

885 The Alameda
San Jose, CA 95126-3102
Telephone 408-288-5515
Facsimile 408-288-8114

April 19, 2022
2021097

Mr. Robert Hahn, PE
City of South San Francisco
315 Maple Ave.
South San Francisco, CA 94080
Cc: Mr. Matthew Ruble, PE

Subject: City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA

Additional Service Request (ASR) No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

Dear Bob:

This additional service request proposal is to include the additional scope required to incorporate a Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation and associated additional permit coordination anticipated for the Utah Ave in-water work.

I. ASR No. 3 - BACKGROUND AND UNDERSTANDING

In the original contract, it was assumed that a Biological Assessment and Section 7 Consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or the National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) would not be required because impacts on these species (if present) would be avoided or minimized to obtain a “No Effect” determination. However, as a result of the biological investigations conducted to date in support of the NESMI, additional effort and documentation related to biological investigations is required to support NEPA approval and permitting for the project.

In order to provide the most economical approach to delivery of the maintenance activities, the environmental consultant would complete environmental documentation and permitting for all nine bridge sites under one Federal Project Number and one set of environmental documents and permits. If the City elects to separate out the bridge sites into one or more sets of projects in order to deliver some of the maintenance actions sooner than others, then we would provide the associated environmental services under a revised scope of work and budget.

Based on this, we are requesting an amendment to the current contract to incorporate these additional services, as described further below.

II. ASR No. 3 - SCOPE OF WORK

TASK 3 – ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES AND DOCUMENTATION

Project Management

The contract scope of work for project management was anticipated to be five months for the NEPA phase and 14 months for the environmental permitting phase. Project kick-off began in April 2021 and NEPA coordination has been ongoing. The environmental permitting phase has not been initiated. Due to the extension of the project schedule for the NEPA phase, to date, we have provided 12 months of project management and is expecting 10 additional months to complete the NEPA phase. As a result,

City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
Additional Service Request No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
Page 2 of 8

we are requesting additional budget to accommodate additional time required to complete these continued activities. The project management effort for ASR No. 3 is included in the following subtasks.

Deliverables: 10 additional months of Project Management for the NEPA phase

Task 3.2: NEPA Approval

Updated Preliminary Environment Study Form

The environmental consultant has begun preparation of an updated PES form to address all nine bridge maintenance locations included in the City's BPMP (i.e., six original bridges and three new bridges). Following project-level analysis during the preparation of the NES(MI), the project at Utah Avenue (Bridge #35C0101) was determined to potentially have unavoidable impacts on the federal threatened southern green sturgeon and southern green sturgeon designated critical habitat and Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act will be required. Because of this, additional efforts are required to incorporate Section 7 resources within the PES. The consultant will provide updated responses to the questions on the PES form to address Section 7 resources.

Deliverables: One electronic copy of the PES form.

NEPA Categorical Exclusion (Optional Task)

Following project-level analysis during the preparation of the NES(MI), Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act will be required. Because of this change, greater efforts will be required to obtain a CE determination and signed CE form from Caltrans. In addition, because Section 7 resources are within the project, more effort will be required to complete the Environmental Commitments Record (ECR), which would be provided to Caltrans.

Deliverable: One electronic copy of the Environmental Commitments Record, NEPA CE Determination, Signed NEPA CE Form.

Task 3.3: Biological Resources: Natural Environment Study [Minimal Impacts]

Based on the Caltrans PES and preliminary research, we understood that there was potential for USFWS federal listed species, such as the federally threatened California red-legged frog and the federal and state endangered California Ridgway's rail, to be present in the project vicinity; however, based on the project action, assumed any impacts on these species (if present) would be avoided or minimized to obtain a "No Effect" determination. Further, we did not expect any species under the jurisdiction of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to have potential to be within the BSA.

Following project-level surveys and thorough technical analysis during the preparation of the NES(MI), the project at Utah Avenue (Bridge #35C0101) was determined to potentially have unavoidable impacts on the federal threatened southern green sturgeon, southern green sturgeon designated critical habitat, and the federal candidate/state threatened longfin smelt. Because of this, additional efforts for species analysis, development team coordination, and documentation are required to address this species in the NES(MI) beyond what was scoped. This amendment is requested to recapture efforts conducted to date and to complete Caltrans approval of the NES(MI).



City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
Additional Service Request No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
Page 3 of 8

Deliverable: Inclusion of evaluation of southern green sturgeon, longfin smelt, and southern green sturgeon critical habitat in the NES(MI).

Task 3.12: Additional Permitting Coordination for Utah @ Colma Creek

Additional services will be performed for Task 3.12: CDFW 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement / RWQCB 401 Permit / ACOE 401 Permit of the Environmental Studies Documentation / Permits (PE Funding Phase) of the SSF BPMP Project. Because of the required in-creek construction and special status species identified at the Utah Avenue (Bridge #35C0101) site, it is anticipated that the regulatory agencies will require a thorough accounting of all anticipated construction activities within their jurisdictions including a systematic sequencing of construction activities for both temporary and permanent construction elements, comprehensive list of required construction equipment, and development of detailed quantities breakdown to specify volume, and dimensions of all materials and features (e.g., creek earthwork, bridge pier and/or abutment concrete repair, temporary dewatering and stream diversion, rip rap fields, etc.) that will be used or installed within each of the regulatory agencies' jurisdiction. To facilitate this additional permitting coordination, the effort also includes the development of all additionally required permit exhibