were all identical at approximately $125,000, which was the amount listed in the RFP. However, based on the approach and understanding of the project, knowledge, ability to meet project schedule, and relevant previous experience, staff recommends that the City select WRT to develop the Streetscape Plan.

WRT assembled a team of a broad range of skill sets and experience. They have extensive experience with the design and management of complex public/civic projects. Management of these types of projects includes coordination of consultants, stakeholders, community input, and the design process. Their integrative design process provides opportunities to seek informed solutions and feedback from all participants, including consultants and client, starting early in the process. Apart from landscape architects and planners their team includes one sub-consultant, Parisi CSW, for preparation of the associated environmental review and transportation/circulation analysis. In addition to a detailed work plan, the WRT team conducted brief conversational interviews with several San Mateo Avenue street users that they met on their initial site visit, giving them a deeper understanding of the community’s needs and priorities.
Staff was impressed with WRT’s experience in developing similar plans throughout the Bay Area. Furthermore, staff was also impressed with their graphic skills, in-depth public participation program, which includes an online internet based and physical survey that will engage the community during the pop-up event. WRT understands the potential challenge of overcoming potential language barriers and cultural differences on this project and is prepared to provide translation services in Spanish, Mandarin Chinese and Hindi. WRT will facilitate two community workshops (pop-up and traditional), conduct two stakeholder meetings, host one walk-shop, two storefront displays and have one presentations at the Planning Commission and City Council meetings. WRT will prepare agendas, facilitate, and prepare meeting summaries and provide outreach materials for all meetings.

Staff conducted reference checks by contacting concerned staff from Alameda County, City of Los Angeles and City of Mill Valley regarding their experience working with WRT. References mentioned that WRT is a very well-qualified firm with recent successful experiences completing streetscape plans followed by the implementation plan for other jurisdictions (Mill Valley, Castro Valley, San Rafael, Pleasant Hill, etc.). At the same time, WRT is a well-seasoned, professional firm, and is extremely responsive and works within agreed to budgets and schedules. Also, WRT employs advanced project management and quality management processes that ensure high quality results. Overall, references were very satisfied with WRT’s public engagement and plan preparation process, and would work with the firm again in the future. A more detailed description of specific tasks to be completed by WRT throughout the preparation of the Streetscape Plan is described below:

- **Task 1: Prepare Detailed Work Plan and Strategy:** The consultant team will prepare a detailed schedule, indicating the dates for the major milestones, including the stakeholder and community meetings, “walk-shop,” and Planning Commission and City Council meetings. The consultant team will confirm the duration of City-staff review periods and incorporate those into the schedule.

- **Task 2 - Staff Meeting and Conference Calls:** The Consultant will conduct a kick-off meeting, check-in and update meetings with staff, two stakeholder meetings, two community meetings and Planning Commission presentation and City Council presentation during the course of the project. The consultant team will schedule and attend all meetings, take meeting notes, submit meeting summaries, and provide presentations and supporting documents/attachments prior to the meeting. The consultant team will also be responsible to submit monthly invoices.

- **Task 3 - Preliminary Feasibility Study and Analysis:** The Consultant will review the existing City plans to lay a foundation for future recommendations. The Consultant will prepare a scaled base map of the San Mateo Avenue study area, depicting the public right of way and approximate building footprints. The Consultant will analyze and document San Mateo Avenue’s assets, opportunity sites, existing streetscape features and map them.
• **Task 4 - CEQA Documentation:** The Consultant will determine and prepare a CEQA compliance recommendation document. This will comprise of preparation of relevant environmental clearance findings to address the environmental impacts associated with the preferred streetscape design alternative selected by the City.

• **Task 5 - Community Outreach:** The Consultant will prepare an outreach strategy with inputs from the City. The Consultant will prepare and provide supporting outreach materials for communication with the City-identified stakeholders such as the Chamber of Commerce and the San Mateo Avenue business owners. The City will be responsible for distributing and posting meeting notifications. The consultant will be conducting the following meetings:

  o Two community meetings - one pop-up event and one traditional presentation
  o Survey (online and physical)
  o Community Walk-shop
  o Two stakeholder meetings
  o Storefront displays (2) (if space can be secured)
  o Presentations to the Planning Commission and City Council

The City Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council will be invited to participate in the community workshops to provide input.

• **Task 6: Downtown San Bruno Streetscape Plan Preparation:** The consultant team will prepare a conceptual San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan that incorporates the following elements:

  o Illustrative Plan, Sections and Perspective Views
  o Enlargement Plans (Bulb out and Sidewalk Design, Paving style, Open space, Plaza)
  o Planting Design
  o Street Furnishings and Amenities
  o Street Lighting
  o Way finding Plan and Signage Concept Design
  o Parking and Curbside Management Plan
  o Traffic Engineering Design
  o Utilities Plan / Recommendation
  o Cost Estimate
  o Programming Recommendations
  o Submittal

The consultant team will prepare and present the final Streetscape Plan - at Planning Commission meetings and the City Council meeting, for adoption. WRT has proposed a schedule of eight months to complete the tasks above, with anticipated plan adoption by August 2019. The City will administer the preparation of all the studies and work products associated with the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan. Based on a strong community
engagement program for the project, the work products, including the Streetscape Plan and CEQA document would be considered at the noticed public meetings and hearings before the Planning Commission and City Council.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

In the FY2016-17 budget, there was a one-time enhancement of $125,000 for a Streetscape Plan in the Community Development Department. This was a one-time enhancement in the General Fund for that fiscal year only. However, due to staffing and workload issues, the Streetscape Plan project was not initiated and the funds were not spent.

Generally in situations where the allocated funds are not encumbered or not spent within the fiscal year, the money falls to fund balance and is available in a following fiscal year. The department is now ready to move forward with the project as there is a new planner assigned to work on the Streetscape Plan. The contract is now ready to be executed with WRT as the preferred consultant if approved by the City Council. The Community Development Department is requesting to appropriate funds in the adopted FY2018-19 budget in the amount of $125,000 from the City’s General Fund balance to fund the consultant costs to prepare the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. No action. Staff does not recommend this alternative.

   Staff does not have enough resources and expertise to carry out this project in-house. No action would delay the project which in-turn would delay the much needed streetscape improvements that the San Mateo Avenue needs to support implantation of the City’s General Plan and Transit Corridors Plan, and economic revitalization of the downtown.

2. Direct staff to solicit other proposals.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Adopt a Resolution Authorizing the City Manager to Execute a Consultant Services Agreement with WRT for the development of the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan in an Amount Not to Exceed $125,000 and appropriating funds in the adopted FY2018-19 budget in the amount of $125,000 from the City’s General Fund balance to fund the consultant costs to prepare the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan.

**DISTRIBUTION:**

None

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Resolution
2. San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan Proposal + Updated Statement of Work Addendum

**DATE PREPARED:**

December 19, 2018
RESOLUTION NO. 2019- ___

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A PROFESSIONAL CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT WITH WRT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SAN MATEO AVENUE STREETSCAPE PLAN IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $125,000 AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS IN THE ADOPTED FY2018-19 BUDGET IN THE AMOUNT OF $125,000 FROM THE CITY’S GENERAL FUND TO FUND THE PROJECT

WHEREAS, In 2009, the City adopted the General Plan which envisions to promote San Mateo Avenue as a symbolic heart of the city through implementation policies to improve the visibility and appearance of the downtown, expand the streetscape amenities, place clearly marked crosswalks and upgrade the appearance of the downtown with combined efforts of the City, merchants and property owners;

WHEREAS, In 2013, the City adopted the Transit Corridors Plan (TCP) which identifies San Mateo Avenue - the Central Business District, one of the five character areas for public realm improvements;

WHEREAS, The TCP articulates the community’s vision for revitalized commercial corridors and identified San Mateo Avenue Streetscape improvements as a short-term implementation project;

WHEREAS, The San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan will develop innovative design standards for all the street features to become an economically positive destination downtown supporting the needs of the community;

WHEREAS, the City received 11 proposals for the Request for Proposal and the staff evaluated proposals based on project understanding and approach, qualifications and experience, and completion of similar projects;

WHEREAS, Staff has recommended WRT to provide development of the City’s San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan based on their qualified project team and experience in streetscape plan-related work in Bay Area;

WHEREAS, WRT’s scope of services includes developing a Streetscape Plan that includes preparation of the detailed work plan and strategy, conducting staff meetings and conference calls, conducting preliminary studies and analysis, CEQA documentation, planning and conducting community engagement;

WHEREAS, the City’s adopted FY2016-17 budget included a one-time enhancement of $125,000 for San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan that was not encumbered;

WHEREAS, to complete the Streetscape Plan the City needs to appropriate funds in the adopted FY2018-19 budget in the amount of $125,000 from the City’s General Fund balance to fund the consultant costs to prepare the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the City Council hereby authorizes the City Manager to execute a professional consultant services agreement with WRT for the development of the City’s San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan in an amount not to exceed
$125,000 and appropriate funds in the adopted FY2018-19 budget in the amount of $125,000 from the City’s General Fund balance to fund the consultant costs to prepare the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan.

Dated: January 8, 2019

ATTEST:

Melissa Thurman, CMC
City Clerk

I, Melissa Thurman, City Clerk, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly and regularly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Bruno this eighth day of January 2019 by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: ________________________________
NOES: Councilmembers: ________________________________
ABSENT: Councilmembers: ________________________________
PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
SAN MATEO AVENUE STREETSCAPE PLAN

SUBMITTED TO CITY OF SAN BRUNO / OCTOBER 16, 2018
Submitted by WRT with Parisi CSW
October 16, 2018

Rucha Dande - Associate Planner  
City of San Bruno  
Department of Public Services  
567 El Camino Real  
San Bruno, CA 94066-4299  
rande@sanbruno.ca.gov

Re: Request for Proposals - San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan  
WRT #8285.01

Dear Rucha:

As described in the San Bruno Transit Corridors Plan, San Mateo Avenue is poised for its next stage of transformation, to become a regional destination as well as a local-serving corridor. The TCP and Request for Proposals sketch out a vision for the Avenue that is unified and identifiable as a “place,” expresses the character of San Bruno, supports existing and new businesses, and is a hub of activity connected to the region by multiple transportation modes. WRT is excited to submit this Proposal to help the community develop its vision for the Avenue’s future.

Change has been the norm in recent years throughout the Bay Area and Peninsula in particular, with skyrocketing growth of the tech industry and associated demand for housing, retail and services. The San Bruno Transit Corridors Plan (TCP) anticipates change and seeks to guide new development while preserving Downtown San Bruno’s most valuable assets. As expressed in the TCP, the City understands the value of proximity to transit, and the employment and housing opportunities that transit brings. The expected influx of new residents and businesses can be harnessed to strengthen retail and the City’s tax base, while increasing the success of its business owners and improving quality of life for its residents.

One challenge for the City will be to support positive change while preserving its existing assets, especially the wide range of local, family-owned businesses that line the Avenue. Already, the TCP’s map of “Parcels Identified for Potential Development or Redevelopment” recognizes the value of the existing buildings that line the corridor, while indicating focused areas for change. To seek the balance between change and preservation, our approach emphasizes engagement with the community and stakeholders – especially the business owners, whose livelihoods depend on the success of the Avenue.

In preparation of this Proposal, we walked the corridor and discussed the project with business owners and visitors. We understand the context of the community and can shape an exciting engagement process to envision a refreshed business district. We understand the importance of branding and identity to strengthen the retail environment. We understand the potential of even the most limited
sidewalk spaces to support activities through creative design. Through our experience completing construction documents and seeing streetscapes through implementation, we understand the complexities of accessibility, utilities, and mobility. And we are sensitive to the needs of merchants, such as attracting customers, facilitating parking, and thriving during the construction period.

WRT is committed to enhancing San Bruno’s future through reimagining San Mateo Avenue as a main street with a strong sense of place. The firm’s ethos is rooted in concepts of community engagement, environmental stewardship, and urban revitalization, which provides our team with a deep understanding of what creates strong and successful public spaces. For San Mateo Avenue, we will apply our expertise in the planning and design of urban street corridors with a focus on place-making and sustainability. In addition, our community-driven complete street design work in communities such as Mill Valley, Castro Valley, and Willits, equips us with the knowledge and experience necessary to hit the ground running on this dynamic project. Our track-record of successful streetscape design illustrates our ability to work with local communities to identify goals and priorities that will result in a design that is supported and championed by the community’s stakeholders and residents.

We are very pleased to be joined by Andrew Lee, David Parisi and Robert Stevens from Parisi-CSW, with whom we have a long history of teaming, and who brings additional talent through technical expertise in traffic, safety, mobility, and engineering, as well as deep knowledge about the design and implementation of complete street projects. Parisi-CSW (formerly Parisi Transportation Consulting) has extensive experience with San Bruno, including work on the San Bruno Walk ‘n’ Bike Plan, which led to the award of a $914,000 grant for the Huntington Avenue Transit Corridor Project, a project identified and conceptually designed by Parisi.

Together, our team of professionals is fully prepared to bring innovative design solutions to enhance the Avenue. We are pleased to submit the following proposal for your consideration. We look forward to discussing our submittal with you in greater detail and answering any questions you may have. Our team believes the project is a tremendous opportunity for the City of San Bruno to strengthen its identity as an urban village that embraces a progressive, environmentally sensitive, and all-inclusive approach to the design of its public spaces, making San Bruno in general, and San Mateo Avenue in particular, an inviting place for all.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John R. Gibbs, ASLA, LEED AP
Principal-in-Charge

John R. Gibbs, ASLA, LEED AP
Principal-in-Charge
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3. WORK PLAN + APPROACH

PROJECT UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH

The San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan RFP describes the Scope of Work under the following seven categories which we will use to organize our understanding and approach.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

One of the most striking and valuable assets of San Mateo Avenue is the diverse community that is served by businesses along the corridor. In a region where cultural diversity is not uncommon, San Mateo Avenue stands out because of the varied mix of restaurants, shops and services that line the street. There are very few vacancies, the existing business seem to be thriving, and most of them seem to have been in their locations for some time. Not only are these shops and restaurants ethnically diverse, but a range of ages and stages of life are served, from toddlers at daycares to children learning to swim, newlyweds at the wedding chapel and wedding photo shop, to new parents. The range of businesses and services is striking, including restaurants; fitness, yoga, martial arts and dance classes; the Volunteer Firemen’s Hall; grocery stores; hair salons; dry cleaners; laundromats; a leather supply store; a notary; an auto parts store; banks; bakeries; and more. A surprisingly large number of these businesses are sole-proprietor, locally-owned businesses.

Supporting the existing businesses and the community that patronizes them will be critical to the success of the Streetscape Plan. Through engagement, WRT will learn the needs of business owners and regular visitors and will develop a plan that seeks broad buy-in from community members and stakeholders who will need to champion the project. WRT is expert at using a variety of engagement formats to reach the broadest possible cross-section of the population, including on-site tours, surveys, workshops, storefront displays and pop-up events. For this project, we propose to gain excitement about the future through tactical urbanism – demonstration projects like a pop up parklet to showcase fun ideas and get people excited about improvements. We will employ our fabrication team to build the dream.

One potential challenge on this project will be overcoming potential language barriers and cultural differences. WRT can provide translation services with in-house staff who speak Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, and Hindi. We can also engage outside translation services. WRT also often enlists stakeholders and community leaders in the outreach process, inviting them to translate languages and represent diverse communities and interest groups.

Community Outreach

Engagement with the community is foundational to every public project we complete. We believe in a collaborative approach with the community and stakeholders that positions the Team to provide technical information and guidance through a consensus-based decision making process.
INVITING DESIGN FOR ALL

A street can be more than a conduit for vehicles and pedestrians; it can be an active open space, supporting a range of activities from dining to resting to exercise to play. A street should design should follow the “8-80” rule, safely accommodating a range of ages and abilities from 8 years old to 80 years old. The design can increase comfort and beauty with tree planting, furnishings, and engaging design elements such as art and custom elements that express the city’s character.

The existing street design goes a long way toward following the “8-80” rule by providing bulb-outs with code-compliant curb-ramps, high-visibility crosswalk striping, mid-street pedestrian-crossing signs and pedestrian-activated flashing beacons. A potential challenge to accessibility is code-compliance shortcomings at building entrances and potentially sidewalk cross-slopes exceeding 2%.

BRAND “SAN BRUNO”

The Avenue can be a vital, regional destination for services and host a successful social hub of lifestyle activity. Business districts have learned that customers are seeking a greater mix of amenities and fresh setting. The corridor deserves a complete makeover to update materials, add design elements, and host life in San Bruno.

The streetscape design can also celebrate the amazing diversity displayed in the businesses along the corridor. The streetscape can support local businesses with outdoor dining space, wayfinding, access to parking, and other business-friendly enhancements.

The minimal sidewalk width will make it challenging to support many sidewalk activities such as dining, however a strategic approach can accommodate a significant amount of activity in a small space. For example, replacing the tree pots with trees planted in tree wells with tree grates can free up precious feet of sidewalk width. Every location where the sidewalk widens, either at bulb-outs and mini-plazas, such as the Centennial Plaza and the small plaza next to Citibank, can be leveraged to maximize activity. The small alleyways that lead to surface parking and other uses can also be designed to increase activity.

Identity

Our team understands that streets and corridors are a dynamic medium through which a community can express its unique identity. In Castor Valley we helped the community reveal its rural roots through streetscape work, and Mill Valley’s Miller Avenue reflects community values of ecology, connection to local environment, and quirky character.
ENGAGING STREETSCAPE

The Avenue can be a vital, regional destination for services and host a successful social hub of lifestyle activity. Business districts have learned that customers are seeking a greater mix of amenities and fresh setting. The corridor deserves a complete makeover to update materials, add design elements, and host life in San Bruno.

The streetscape design can also celebrate the amazing diversity displayed in the businesses along the corridor. The streetscape can support local businesses with outdoor dining space, wayfinding, access to parking, and other business-friendly enhancements.

The minimal sidewalk width will make it challenging to support many sidewalk activities such as dining, however a strategic approach can accommodate a significant amount of activity in a small space. For example, replacing the tree pots with trees planted in tree wells with tree grates can free up precious feet of sidewalk width. Every location where the sidewalk widens, either at bulb-outs and mini-plazas, such as the Centennial Plaza and the small plaza next to Citibank, can be leveraged to maximize activity. The small alleyways that lead to surface parking and other uses can also be designed to increase activity.

PARKING

The Streetscape Plan must support local businesses by providing adequate access to parking, with both on-street and off-street sources. One of the biggest challenges of the Streetscape Plan will be that many of the potential improvements described in the Transit Corridors Plan and RFP may require removal of on-street parking. These include parklets, extended bulb-outs for seating or planting (including stormwater-management planting areas), bus stops, and loading zones. The Downtown Parking Study indicates that on-street parking is well used, and business owners told us the same during our on-site interviews.

Potential solutions to this conflict are to maximize use of the existing bulb-outs for either street furnishings and amenities or planting, rather than extending or adding bulb-outs. Reduction in on-street parking may be determined to be a fair tradeoff to achieve the plan’s activation and sustainability goals. The Streetscape Plan will also propose ways to increase connections to off-street parking resources, which are numerous and close by. Signage, lighting, and physical improvements can go a long way toward shortening the psychological distance from off-street parking to businesses along the Avenue.

Local Business Environment

We firmly believe that successful engagement with merchants results in compelling ideas that attract people to the corridor and address day to day operations like trash collection, loading, and utilities. We have worked closely with merchant stakeholders during design and construction on past projects including those located in Albany, Castro Valley, Mill Valley and Palo Alto.
EFFICIENT CONNECTION
San Mateo Avenue’s proximity to transit is an asset that should not be taken for granted. The Streetscape Plan can strengthen connections to nearby transit stations and accommodate those arriving by alternative modes. In addition to the proposed improvements at the intersection of San Mateo Avenue and El Camino Real, we propose to study improvements to the underpass connection at the Caltrain station. As stated in the RFP, enhanced bus stops along the Avenue and ample bike parking should also be implemented to support those modes. One challenge to creation of a true “complete street” is that Class II bike lanes cannot be accommodated on San Mateo Avenue without removing a significant amount of parking or making costly changes to curb locations. Bicycling within the travel lane can be supported through traffic-calming and signage, e.g., sharrows.

INFRASTRUCTURE
The Streetscape Plan presents an opportunity to advance sustainability in San Bruno and meet Regional Board requirements. The Plan can combine stormwater-treatment best practices with cutting-edge tree-planting details and low-water-use plant palette to reduce water use, provide for a healthy urban forest, treat stormwater, and provide shade and comfort. WRT and Parisi/CSW have extensive experience in implementing innovative green-infrastructure design including suspended pavement, permeable paving, and innovative bioretention planter details that support tree growth and plant health.

One potential challenge for the Plan to address is that raised crosswalks (as proposed in the Transit Corridors Plan) present drainage challenges and may be undesirable for bus operations. We propose an assessment of raised crosswalks alongside alternative ways to achieve the same goal of increasing pedestrian safety.
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

WRT has extensive experience with the design and management of complex Public/ Civic projects. Management of these types of projects includes coordination of consultants, stakeholders, community input, and the design process. WRT performs high quality consulting services that are tailored to the specific needs of a given project and client, and our goal is to deliver innovative design solutions that are completed on schedule and within budget. WRT will provide team management, document meeting outcomes and design decisions, and act as a single point of contact for the City. WRT employs advanced project management software that tracks hours in real time and allows the project manager to apply staff resources to the tasks intended. Use of the software protects the project from unforeseen budget issues and simplifies the billing processes.

The following aspects are integral to our management philosophy:

- A work plan that defines the project tasks
- A schedule that meets the City’s needs
- Effective communication
- Coordination of sub consultant team
- Internal quality control at each stage of the project
- Control of project budget

Monthly Status Report, Invoicing

WRT will track the Project Work Plan and associated fees, and will develop monthly status reports outlining all activities for which charges have been made by the consultant or sub-consultants. Monthly status Reports will be submitted with Monthly Invoices for the project’s duration.

Quality Control / Quality Assurance

WRT’s quality-management process emphasizes the prevention of errors in addition to the correction of errors. Our integrative design process provides opportunities to seek informed solutions and feedback from all participants, including consultants and the client, starting early in the process. Quality reviews are completed at three levels: (1) individual level, where each team member is responsible and accountable; (2) discipline level, where each discipline is required to review their own work including the coordination with all other disciplines; and (3) team level, where a WRT-designated reviewer provides total project reviews. Draft documents are not released without assurances from the WRT Project Manager and Principal-in-Charge that all scheduled reviews have been completed and all comments addressed. Protocols are established at the start of the project identifying the schedule of deliverables, comment periods, revisions and meetings between the client and WRT and the entire project team.

Design Fee Control

With this proposal as a starting point, WRT will work with the City to define the work required, proposed deliverables, and the associated fee. If any element requested significantly differs from our proposed scope of work, WRT will provide a written extra-service request that includes detailing the task and estimated cost. No extra-service work will be completed until we receive written authorization. If WRT or its subconsultants incur costs in excess of their allocated budget without prior authorization, the consultant team will assume the liability.

Safety

Ensuring public safety is critical to an enjoyable and successful destination main street. Our work resolves conflict points making it easier for people – especially kids and seniors – to move safely along and across the street. Lighting, clear sight lines, and an activated environment ensure a welcoming environment. On Miller Avenue, we implemented pedestrian activated flashing beacons in a completely reconfigured intersection to reduce conflicts.
The City's original scope language from the RFP is included below in grey italics and strikethrough.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

**TASK 1: PREPARE DETAILED WORK PLAN AND STRATEGY**

The Consultant will prepare an elaborate work plan and include a detailed meeting and presentation schedule.

**Deliverables:** A robust work plan strategy and approach, including a proposed communication plan, and defined schedule that meets the timeline.

WRT will confirm this proposed scope of services with the City, and make any modifications agreed to by WRT and the City. WRT will prepare a detailed schedule, indicating the dates for the major milestones, including the stakeholder and community meetings, “walk-shop,” and Planning Commission and City Council meetings. WRT will confirm the duration of City-staff review periods and incorporate those into the schedule.

**TASK 2: MEETINGS / CONFERENCE CALL**

The Consultant will conduct the following meetings during the course of the project.

2.1 **Kick-off meeting**

2.2 **Check-in and update meetings with staff**
(4 in-person meetings in San Bruno, and 6 conference calls)

2.3 **Two stakeholder meetings**

2.4 **Two community meetings**

2.5 **Planning Commission Presentation**

2.6 **City Council Presentation**

**Deliverables:** The Consultant will schedule and attend all meetings, take meeting notes, submit meeting summaries, and provide presentations and supporting documents/attachments two weeks prior to the meeting. The Consultant will also be responsible to submit monthly invoices.

**TASK 3: PRELIMINARY FEASIBILITY STUDY AND ANALYSIS**

(a) The Consultant will review the existing City plans to lay a foundation for future recommendations. The Consultant will prepare a scaled base map of the San Mateo Avenue study area, depicting the public right of way and approximate building footprints. The Consultant will analyze and document San Mateo Avenue’s assets, opportunity sites, existing streetscape features and map them.

(b) At this stage the consultant will also determine the requirement of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance document.

**Deliverables:**
- Downtown San Bruno base map
- A detailed documentation of existing conditions that can serve as a chapter in the final report
- Determination of CEQA document

3.1 **DATA COLLECTION AND FIELD REVIEW**

Our team will collect information and perform a field review along San Mateo Avenue from El Camino Real to Huntington Avenue to understand basic conditions along the corridor. The team will collect and review the following documents:

- Pavement Condition Data from Streetsaver
- Sanitary sewer and storm drainage
- City and public utility as-built data
- Traffic volume, speed, and collision data

3.2 **EXISTING CONDITIONS MAPPING**

Our team will prepare a base map of the corridor using the City and County aerial photogrammetry. We will include boundary and utility information using record data.
“San Mateo Avenue feels very welcoming, there are people walking around...If I were to change something, I’d make it more pedestrian friendly, easier to walk around.”
- Bay Area Entrepreneur Center Employee
“It’s becoming crowded, especially on weekends, and parking will become a bigger issue than it already is now, which is bad for business.”

- Happy Scissors Employee
3.3 SITE ANALYSIS

3.3.1 Site Reconnaissance

The team will visit the site to assess conditions including:

INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY:

- Pavement condition including the location, type, and severity of distress
- Conditions of the concrete sidewalks including compliance with accessibility code (CBC) at typical locations including mid-block and at street crossings
- Conditions of accessibility between the public rights of way and private properties at typical locations
- Inventory of regulatory street signs
- A photometric assessment collecting existing light level readings for conformance to typical roadway lighting standards for bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles.
- We will review conditions that impact bicycle and pedestrian safety including limited sight distance and utility appurtenances that present hazards.
- Inventory of traffic signal hardware including pedestrian push buttons.

STREET CHARACTER, LANDSCAPE AND FURNISHINGS INVENTORY:

- Pavement types
- Hardscape elements (planters, seatwalls, etc.)
- Street furnishings
- Directional signage
- Planting
- Building character and uses

3.3.2 Hydrology Assessment

The team will assess the hydrology of the corridor to determine if modifications to the drainage system are necessary to prevent flooding as well as to determine if street modifications will obstruct drainage. In coordination with City staff, we will review known issues with the storm drain collection system.

3.3.3 Utility Assessment

The team will meet with the City’s water and sanitary sewer department as well as PG&E and AT&T to understand the conditions and capacity of their utility infrastructure.

3.3.4 Opportunities & Constraints Analysis

WRT will develop an Opportunities and Constraints diagram and narrative indicating areas for potential improvements and physical constraints. The diagram will indicate potential locations for seating and gathering areas, outdoor dining, parklets, stormwater-management planting areas, street trees, bus stops with shelters, and other improvements. As described in the RFP, the team will also assess the potential for diagonal on-street parking.

3.4 DETERMINATION OF CEQA DOCUMENTATION

The Transit Corridors Plan completed a program-level EIR that illustrates relevant environmental resources along San Mateo Avenue. With completion of the concept plan for the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape plan, the CEQA approach could be to file an addendum to the certified document as the proposed project would likely be similar. However, the proposed improvements should fall within the classes of projects as defined in the Public Resources Code, which have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are thus exempt from CEQA. As this project will likely make modifications to existing infrastructure but make negligible or no expansion of the existing use, it should qualify for a Categorical Exemption under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15301 applies to minor alterations of existing infrastructure within the public’s right-of-way. As the lead agency, the City of San Bruno can further support the finding by imposing standard conditions of approval on the project. For example, if any trees must be removed, it will be important that compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act be required and that surveys be completed to ensure that nesting birds would not be harmed during tree removal. Also, the City can impose a standard condition regarding the potential inadvertent discovery of unknown archaeological resources during project construction. Our team will provide a recommendation to comply with CEQA in coordination with the City’s planning department.
3.5 PRELIMINARY DESIGN CONCEPTS

For presentation at the first stakeholder and community meetings, WRT will develop an exhibit of drawings and precedent images illustrating potential design concepts for stakeholder and community feedback. These would be prototypical concepts that could be applied at different locations along the corridor, i.e., a “menu” of conceptual improvements. These would include such elements as mini-plazas at bulb-outs, stormwater-treatment planting areas, parklets, crosswalk treatments, furnishings and light fixtures.

TASK 4: CEQA DOCUMENTATION

The Consultant will determine and prepare a CEQA compliance document. This will comprise of preparation of relevant environmental document for example a negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration, to address the environmental impacts associated with the preferred streetscape design alternative selected by the Agency/City.

Deliverable:
- One hard copy and one electronic file (.pdf format) of both the draft and final CEQA document

As described under Task 3.4, Determination of CEQA Documentation, above, our team will provide a recommendation to comply with CEQA in coordination with the City’s planning department.

Deliverable:
- CEQA documentation recommendation memorandum.

TASK 5: COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The Consultant will prepare an outreach strategy with inputs from the City. The Consultant will prepare and provide supporting outreach materials for communication with the City-identified stakeholders. A genuine effort should be made to garner community participation to achieve a consensus and feedback around the project. The Consultant will develop input-gathering worksheet for outreach events, community surveys (online and/or physical), and community walk shops as part of their community outreach strategy. The stakeholders could be but not limited to:

- San Mateo Avenue Business owners
- San Bruno Chamber of Commerce

Deliverable:
- San Bruno Community Foundation

Deliverable:
- Two community meetings
  (one pop-up event and one traditional presentation)
- Survey
- Walk-shop
- Two stakeholder meetings
- Storefront displays (2)
- Two presentations - One presentation of draft Streetscape Plan at Planning Commission and one at the City Council.

5.1 OUTREACH STRATEGY AND COLLATERAL

WRT will confirm the below proposed outreach strategy with City staff, make necessary refinements and decisions, and schedule the outreach activities. To give the outreach recognizable identity, WRT will develop a graphic standard for the project’s outreach materials, such as a consistent header and footer, logo placement, and typeface selection. WRT and City staff will determine the appropriate types of notifications. As described under Task 3.4, Determination of CEQA Documentation, above, our team will provide a recommendation to comply with CEQA in coordination with the City’s planning department.

Deliverable:
- CEQA documentation recommendation memorandum.

5.2 COMMUNITY SURVEY (ONLINE AND PHYSICAL)

WRT will develop a survey, to be administered both online (via Survey Monkey) and in person at the “walk-shop” and community meeting pop-up event. WRT will tally survey responses and provide a survey-results memorandum.

5.3 COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

WRT will hold two stakeholder meetings, two community meetings, a “walk-shop,” an on-line and in-person survey, and one Planning Commission presentation and one City Council presentation in the following sequence:

5.4 WALK-SHOP: A DIALOG ABOUT THE STREET AND ITS POTENTIAL

WRT will conduct a “walk-shop” with stakeholders and interested members of the community. WRT will listen to participant’s impressions and concerns about the existing
conditions of the streetscape, as well as what they see as successful. This will also be an opportunity for WRT to describe potential improvements.

5.5 **STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1: LISTENING TO STAKEHOLDERS**

WRT will meet with community-organization representatives, property owners, business owners, and other stakeholders to present the consultant team's existing-conditions inventory and analysis and to listen to the stakeholders about their needs, hopes, concerns, and opinions about San Mateo Avenue.

5.6 **COMMUNITY MEETING #1: GENERAL INPUT AND RESPONSES TO PRELIMINARY CONCEPTS**

At the first community meeting, WRT will briefly present its understanding of existing conditions and will present the Preliminary Concepts (see Task 2). The community participants will be asked to give feedback on the existing conditions and the preliminary concepts, and will also have an opportunity to provide input on potential themes for signage and public art and custom elements. Feedback tools may include comment cards, “dots” exercises on graphics (to assess preferences), and Post-it note comments on a large existing conditions map/aerial photograph.

“I would add more trees...bring some green, bring some freshness.”

- Two Starbucks customers
"I love it here because of the different ethnic stores."

- Two Starbucks customers

This community meeting will as a “pop-up” event on the site, possibly at the plaza adjacent to the Citibank building. We have found the on-site “pop-up” option to be a great way to gather input from those who are unlikely to attend an evening meeting, and capture a wider range of users of a site, including ages, ethnicities and socio-economic demographics.

Prior to the community meeting, WRT will use temporary methods to mock-up specific potential improvements. The mock-ups might include changes to the curb alignment to provide space for public use or additional planting area or adding furniture and potted plants to certain bulb-out areas, or a “parklet” in a parking space, similar to a “Park(ing) Day” installation. We have found that this type of prototyping is an invaluable way to describe potential changes to the streetscape.

5.7 STAKEHOLDER MEETING #2: DRAFT STREETSCAPE PLAN

Based on City staff, stakeholder and community input to date, WRT will prepare the graphic components, and preliminary text such as project goals, of the Draft Streetscape Plan. WRT will present the Draft Streetscape Plan graphics and preliminary text at the second stakeholder meeting. The plan
will be illustrated through easily legible illustrative graphics, including a rendered plan, sections, and perspective views generated from a 3-D digital model. Precedent images and materials and furnishings cut-sheets will illustrate paving, hardscape, furnishings and plant materials. The stakeholders will give general feedback, which will be recorded by WRT. Because stakeholder feedback, and ultimately buy-in, is so critical to success, we propose conducting this stakeholder input over the course of one day, with five timeslots provided to accommodate stakeholders with different schedules.

5.8 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING: DRAFT STREETSCAPE PLAN AND STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

WRT will present the Preliminary Draft Streetscape Plan and report on the stakeholder and community input to the Planning Commission for additional input.

5.9 COMMUNITY MEETING #2: STREETSCAPE PLAN

After revising the Draft Streetscape Plan based on input from City staff, planning commission, and stakeholders, WRT will present the Streetscape Plan to the community during a formal presentation. As with the second stakeholder meeting, the presentation will be primarily graphic in nature, with easily legible illustrative graphics including a rendered plan, sections and perspective views generated from a 3-D model. WRT will present photographs of the proposed furnishings and materials; and concept renderings of the signage types, with enough detail to convey the signage theme, colors and materials, typography, and typical content. Associated with Community Meeting #2, WRT will prepare a storefront display that can be posted at a to-be-determined storefront on San Mateo Avenue.

5.10 CITY COUNCIL MEETING: STREETSCAPE PLAN

WRT will present the Streetscape Plan to City Council, and report on the stakeholder and community process.

TASK 6: DOWNTOWN SAN BRUNO STREETSCAPE PLAN PREPARATION

The consultant team will prepare a conceptual San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan that incorporates the following elements:

Illustrative Plan, Sections and Perspective Views

WRT will prepare an illustrative plan that includes the entire study area. The plan will be drafted in AutoCAD and computer-rendered for legibility. The plan will be to scale, with key dimensions indicated. WRT will also prepare cross-sections at typical locations, indicating the dimensions of the roadway, curb-extensions, planting areas, sidewalk, etc. WRT will prepare perspective views using 3-D modelling software. Aerial perspectives will show overall improvements, while eye-level views will illustrate the design from a person’s point of view.

Enlargement Plans (Bulb out and Sidewalk Design, Paving style, Open space, Plaza)

WRT will prepare schematic enlargement plans for typical areas indicating typical dimensions, layout of furniture, paving patterns and materials, and planting details such as tree grate sizes and configurations and recommendations for suspended pavement or structural soil. WRT will also prepare conceptual enlargement plans for unique locations such as the proposed reconfigured intersection at San Mateo Avenue and El Camino Real, bus stops, and smaller pocket-parks and parklets that may be part of the plan.

Planting Design

The Streetscape Plan will propose specific tree species and include photographs of the species in the plan document. The planting plan will indicate the locations of each species.

Street Furnishings and Amenities

WRT will include photographs and drawings of the proposed family of street furnishings and site amenities.

Street Lighting

WRT will include specific street-light fixture recommendations. Fixture spacing will be based on general industry guidelines. Photometric analysis and specifications for lamp wattages and optics will not be included.
Wayfinding Plan and Signage Concept Design

WRT will prepare a wayfinding plan focusing on the San Mateo Avenue corridor, and indicating locations for signs and gateway elements off of the corridor but directing traffic to the corridor. The plan will indicate sign and gateway monument types and general content. Off-street parking signage will be incorporated as well as directional signage to key locations, and gateways/monuments that enhance the downtown’s character. WRT will develop schematic-level signage design, including the graphic theme, color selection, typeface, and types of installation. WRT will develop three larger gateway features to a schematic-design level.

Parking and Curbside Management Plan

The team will draw on the existing conditions assessment and recommendations resulting from the Downtown Parking Management Plan to develop compatible streetscape treatments and strategies for San Mateo Avenue. Our recommendations may include demarcating some general curbside parking into extended loading zones (for businesses with heavy deliveries) and short-term loading zones (for FedEx/UPS/Amazon and ride sharing companies); conversion of general parking into bicycle parking (bike corrals) and parklets. Treatments and strategies would be developed as part of a toolkit or prototypical block for consideration by the businesses on each block. Strategies to mitigate the loss of curbside parking will draw from the recommendations of the Downtown Parking Management Plan.

Traffic Engineering Design

The team will develop conceptual plans for one prototypical block including one typical intersection and one transit stop. The prototypical block design will include illustrative designs to calm traffic, emphasize non-motorized modes, and convey wayfinding and parking information. Streetscape treatments may include colored pavement, lane markings and signs.

The team will also develop concept plans for San Mateo Avenue’s intersections with El Camino Real and Huntington Avenue. These designs will consider realigning the intersection geometry, modifying traffic control (signals and signs), providing a gateway treatment into the Downtown.

Utilities Plans / Recommendations

Based on its hydrology assessment, the consultant team will provide recommendations to both locate and size green infrastructure components such as pervious pavements and raingardens consistent with San Mateo County’s Provision C.3. Based on information provided by the City and utilities, the team will determine near term infrastructure improvements that will require rehabilitation as well as understanding capacity issues that must be addressed to support development that may occur along the corridor.

Cost Estimate

The consultant team will develop a cost analysis to complete design and construction of the proposed improvements. This will also include public utility fees that may be necessary to support the modifications.

Programming Recommendations

The Streetscape Plan may incorporate programming recommendations based on conversations with City staff and stakeholders, such as street fairs, farmers’ markets, and events and programs that could take place in the plazas and small parks along the corridor.

Submittals

The consultant team will present the draft and final graphic illustrative plan, sections, perspective views, precedent images and materials and furnishings images at stakeholder, community, Planning Commission and City Council meetings as described under Task 5, Community Outreach, above. Following those presentations, WRT will compile the graphics and narrative into the Streetscape Plan and provide the following submittals.

6.1 DRAFT STREETSCAPE PLAN

The consultant team will provide one draft Streetscape Plan, including the above graphics and narrative, to City staff for review and comment.

6.2 INTERMEDIATE RESPONSE DOCUMENT

City staff will compile the comments into a spreadsheet or table-format response document, which the consultant team will use to provide initial responses and clarify comments.
“I’d have different lighting, like in Palo Alto…so that the street is more festive….If you want a night scene, you need to make it look inviting for that.”
- Local Resident / Starbucks Employee / Kuyao’s Asian Cuisine Customer

6.3 FINAL STREETSCAPE PLAN

After the comments and responses are reviewed by City staff, the consultant team will finalize the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan document.

Deliverables:
- Draft San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan
- Intermediate response document
- Final Conceptual* San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan
OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES + EXPERIENCE

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

OPPORTUNITY: Engage a diverse community in a variety of fun, interactive formats.

CHALLENGE: Overcome potential language barriers and cultural differences.

EXPERIENCE: Our toolkit is full of creative techniques. Translation services with in-house staff or outside consultants. Collaborate with stakeholders and community leaders to reach diverse communities and interest groups.

INVITING DESIGN FOR ALL

OPPORTUNITIES: Follow the “8-80” rule, accommodating people from 8 years old to 80 years old; Celebrate the amazing diversity; Support local businesses; Increase comfort and beauty.

CHALLENGE: Existing accessibility code-compliance shortcomings.

EXPERIENCE: Safety and comfortable access underlies the retail strategy of Castro Valley Blvd, Palo Alto University Ave, and Cloverdale Blvd.

BRAND SAN BRUNO

OPPORTUNITY: Create an identifiable and unique design language.

CHALLENGE: Balance cost-effective solutions with custom elements to meet budget.

EXPERIENCE: Castro Valley Boulevard signage, wayfinding and identity strategy and implementation.
ENGAGING STREETSCAPE

**OPPORTUNITY:** Give it the makeover it deserves!

**CHALLENGE:** Maximize the use of available sidewalk space through creative design.

**EXPERIENCE:** Miller Avenue Streetscape uses every opportunity to enhance the character and usability of the public realm.

EFFICIENT CONNECTIONS

**OPPORTUNITY:** Strengthen connections to nearby transit stations. Accommodate those arriving by alternative modes.

**CHALLENGE:** Class II and IV bike lanes cannot be accommodated without significant cost and tradeoffs.

**EXPERIENCE:** The cross section of Castro Valley Blvd was designed down to the inch. Diagonal parking was tested.

PARKING

**OPPORTUNITY:** Support local businesses by better leveraging existing parking.

**CHALLENGE:** Balance improvements that require removal of on-street parking with a parking strategy.

**EXPERIENCE:** Plans that support the provision of off-street parking and developed wayfinding signage.

INFRASTRUCTURE

**OPPORTUNITY:** Combine stormwater-treatment best practices with cutting-edge tree-planting details and low-water-use plant palette.

**CHALLENGE:** Raised crosswalks present drainage challenges and may be undesirable for bus operations.

**EXPERIENCE:** Castro Valley Boulevard implemented suspended pavement technology, permeable pavement, stormwater detention planting areas, and custom tree-grate details.
4. KEY PERSONNEL BACKGROUND

WRT
PRIME | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE + URBAN DESIGN + OUTREACH LEAD

Founded in 1963, WRT was immediately recognized for its first projects, which represented the two main directions of WRT’s environmental ethos: designing with nature and enriching urbanism. Today, WRT’s practice reflects its environmental philosophy at all scales from broad planning strategies to urban design to detailed aspects of architecture and landscape architecture. The firm’s practice is based upon understanding the opportunities and responsibilities that come with specific sites and their environment. We blend context-responsive and environmentally-sensitive design with a commitment to community participation. WRT employs a “Complete Streets Plus (CS+)” approach to street-making that takes the industry accepted notion of Complete Streets one step farther. We recognize that in addition to providing the full range of mobility options within the street corridor, a number of additional social, cultural, ecological and other sustainable functions can also be provided. The combination of these elements will be different for every community and corridor but can be a powerful tool in defining a functional balance and culturally distinctive sense of place. Providing for specific kinds of social activities gives rise to appealing forms and design treatments just as providing for specific ecological functions leads to unique landscape expressions. Other sustainable functions such as energy conservation (and even generation), use of recycled / recyclable materials and local food production can also add new dimensions to a public corridor.

PARISI CSW
TRANSPORTATION + INFRASTRUCTURE

The Parisi CSW Design Group is a full-service design firm consisting of over 30 designers. Our philosophy centers on providing complete and sustainable infrastructure that recognizes the need to deliver mobility, surface and underground improvements to the areas in which we work, live and play. Parisi CSW delivers integrated transportation planning and civil engineering approaches to communities throughout Northern California.

With offices throughout the Bay Area, including in Berkeley, Parisi CSW is recognized for planning and designing successful Complete and Green Street projects that integrate innovative transportation solutions both on schedule and within budget. Recent team member successes include planning, designing and implementing major public infrastructure projects on Castro Valley Boulevard, Geary Boulevard, Hearst Avenue, Hesperian Boulevard, Miller Avenue, San Pablo Avenue, and Shattuck Avenue. Parisi Transportation Consulting will be a SLBE on January 1, 2018.

COLLABORATION

Members of our team have collaborated on Complete Streets planning projects for over 15 years including:

- Miller Avenue Streetscape (Mill Valley, CA)
- Castro Valley Boulevard (Castro Valley, CA)
- Macdonald Avenue Streetscape (Richmond, CA)
- Central Avenue Streetscape (El Cerrito, CA)
- Hampton Road (Alameda County, CA)
- Sacramento Street (Vallejo, CA)
- San Pablo Avenue (Albany, CA)
- San Pablo Avenue (Richmond and San Pablo, CA)
- Path to Transit (Hercules, CA)
- Sir Francis Drake Boulevard (Marin County, CA)
- Third Street (San Rafael, CA)
- Yosemite Avenue (Manteca, CA)
- Cloverdale Boulevard (Cloverdale, CA)
- Willits Main Street Enhancement Plan (Willits, CA)
- Broadway Complete Street Project (Sacramento, CA)
- Contra Costa Boulevard (Pleasant Hill, CA)
This team’s expertise is based on an established history of successfully completing similar projects. Each firm has worked together and independently to build complete streets. We have led charrettes and worked side by side with communities to craft compelling solutions. Below is a snapshot of our members and how the team is structured. On the following pages you will find brief descriptions of the roles of our assigned staff.
As Principal-in-Charge John will guide the overall direction of the project and provide final review of all products. He is a landscape architect and urban designer with 20 years of experience. He shares WRT’s deep commitment to environmentally rooted planning and design excellence. His work reflects his belief that open space infrastructure, whether at the scale of streets, landscaped plazas, or parks is a crucial and integral part of creating quality urban environments. He is a practice leader in WRT’s Community Design and Parks & Open Space practices where he is committed to enhancing community open space and expanding mobility options through complete streets, trails, and district pedestrian networks. Community engagement is fundamental to all facets of his work and his outreach skills are valued by clients who seek outcomes rooted in productive public dialogue.

EDUCATION
University of California, Berkeley, Master of Landscape Architecture
University of California, Davis, Bachelor of Landscape Architecture

AFFILIATIONS + AWARDS
CA Landscape Architect #4417
American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)
U.S. Green Building Council LEED Accredited Professional
Lake Merritt Park: Downtown + Neighborhood Edges, ASLA-NCC Merit Award, 2014
Lake Merritt Municipal Boathouse, APWA Northern California Project of the Year, 2010
Richmond Memorial Civic Center, ABAG Building a Better Bay Area: Urban Design, 2010 - CPFS Preservation Design Award, 2010

ENGAGEMENT
Frequent Design Critic to UC Berkeley and Academy of Art University
“Landscape Urbanism: A New Environmental-ism for Design” Lecture UC Berkeley
LARE (CA License) Preparatory Course Instructor
Teaching Assistant to UC Berkeley Landscape Architecture and Urban Design Professors
Lake Merritt Park: 10 Years Later - National ASLA Presentation

WORK EXPERIENCE
Urban Ecology - Community Participation Coordinator and Urban Design Educator: 1999
Hablitzel Landscape Architects (HLA) - Landscape Architectural Designer: 1994 - 1995
JACOB TOBIAS
ASLA, LEED AP
PROJECT MANAGER | SENIOR ASSOCIATE | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT + URBAN DESIGNER

As Project Manager Jake will be the main point of contact for the City and subconsultants. He will oversee the day-to-day progress of the project. Jake is a landscape architect and urban designer in WRT’s San Francisco office. With over 15 years of experience, his work includes design at the full range of scales from master planning to detail design. He is interested in incorporating green infrastructure, ecological design principles and community participation in the design process.

EDUCATION
University of California, Berkeley, Master of Landscape Architecture
Macalester College, Bachelor of Arts

AFFILIATIONS + AWARDS
Landscape Architect, CA License #4890
American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)
U.S. Green Building Council LEED Accredited Professional
Richmond Memorial Civic Center, CPFS Preservation Design Award, 2010
Richmond Memorial Civic Center, ABAG Building a Better Bay Area: Urban Design, 2010
San Francisco State University Master Plan; ASLA Northern California Chapter Merit Award (Planning), 2009

ENGAGEMENT
ASLA Northern California Chapter Executive Committee Director, 2014-2016
UC Berkeley Extension, Advanced Landscape Design Studio Instructor, 2007 - 2014
California Landscape Architect Registration Exam Preparation Instructor, 2003 - 2013
UC Berkeley, Landscape Architectural Graphics Guest Instructor, 2000
Bay Friendly Landscape Course and Conference

SELECTED PROJECTS
+ project award
Miller Avenue Streetscape Plan and Design
Mill Valley, CA
Napa Downtown Pedestrian Corridor
Napa, CA
Richmond Memorial Civic Center Plaza
Richmond, CA
Lake Merritt Park
Oakland, CA
California Pacific Medical Center Streetscapes
San Francisco, CA
Cloverdale Boulevard Streetscape
Cloverdale, CA
Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Corridor Rehabilitation
Greenbrae, CA
San Pablo Avenue Complete Street Project
Richmond + San Pablo, CA
Hunter’s Point Shipyard Streetscapes
San Francisco, CA
Gilman Avenue Streetscape Improvements
San Francisco, CA
California Pacific Medical Center Streetscapes
San Francisco, CA
Golf Club Road / Old Quarry Road Improvements
Pleasant Hill, CA
Contra Costa Boulevard Streetscape Design
Pleasant Hill, CA
Wilson Avenue Corridor Study + Detail Design
Vallejo, CA
Farmers Lane Extension
Santa Rosa, CA
Sacramento Street Improvements
Vallejo, CA
As a landscape designer and urban designer, Alana has led several mobility planning and design exercises which heavily focus on community based advocacy for pedestrian and cyclist safety and well-being. She has always had a keen interest in the urban realm and how interventions can be made to enhance the quality and comfort of any given space. Currently, she is working on a number of projects combining her interest in Complete Streets and urban revitalization. Alana received advanced degrees in Landscape Architecture from the University of Maryland, College Park and a Master’s degree in Urban Design from the University of California, Berkeley. She has gained a wide range of experience while working with firms ranging in project scope, scale, and geographic project location.

**EDUCATION**

- University of California, Berkeley, Master of Urban Design
- University of Maryland, College Park, Bachelor of Landscape Architecture
- South China University of Technology - Guangzhou, China, Study Abroad
- Institutio de Monteverde, Puntarenas Province, Monteverde, Costa Rica, Study Abroad
- Landon in Spain, Santander, Spain, Study Abroad

**AFFILIATIONS + AWARDS**

- University of California, Berkeley, Graduate Student Award, 2013-2014

**ENGAGEMENT**

- British Embassy, Washington DC, Research Intern, Sustainable Infrastructure, 2012
- University of California, Berkeley, Design Jury, Intro to Design, 2014
- University of California, Berkeley, Research Assistant, Urban Fabric, 2013-2014

**WORK EXPERIENCE**

- WRT - Landscape Designer, 2016 - Present
- PLAT Studio - Designer, 2015 - 2016
Robert Stevens, PE, LEED AP  
Senior Transportation Planner and Civil Engineer

Robert specializes in developing private and public infrastructure projects delivering more than $200 million in construction valuation over the last 10 years. Engaged throughout the life of the project, his experience ranges from conceptual design to detailed engineering culminating in final construction. Robert coordinates the design effort of the team, public agencies, community organizations, and private parties resulting in consensus based solutions delivered on schedule and budget. His relevant experience includes:

Complete and Green Streets
- Macdonald Avenue, Richmond: Four phases with a total construction valuation of $25 million, $11 million completed to date.
- Nevin Avenue, Richmond: Two phases complete with a total construction valuation of $10 million.
- Castro Valley Streetscape, Alameda County: Total construction value of $9 million.
- Miller Avenue Streetscape, Mill Valley: Total construction value of $15 million.
- Central Avenue, El Cerrito: Total construction value of $1.2 million.
- Contra Costa Boulevard, Pleasant Hill: Total construction value of $7 million.
- Hesperian Boulevard Streetscape, Alameda County: Total construction value of $30 million.
- East 14th Streetscape, Alameda County: Project Study Report and preparation of PSE at several key intersections.

Public Infrastructure
- Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, Marin County Phase 1: Responsible for the rehabilitation of 5.2 miles of roadway including sustainable construction strategies and improvements to storm water quality.
- Hampton Road, Grove Way, San Miguel, Santa Maria, and Boston Road, Alameda County: Responsible for the planning and detailed design to transform residential corridors into complete streets supporting pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use.
- Path to Transit, Hercules: Responsible for the planning, design, and implementation of new streets, bridge, utility systems, and restoration of Refugio Creek facilitating the development of a regional intermodal facility.
- Rule 20B Undergrounding: Coordinated the Rule 20B undergrounding of Hesperian, Stanley, and Lewelling Boulevards as well as Moraga Road, Highway 29, and Macdonald Avenue.
- Plaza and Del Norte BART Stations: Pedestrian and bicycle improvements as well as placemaking at two BART station in El Cerrito.
- Marin Avenue Bicycle Lanes, Albany: Planning and final engineering to construction Class II bicycle lanes with buffers and widened sidewalks.

Professional Highlights
- 20+ years of design experience
- 10+ years of construction management
- 5+ years of marine engineering
- Specialized experience with:
  - Design of traffic signal sand street lighting systems
  - Fiber optic network deployment
  - C3 and Green Design
  - Full Depth and Cold in Place Pavement Reclamation
  - Marine dredging

Education
- B.S. Civil Engineering, San Jose State University

Registration
- Professional Civil Engineer
  - California – No 59660
  - Arizona – No 64581
  - Oregon – No 92588PE
  - Nevada – No 24882

Affiliations
- LEED Accredited Professional
- US Green Building Council
- American Society of Civil Engineers
- American Public Works Association
DAVID PARISI, PE, TE
TRAFFIC ENGINEER / CIVIL ENGINEER

David Parisi manages a variety of challenging transportation projects throughout the West Coast. Mr. Parisi’s 30 years of experience include various aspects of transportation and environmental planning, and civil and traffic engineering. He spearheads multi-disciplinary transportation projects from inception through design and development. These projects include: environmental assessments in accordance with NEPA and CEQA; highway, railway, and multi-modal corridor studies; area-wide traffic circulation studies; rail transit projects; roadway and interchange feasibility analyses; access planning for pedestrians, bicyclists and people with disabilities; localized traffic impact evaluations; and transportation system improvements.

David Parisi specializes in developing Complete Street, transit and transit-oriented development, traffic calming and Vision Zero, and Safe Route to School projects. His relevant experience in these areas includes:

MULTIMODAL PLANNING & DESIGN
- Better Market Street Plan, San Francisco: Project manager
- Miller Avenue Plan, Mill Valley: Project manager
- Bridgeway Multimodal Project, Sausalito: Project manager
- 19th Avenue/Park Presidio Transportation Plan: Project manager
- Front Street (SR 22) Main Street Project, Salem: Traffic engineer
- Tacoma Main Street Project, Portland: Traffic engineer

TRANSIT PLANNING & DESIGN
- Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit, San Francisco, Project manager
- Cascade Station TOD, Portland: Project manager
- Third Street Light Rail Project, San Francisco: Transportation engineer
- Loma Rica Ranch TND, Grass Valley: Transportation engineer
- Portland-Vancouver High Capacity Transit: Transportation engineer
- AirMAX Light Rail Project, Portland: Transportation engineer

TRAFFIC CALMING & SAFETY
- Marin County Systemic Safety Analysis Report, Marin County: Project manager
- Traffic Calming Guidebook Development, Various Cities: Manager
- San Jose Schools Traffic Calming Program, San Jose: Project manager
- San Francisco Vision Zero Ramp Intersections Study, San Francisco: Principal-in-Charge
- Golden Gate Park Traffic Calming Plan, San Francisco: Manager
- Sacramento Vision Zero Citywide Project, Traffic engineer

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL
- Marin County SR2S Program, Marin County: Program manager
- Santa Barbara SR2S Project, Santa Barbara: Transportation engineer
- ITE School Safety Task Force, California: Committee chair
- Safe Routes to School Training Workshops, National: Project manager
- California Statewide Safe Routes to School Committee: Member
- Pasadena Suggested Routes to School Program: Project manager

PROFESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS
- Registered Civil Engineer and Traffic Engineer
- 30 years of experience
- Certified Walkable Community Workshop Trainer (Caltrans and Dept. of Health Services)
- National trainer in Traffic Calming and Safe Routes to Schools
- Developed National Safe Routes to School Training Course for FHWA and the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center (PBIC)
- Member of ITE, WTS and CNU
- Past president of 700-member Bay Area Section of Institute of Transportation Engineers

EDUCATION
- B.S. Civil Engineering, Colorado State University, 1985

PUBLICATIONS
- “Transportation Professionals Get Involved with Safe Routes to School”, ITE Journal, 2005
- “Transportation Tools to Improve Children’s Health and Mobility”, CA DHS, OTS and LGC, 2003
- “A Community-Driven Approach to Traffic Calming”, ITE 2001
- “What is ‘Trip Capacity’ and Why is it Important in Mixed Use Transit Oriented Development?”, Railvolution 2001
- “Prioritizing Multi-Modal Projects”, Pro Walk International Conference, 1996
Andrew Lee, PE, TE
TRAFFIC ENGINEER / CIVIL ENGINEER

Andrew Lee has 12 years’ experience with a variety of transportation projects throughout California. His work at Parisi encompasses a wide variety of project types and phases, spanning from initial transportation planning and conceptual design; to detailed traffic and civil designs, plans, specifications, and cost estimates (PS&E); and Caltrans permitting. Andrew specializes in developing innovative and creative designs for multimodal traffic, including Vision Zero projects, vehicular and bicycle roundabouts, one and two-way separated bikeways (cycletracks), multiuse paths, and ADA-retrofits to pedestrian facilities. As a transportation planner with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), he helped identify a staff-recommended alternative on the Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit project and three unique alternatives for the Better Market Street project. His boarder experience incudes non-motorized transportation planning, transit access studies, and traffic circulation studies.

Mr. Lee specializes in Complete Streets, transit and transit-oriented development, transportation element updates, travel demand modeling, and Safe Routes to School projects. His relevant experience in these areas includes:

MULTIMODAL PLANNING & DESIGN
- Central Marin Ferry Roundabout Design, Larkspur: Traffic engineer
- Tiburon Boulevard Bike Box Design, Tiburon: Traffic engineer
- Madera Blvd. Roundabout Design, Corte Madera: Traffic engineer
- Hearst Avenue Complete Street, Berkeley: Traffic engineer
- Woodside Road (SR 84) Complete Street Plan: Traffic engineer

MULTIMODAL SAFETY ANALYSIS
- San Francisco Vision Zero Ramp Intersections Study, San Francisco: Project manager
- Marin County Systemic Safety Analysis, Marin County: Traffic engineer
- Better Market Street, San Francisco: Transportation planner
- San Bruno Walk ‘n’ Bike Plan: Traffic engineer
- Napa Valley Vine Train Crossing Study, Napa County: Traffic engineer
- Bay Trail-Vine Trail Feasibility Study, Vallejo: Traffic engineer
- Transit and Transit-Oriented Development

TRAFFIC CALMING PLANNING & DESIGN
- San Mateo County SR25 Program (Half Moon Bay, Burlingame, Millbrae, San Carlos, South San Francisco): Transportation engineer
- Las Lomitas Elementary School Transportation Study, Atherton: Traffic engineer
- Marin County SR25 Program, Marin County: Traffic engineer

PROFESSIONAL HIGHLIGHTS
- Registered Civil Engineer and Traffic Engineer
- 12 years of experience
- California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) 2015 quarterly meeting presenter, “Experimental Treatment, SR 131-Blackfield Bike Boxes”
- California by Bike 2013 Conference Presenter, “SFMTA Bicycle Strategy”
- SF Bay ITE 2013 monthly meeting presenter, “Geary Bus Rapid Transit Project”
- SPUR SF 2012 presenter, “Geary Boulevard”

EDUCATION
- M.A. Urban Planning, UCLA, 2010
- B.S. Civil Engineering, Cal Poly SLO, 2002
- UC Berkeley Extension, Project Management, 2013

PUBLICATIONS
- “Commute Distance and Ethnic Neighborhoods”, TRB 201
Members of our team have collaborated on Complete Street projects for 15 years. This matrix is a snapshot of our collaborative and independent experience relevant to San Mateo Avenue. On the following pages you will find detailed descriptions of a selection of these projects.

**EXPERIENCE MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Streets</th>
<th>Community-Driven Process</th>
<th>Aging Infrastructure</th>
<th>Activation (i.e. Parklets, Pocket Parks)</th>
<th>Public Art</th>
<th>Sustainable Features</th>
<th>Project Visualization</th>
<th>Revitalization + Merchant Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Work completed by Robert Stevens before joining Parisi-CSW.
WRT and Parisi CSW assisted the town of Mill Valley to craft a “Complete Street” vision for Miller Avenue. A robust and engaging community process resulted in a plan that balances multi-modal access, improves ecological conditions for nearby streams, creates plazas and spaces for social activities, and reflects the unique character of this Marin County town. Community participation was fostered through online media such as a web page, email newsletters, and Facebook as well as traditional community meetings and focus group conversations. The plan provides schematic level design plans drawn in CAD to guide near term implementation. The expertise of WRT’s transportation consultants informed layouts with specific dimensional criteria to best proportion the various street functions. Regulation of parking in the retail main street and improving transit service were additional transportation points the plan addressed. Cost estimation and project phasing provided city leadership and public works the tools to plan appropriately for implementation.

WRT and Parisi CSW continued to assist Mill Valley with the implementation of the streetscape plan through completion.
WRT led a multi-disciplinary team to prepare Castro Valley’s Redevelopment Strategic Plan. The Plan aims to revitalize the Central Business District by (1) retrofitting the strip commercial development patterns that were established along the corridor when it was a State Highway, and (2) transforming the 1.7-mile Castro Valley Boulevard—a wide, automobile-dominated thoroughfare—into a safe and attractive retail main street, while still accommodating necessary traffic volumes.

The subsequent redesign of the Castro Valley Boulevard was the first step in implementing the Plan and jump-starting parallel initiatives to encourage new commercial uses, centralize public parking, and strengthen the district’s walkability and bikeability. WRT’s design for Castro Valley Boulevard combines pedestrian enhancements—such as street trees, bulb-outs and pedestrian-scaled lights—with highly-crafted public art elements. Travel and parking lane widths are sized to facilitate the safe flow of cars, while calming travel speeds and respecting other modes of travel. Bicycle lanes are well marked with colored asphalt to further highlight the non-vehicular roadway functions, and permeable paving and rain gardens are incorporated to capture and filter stormwater runoff.
The catalytic goals of the Plan’s streetscape improvements have been met with the opening of new businesses, a new library and park, and a public market development in the works.
Parisi CSW and WRT are collaborating with the City of San Rafael for their Third Street Complete Street Project. Third Street is a critical component of San Rafael's transportation network serving tens of thousands each day as they travel to work, school, recreation, and retail destinations. Marin County's busiest transit node, the Bettini Transit Center, brings nearly 9,000 people daily through Third Street as they use Golden Gate and Marin Transit services. As SMART continues to grow its system, it could bring thousands more to the corridor. Third Street is not only important to San Rafael, but serves regional need linking Highway 101 and West Marin communities.

The City has an allocation from the Transportation Authority of Marin through the Measure A program to rehabilitate Third Street. The City has hired a consultant team including Parisi Transportation Consulting to lead the Third Street study. The project includes holding a series of community meetings, technical working groups, and community working group meetings to better understand the stakeholder goals, review alternatives, and develop a preferred alternative for Third Street. The project will build on existing studies, community input, and city goals, congestion relief, safety enforcement, and complete street options for Third Street that assist stakeholders to understand and trade-offs of each resulting in the development of a preferred alternative for use in an environmental document and report to the city council.
WRT lead urban design and planning as part of the consultant team during completion of Albany’s Complete Streets Plan. The Caltrans Planning Grant funded project focused on developing implementable solutions to current safety, multi-modal, and community identity issues through an intensive community charrette process. Applying input garnered from this process, several design alternatives were developed to address multi-modal opportunities and to structure enhancements that support revitalization, and to illustrate the various cross-sections that could fit in bicycles, automobiles, and transit and how they would work on each section of the corridor.

Implementing first phase components of the Plan, the San Pablo Avenue / Buchanan Street project focuses on priority pedestrian and bicycle access along these thoroughfares and at critical crossing points. WRT is leading the design of the Gateway Gardens area, which enhances pedestrian connectivity between commercial areas, City Hall, neighborhoods and local schools. The design explores movement – of water, wildlife, the wind, and people – incorporating dynamic feature that express these elements. Creative use of forms, colorful elements and bridges make the experience of moving through the space enjoyable.
GATEWAY MONUMENTS, GATEWAY SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING SIGNAGE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

WRT has enjoyed working with the City of Pleasant Hill on a number of civic projects. As part of WRT’s ongoing engagement we were prepared a city wide study for Gateway Monuments, Gateway Signage, and Wayfinding Signage. WRT engaged directly with the community through numerous workshop and meetings. Together we explored various signage design options, and possible locations throughout the city. We concluded our study with a feasibility document and preferred option.

We went onto implement the Gateway and Wayfinding Signage portion of the work. WRT designed the sign to be transferable to most locations, so the city can continue to install gateways as they grow. Once the details were complete WRT constructed a full size mock up of gateway signage, which we field tested and photographed in all the preferred locations. There are currently nine installations completed at key locations into the city.

Wayfinding signage has also been installed per WRT documentation, and we have recently completed a Feasibility Document for the Gateway Monuments which will likely be installed at 680 off ramps and at the Monument Boulevard Underpass.

YEAR COMPLETED
Ongoing

KEY PERSONNEL
John Gibbs

CLIENT
Kelly Calhoun - Economic Development Manager
(925) 671-5213 / kcalhoun@pleasanthillca.org
Mario Moreno - City Engineer + Engineering Division Manager
(925) 671-5252 / mmoreno@pleasanthillca.org
City of Pleasant Hill
100 Gregory Lane
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
Willits is one of many small, charming cities in the forested Northern California county of Mendocino. Until 2016 it was bisected by US 101, one of the most heavily traveled roads in the area. It has long been both lifeblood – bringing summer tourists and conduit for the daily transport of goods statewide – and scourge – a source of massive congestion and safety concerns. As a State-owned and operated highway, it had been difficult to truly transform the City’s main artery into a thread that binds the community together. With the completion of a highway bypass in November 2016, this dynamic has changed: the City and its people can now guide Main Street’s future. Working with Caltrans in preparation for the opening of the bypass and the transfer of this 3-mile segment of road, the City hired WRT to lead the redesign of this now local thoroughfare – from state highway to the center of community life. Now unburdened of regional traffic and under the jurisdiction of the City, it was important to employ a robust community outreach effort to ensure that Main Street becomes exactly what the people of Willits need and want. The cornerstone of the process was a week-long community charrette anchored by a series of meetings with stakeholders, emergency responders and the public. Provided with a downtown store front as a base of operations, the consultant team drew inspiration from the historic downtown masonry buildings, stories from long-time residents, and the creeks coursing from the surrounding hills crossing Main Street at bridges. The Main Street Willits Corridor Plan – which addresses topics including traffic calming, pedestrian safety, street trees, and community gateways – was unanimously approved by City Council on December 6, 2016.
West Nevin Avenue linking Richmond’s Civic Center with the BART station is a key pedestrian and bicycle corridor. However, damaged pavement and sidewalks as well as conflicts with vehicles made biking and walking difficult. Members of our team completed preliminary engineering studies, NEPA/CEQA evaluation, final design, and E76 authorization through Local Assistance to completely reconstruct the corridor with wide sidewalks, new street lighting, and introduction of traffic calming elements to create a bicycle boulevard.

A key feature of the project includes the integration of green street features to improve the quality of storm water runoff. Elements integrated in to the project include rain gardens as well as pervious pavers and pavement. The City completed the $9 million project in early 2017.
STATE ROUTE 131 BIKE BOX PROJECT

TIBURON, CA | PARISI CSW

Parisi Transportation Consulting planned, designed and provided construction support for the first bike boxes on a State facility in Caltrans’ District 4. The Route 131 bike box project originated as part of Parisi’s involvement in the Town of Tiburon’s Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program. Route 131 presented a barrier to students crossing the State highway to and from school due to the heavy traffic volumes, high speeds and the lack of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Parisi developed a bike box design that reallocated roadway travel lanes, modified traffic signal phasing and timing, and revised pavement markings. Parisi presented the concept to the CTCDC for approval, and completed engineering designs and a before-and-after study. Today, hundreds of bicyclists use the facility each day.
Parisi Transportation Consulting lead the transportation design work on Hearst Avenue, a collector roadway bordering the UC Berkeley campus. Our signal and beacon work included improvements to four existing traffic signals, one new signal, and rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) at two intersections. The signal designs included adding bicycle and vehicle video detection, bicycle signals, accessible pedestrian signals (APS), pedestrian kick buttons, emergency vehicle preemption equipment, and signal interconnect.

Innovative design in the Hearst Avenue project included transit boarding islands with bicycle bypass lanes, parkingprotected bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, two-stage bike left turn boxes, permitted / protected signal phasing, partial roadway closures, and relocating crosswalks to avoid vehicle conflicts.

Parisi prepared the signal timing plan for the entire project corridor.
Parisi Transportation Consulting has been leading San Francisco’s Vision Zero Ramp Intersection Project, which involves developing recommendations to improve safety at intersections where highway ramps intersect city streets within the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood.

SoMa is one of San Francisco’s fastest-growing neighborhoods, and is programmed to receive almost 20,000 new residents and 50,000 new jobs by 2040. The neighborhood has a concentration of several schools, single room occupancy hotels, and senior centers, which attract populations at high risk of injury from traffic collisions.

Parisi is developing intersection improvement plans that include short-term recommendations such as signal timing or phasing changes, and striping or signage improvements, as well as longer-term measures such as lane reconfigurations, turning prohibitions, and geometric changes.
BELLE HAVEN NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC CALMING PLAN
MENLO PARK, CA | PARISI CSW

Parisi Transportation Consulting is developing a traffic calming plan for the Belle Haven neighborhood in Menlo Park. Parisi conducted comprehensive assessments of traffic volumes, vehicular travel speeds, and cut-through volumes based on license plate surveys. Parisi prepared easy-to-understand graphics to illustrate current conditions. Parisi facilitated community workshops to confirm the community’s concerns and to share initial alternative traffic calming strategies. Based on existing traffic conditions and community input, Parisi prepared a refined neighborhood traffic calming plan including speed humps, curb bulb-out extensions, pavement markings, radar speed feedback signs, and gateway treatments.

Parisi will be preparing engineering plans for the traffic calming measures and conducting an “after study” for presentation to the community.
6. REFERENCES

CASTRO VALLEY BOULEVARD COMPLETE STREET
(CASTRO VALLEY, CA)
Jaimie Orfanos
Manager
Alameda County Community Development Agency / Economic + Civic Development Department
224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 110
Hayward, CA 94544
(510) 670-6107 / jorfanos@co.alameda.ca.us

MILLER AVENUE STREETSCAPE PLAN + DESIGN
(MILL VALLEY, CA)
Danielle Staude
Senior Planner
City of Mill Valley
26 Corte Madera Avenue, Mill Valley, CA 94941
(415) 388-4033 X4812 / dstaude@cityofmillvalley.org

RIVERSIDE DRIVE + LANKERSHIM BOULEVARD COMPLETE STREETS
(TOLUCA LAKE - LOS ANGELES, CA)
Ryan Altoon
President + Planning & Land-Use Committee Chair
Greater Toluca Lake Neighborhood Council
10116 Riverside Drive, Suite 200A
Toluca Lake, CA 91602
(818) 755-7674 / raltoon@andersonpacificllc.com

MACDONAL AVENUE STREETSCAPES
(RICHMOND, CA)
Alan Wolken - Planning and Development Services
Municipal Resource Group
675 Hartz Avenue, Suite 300, Danville, CA 94526
(707) 410-6299 / awolken@municipalresourcegroup.com
(Formerly the City of Richmond’s Community Redevelopment Agency director.)
8. BUDGET + PERSONNEL BREAKDOWN

The following fee proposal is included for consideration. The WRT Team fee includes services as described in the Request for Proposals and as expanded on in our detailed Scope of Services. We aligned our scope to fit the project budget of $125,000 established by the City of San Bruno. The tasks we identified, and hours assigned to them, show that the desired scope can be accommodated within the target budget. If necessary, we will be happy to work with Staff to refine the services in order to better address your needs.
## Job Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Lee</td>
<td>240.00$</td>
<td>1,600.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Stevens</td>
<td>170.00$</td>
<td>1,190.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>105.00$</td>
<td>690.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Engineer</td>
<td>125.00$</td>
<td>875.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Level I</td>
<td>175.00$</td>
<td>1,525.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Level II</td>
<td>175.00$</td>
<td>1,525.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150.00$</td>
<td>1,125.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130.00$</td>
<td>1,010.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 1 Work Plan and Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.1 Work Plan, Communication Plan, Schedule</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,600.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 2 Meetings/Conference Calls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.1 Kick-off meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,520.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.2 Meetings with staff (51 total)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,880.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.3 Two community meetings - SEE BELOW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.4 Two stakeholder meetings - SEE BELOW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.5 Planning Commission Presentation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.6 City Council Presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 3 Analysis and Preliminary Feasibility Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.1 Review the existing City plans</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,800.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.2 Site Analysis, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,520.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.3 Determine CEQA compliance requirement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3.5 Preliminary Design Concepts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,300.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 4 CEQA Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.1 CEQA Compliance Document Recommendation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,400.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 5 Community Outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.1 Outreach Strategy and Collateral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,760.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.2 Community Survey (online and physical)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.3 Community Walk-shop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,520.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.4 Stakeholder Meeting 1 - preparation and attendance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,960.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.5 Stakeholder Meeting 2 - preparation and attendance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,585.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.6 Community Meeting 1 - preparation and attendance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,020.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5.7 Community Meeting 2 - preparation and attendance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,825.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 6 Streetscape Plan Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours by Task</th>
<th>Cost by Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 6.1 Draft Streetscape Plan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23,740.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6.2 Intermediate response document</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,760.00$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6.3 Final Streetscape Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,100.00$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Fee

- Total Fee: $125,000
NOTES
San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan
Scope of Work
as submitted December 20, 2018
WRT

The City's original scope language from the RFP is included below in grey italics and strikethrough.

**TASK 1: PREPARE DETAILED WORK PLAN AND STRATEGY**

The Consultant will prepare an elaborate work plan and include a detailed meeting and presentation schedule.

**Deliverables:** A robust work plan strategy and approach, including a proposed communication plan, and defined schedule that meets the timeline.

WRT will confirm this proposed scope of services with the City, and make any modifications agreed to by WRT and the City. WRT will prepare a detailed schedule, indicating the dates for the major milestones, including the stakeholder and community meetings, “walk-shop,” and Planning Commission and City Council meetings. WRT will confirm the duration of City-staff review periods and incorporate those into the schedule.

**TASK 2: MEETINGS / CONFERENCE CALL**

The Consultant will conduct the following meetings during the course of the project.

2.1 Kick-off meeting

2.2 Check-in and update meetings with staff
    (4 in-person meetings in San Bruno, and 6 conference calls)

2.3 Two stakeholder meetings

2.4 Two community meetings

2.5 Planning Commission Presentation (2)

2.6 City Council Presentation

**Deliverables:** The Consultant will schedule and attend all meetings, take meeting notes, submit meeting summaries, and provide presentations and supporting documents/attachments two weeks prior to the meeting. The Consultant will also be responsible to submit monthly invoices.

**TASK 3: PRELIMINARY FEASIBILITY STUDY AND ANALYSIS**

(a) The Consultant will review the existing City plans to lay a foundation for future recommendations. The Consultant will prepare a scaled base map of the San Mateo Avenue study area, depicting the public right of way and approximate building footprints. The Consultant will analyze and document San Mateo Avenue’s assets, opportunity sites, existing streetscape features and map them.

(b) At this stage the consultant will also determine the requirement of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compliance document.
Deliverables:

Downtown San Bruno base map
A detailed documentation of existing conditions that can serve as a chapter in the final report
Determination of CEQA document

3.1 DATA COLLECTION AND FIELD REVIEW

Our team will collect information and perform a field review along San Mateo Avenue from El Camino Real to Huntington Avenue to understand basic conditions along the corridor. The team will collect and review the following documents:

- Pavement Condition Data from Streetsaver
- Sanitary sewer and storm drainage
- City and public utility as-built data
- Traffic volume, speed, and collision data

3.2 EXISTING CONDITIONS MAPPING

Our team will prepare a base map of the corridor using the City and County aerial photogrammetry. We will include boundary and utility information using record data.

3.3 SITE ANALYSIS

3.3.1 Site Reconnaissance

The team will visit the site to assess conditions including:

INFRASTRUCTURE INVENTORY:
- Pavement condition including the location, type, and severity of distress
- Conditions of the concrete sidewalks including compliance with accessibility code (CBC) at typical locations including mid-block and at street crossings
- Conditions of accessibility between the public rights of way and private properties at typical locations
- Inventory of regulatory street signs
- A photometric assessment collecting existing light level readings for conformance to typical roadway lighting standards for bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles.

We will review conditions that impact bicycle and pedestrian safety including limited sight distance and utility appurtenances that present hazards.

Inventory of traffic signal hardware including pedestrian push buttons.

STREET CHARACTER, LANDSCAPE AND FURNISHINGS INVENTORY:

- Pavement types
- Hardscape elements (planters, seatwalls, etc.)
- Street furnishings
- Directional signage
- Planting
- Building character and uses
3.3.2 Hydrology Assessment

The team will assess the hydrology of the corridor to determine if modifications to the drainage system are necessary to prevent flooding as well as to determine if street modifications will obstruct drainage. In coordination with City staff, we will review known issues with the storm drain collection system.

3.3.3 Utility Assessment

The team will meet with the City’s water and sanitary sewer department as well as PG&E and AT&T to understand the conditions and capacity of their utility infrastructure.

3.3.4 Opportunities & Constraints Analysis

WRT will develop an Opportunities and Constraints diagram and narrative indicating areas for potential improvements and physical constraints. The diagram will indicate potential locations for seating and gathering areas, outdoor dining, parklets, stormwater-management planting areas, street trees, bus stops with shelters, and other improvements. As described in the RFP, the team will also assess the potential for diagonal on-street parking.

3.4 DETERMINATION OF CEQA DOCUMENTATION

The Transit Corridors Plan completed a program-level EIR that illustrates relevant environmental resources along San Mateo Avenue. With completion of the concept plan for the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape plan, the CEQA approach could be to file an addendum to the certified document as the proposed project would likely be similar. However, the proposed improvements should fall within the classes of projects as defined in the Public Resources Code, which have been determined not to have a significant effect on the environment and are thus exempt from CEQA. As this project will likely make modifications to existing infrastructure but make negligible or no expansion of the existing use, it should qualify for a Categorical Exemption under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15301 applies to minor alterations of existing infrastructure within the public’s right-of-way. As the lead agency, the City of San Bruno can further support the finding by imposing standard conditions of approval on the project. For example, if any trees must be removed, it will be important that compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act be required and that surveys be completed to ensure that nesting birds would not be harmed during tree removal. Also, the City can impose a standard condition regarding the potential inadvertent discovery of unknown archaeological resources during project construction. Our team will provide a recommendation to comply with CEQA in coordination with the City’s planning department.

3.5 PRELIMINARY DESIGN CONCEPTS

For presentation at the first stakeholder and community meetings, WRT will develop an exhibit of drawings and precedent images illustrating potential design concepts for stakeholder and community feedback. These would be prototypical concepts that could be applied at different locations along the corridor, i.e., a “menu” of conceptual improvements. These would include such elements as mini-plazas at bulb-outs, stormwater-treatment planting areas, parklets, crosswalk treatments, furnishings and light fixtures.
TASK 4: CEQA DOCUMENTATION

The Consultant will determine and prepare a CEQA compliance document. This will comprise of preparation of relevant environmental document for example a negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration, to address the environmental impacts associated with the preferred streetscape design alternative selected by the Agency/City.

Deliverable:
One hard copy and one electronic file (.pdf format) of both the draft and final CEQA document

As described under Task 3.4, Determination of CEQA Documentation, above, our team will provide a recommendation to comply with CEQA in coordination with the City’s planning department.

Deliverable:
CEQA documentation recommendation memorandum.

TASK 5: COMMUNITY OUTREACH

The Consultant will prepare an outreach strategy with inputs from the City. The Consultant will prepare and provide supporting outreach materials for communication with the City-identified stakeholders. A genuine effort should be made to garner community participation to achieve a consensus and feedback around the project. The Consultant will develop input-gathering worksheet for outreach events, community surveys (online and/or physical), and community walk shops as part of their community outreach strategy. The stakeholders could be but not limited to:

San Mateo Avenue Business owners
San Bruno Chamber of Commerce
San Bruno Community Foundation

Deliverable:
Two community meetings
   (one pop-up event and one traditional presentation)
Survey
Walk-shop
Three stakeholder meetings
Storefront displays (2)
Three presentations - Two presentation updates at the Planning Commission and one at the City Council.

5.1 OUTREACH STRATEGY AND COLLATERAL

WRT will confirm the below proposed outreach strategy with City staff, make necessary refinements and decisions, and schedule the outreach activities. To give the outreach a recognizable identity, WRT will develop a graphic standard for the project’s outreach materials, such as a consistent header and footer, logo placement, and typeface selection. WRT and City staff will determine the appropriate types of notifications. We assume that the City will be responsible for distributing and posting meeting notifications. WRT will also prepare a storefront display to publicize the project and announce upcoming engagement opportunities.
5.2 COMMUNITY SURVEY (ONLINE AND PHYSICAL)

WRT will develop a survey, to be administered both online (via Survey Monkey) and in person at the “walk-shop” and community meeting pop-up event. WRT will tally survey responses and provide a survey-results memorandum.

5.3 COMMUNITY AND STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

WRT will hold two stakeholder meetings, two community meetings, a “walk-shop,” an on-line and in-person survey, and one Planning Commission presentation and one City Council presentation in the following sequence:

5.4 WALK-SHOP: A DIALOG ABOUT THE STREET AND ITS POTENTIAL

WRT will conduct a “walk-shop” with stakeholders and interested members of the community. WRT will listen to participant’s impressions and concerns about the existing conditions of the streetscape, as well as what they see as successful. This will also be an opportunity for WRT to describe potential improvements.

5.5 STAKEHOLDER MEETING #1: LISTENING TO STAKEHOLDERS

WRT will meeting with community-organization representatives, property owners, business owners, and other stakeholders to present the consultant team’s existing-conditions inventory and analysis and to listen to the stakeholders about their needs, hopes, concerns, and opinions about San Mateo Avenue.

5.6 COMMUNITY MEETING #1: GENERAL INPUT AND RESPONSES TO PRELIMINARY CONCEPTS

At the first community meeting, WRT will briefly present its understanding of existing conditions and will present the Preliminary Concepts (see Task 2). The community participants will be asked to give feedback on the existing conditions and the preliminary concepts, and will also have an opportunity to provide input on potential themes for signage and public art and custom elements. Feedback tools may include comment cards, “dots” exercises on graphics (to assess preferences), and Post-it note comments on a large existing conditions map/aerial photograph.

This community meeting will as a “pop-up” event on the site, possibly at the plaza adjacent to the Citibank building. We have found the on-site “pop-up” option to be a great way to gather input from those who are unlikely to attend an evening meeting, and capture a wider range of users of a site, including ages, ethnicities and socio-economic demographics.

Prior to the community meeting, WRT will use temporary methods to mock-up specific potential improvements. The mock-ups might include changes to the curb alignment to provide space for public use or additional planting area or adding furniture and potted plants to certain bulb-out areas, or a “parklet” in a parking space, similar to a “Park(ing) Day” installation. We have found that this type of prototyping is an invaluable way to describe potential changes to the streetscape.

5.7 STAKEHOLDER MEETING #2: DRAFT STREETSCAPE PLAN

Based on City staff, stakeholder and community input to date, WRT will prepare the graphic components, and preliminary text such as project goals, of the Draft Streetscape Plan. WRT will present the Draft Streetscape Plan graphics and preliminary text at the second stakeholder meeting. The plan will be illustrated through easily
legible illustrative graphics, including a rendered plan, sections, and perspective views generated from a 3-D digital model. Precedent images and materials and furnishings cut-sheets will illustrate paving, hardscape, furnishings and plant materials. The stakeholders will give general feedback, which will be recorded by WRT. Because stakeholder feedback, and ultimately buy-in, is so critical to success, we propose conducting this stakeholder input over the course of one-half day, with timeslots provided to accommodate stakeholders with different schedules.

5.8 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS: STUDY SESSION AND DRAFT STREETSCAPE PLAN / STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

WRT will present early concepts along with stakeholder and community input to the Commission in a study session format. The second update will present the Preliminary Draft Streetscape Plan.

5.9 COMMUNITY MEETING #2: STREETSCAPE PLAN

After revising the Draft Streetscape Plan based on input from City staff, planning commission, and stakeholders, WRT will present the Streetscape Plan to the community during a formal presentation. As with the second stakeholder meeting, the presentation will be primarily graphic in nature, with easily legible illustrative graphics including a rendered plan, sections and perspective views generated from a 3-D model. WRT will present photographs of the proposed furnishings and materials; and concept renderings of the signage types, with enough detail to convey the signage theme, colors and materials, typography, and typical content.

Associated with Community Meeting #2, WRT will prepare a storefront display that can be posted at a to-be-determined storefront on San Mateo Avenue.

5.10 CITY COUNCIL MEETING: STREETSCAPE PLAN

WRT will present the Streetscape Plan to City Council, and report on the stakeholder and community process.

TASK 6: DOWNTOWN SAN BRUNO STREETSCAPE PLAN PREPARATION

The consultant team will prepare a conceptual San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan that incorporates the following elements:

Illustrative Plan, Sections and Perspective Views

WRT will prepare an illustrative plan that includes the entire study area. The plan will be drafted in AutoCAD and computer-rendered for legibility. The plan will be to scale, with key dimensions indicated. WRT will also prepare cross-sections at typical locations, indicating the dimensions of the roadway, curb-extensions, planting areas, sidewalk, etc. WRT will prepare perspective views using 3-D modelling software. Aerial perspectives will show overall improvements, while eye-level views will illustrate the design from a person’s point of view.

Enlargement Plans (Bulb out and Sidewalk Design, Paving style, Open space, Plaza)

WRT will prepare schematic enlargement plans for typical areas indicating typical dimensions, layout of furniture, paving patterns and materials, and planting details such as tree grate sizes and configurations and recommendations for suspended pavement or structural soil. WRT will also prepare conceptual enlargement plans for unique locations such as the proposed reconfigured intersection at San Mateo Avenue and El Camino Real, bus stops, and smaller pocket-parks and parklets that may be part of the plan.
Planting Design

The Streetscape Plan will propose specific tree species and include photographs of the species in the plan document. The planting plan will indicate the locations of each species.

Street Furnishings and Amenities

WRT will include photographs and drawings of the proposed family of street furnishings and site amenities.

Street Lighting

WRT will include specific street-light fixture recommendations. Fixture spacing will be based on general industry guidelines. Photometric analysis and specifications for lamp wattages and optics will not be included.

Wayfinding Plan and Signage Concept Design

WRT will prepare a wayfinding plan focusing on the San Mateo Avenue corridor and indicating locations for signs and gateway elements off of the corridor but directing traffic to the corridor. The plan will indicate sign and gateway monument types and general content. Off-street parking signage will be incorporated as well as directional signage to key locations, and gateways/monuments that enhance the downtown’s character. WRT will develop schematic-level signage design, including the graphic theme, color selection, typeface, and types of installation. WRT will develop three larger gateway features to a schematic-design level.

Parking and Curbside Management Plan

The team will draw on the existing conditions assessment and recommendations resulting from the Downtown Parking Management Plan to develop compatible streetscape treatments and strategies for San Mateo Avenue. Our recommendations may include demarcating some general curbside parking into extended loading zones (for businesses with heavy deliveries) and short-term loading zones (for FedEx/UPS/Amazon and ride sharing companies); conversion of general parking into bicycle parking (bike corrals) and parklets. Treatments and strategies would be developed as part of a toolkit or prototypical block for consideration by the businesses on each block. Strategies to mitigate the loss of curbside parking will draw from the recommendations of the Downtown Parking Management Plan.

Traffic Engineering Design

The team will develop conceptual plans for one prototypical block including one typical intersection and one transit stop. The prototypical block design will include illustrative designs to calm traffic, emphasize non-motorized modes, and convey wayfinding and parking information. Streetscape treatments may include colored pavement, lane markings and signs.

The team will also develop concept plans for San Mateo Avenue’s intersections with El Camino Real and Huntington Avenue. These designs will consider realigning the intersection geometry, modifying traffic control (signals and signs), providing a gateway treatment into the Downtown.

Utilities Plans / Recommendations

Based on its hydrology assessment, the consultant team will provide recommendations to both locate and size green infrastructure components such as pervious pavements and raingardens consistent with San Mateo County’s Provision C.3. Based on information provided by the City and utilities, the team will determine near term infrastructure improvements that will require rehabilitation as well as understanding capacity issues that must be addressed to support development that may occur along the corridor.

Cost Estimate

The consultant team will develop a cost analysis to complete design and construction of the proposed improvements. This will also include public utility fees that may be necessary to support the modifications.
Programming Recommendations

The Streetscape Plan may incorporate programming recommendations based on conversations with City staff and stakeholders, such as street fairs, farmers’ markets, and events and programs that could take place in the plazas and small parks along the corridor.

Submittals

The consultant team will present the draft and final graphic illustrative plan, sections, perspective views, precedent images and materials and furnishings images at stakeholder, community, Planning Commission and City Council meetings as described under Task 5, Community Outreach, above. Following those presentations, WRT will compile the graphics and narrative into the Streetscape Plan and provide the following submittals.

6.1 DRAFT STREETSCAPE PLAN

The consultant team will provide one draft Streetscape Plan, including the above graphics and narrative, to City staff for review and comment.

6.2 INTERMEDIATE RESPONSE DOCUMENT

City staff will compile the comments into a spreadsheet or table-format response document, which the consultant team will use to provide initial responses and clarify comments.

6.3 FINAL STREETSCAPE PLAN

After the comments and responses are reviewed by City staff, the consultant team will finalize the San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan document.

Deliverables:

Draft San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan
Intermediate response document
Final Conceptual* San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan
## Analysis and Preliminary Feasibility Study

### CEQA Documentation

### Community Outreach

### Meetings/Conference Calls

### Work Plan and Strategy

### Sub-Total

### Total Fee

### Total

### Sub-Total - Labor

### Sub-Total - Reimbursables (Travel / Printing)

### Total 35,685$

### 125,000$
## San Mateo Avenue Streetscape Plan
### Project Schedule 12/20/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task 1</th>
<th>Task 1.1</th>
<th>Work Plan and Strategy</th>
<th>Work Plan, Communication Plan, Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>Task 2.1</td>
<td>Meeting/Conference Calls</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2.2</td>
<td>Meetings with staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2.3</td>
<td>Two community meetings - SEE BELOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2.4</td>
<td>Two stakeholder meetings - SEE BELOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2.5</td>
<td>Planning Commission Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 2.6</td>
<td>City Council Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>Task 3.1</td>
<td>Analysis and Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Review the existing City plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3.2</td>
<td>Base Map</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3.3</td>
<td>Site Analysis, Opportunities &amp; Constraints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3.4</td>
<td>Determine CEQA compliance requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 3.5</td>
<td>Preliminary Design Concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4</td>
<td>Task 4.1</td>
<td>CEQA Documentation</td>
<td>CEQA Compliance Document Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5</td>
<td>Task 5.1</td>
<td>Community Outreach</td>
<td>Outreach Strategy and Collateral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5.2</td>
<td>Community Survey (online and physical)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5.3</td>
<td>Community Walk-shop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5.4</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5.5</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting 2 – five timeslots during one day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5.6</td>
<td>Community Meeting 1 - preparation and pop-up event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 5.7</td>
<td>Community Meeting 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6</td>
<td>Task 6.1</td>
<td>Streetscape Plan Preparation</td>
<td>Draft Streetscape Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 6.2</td>
<td>Intermediate response document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task 6.3</td>
<td>Final Streetscape Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Meetings
- Staff Meeting
- Community Meeting
- Stakeholder Meeting
- City Council / Planning Commission Meeting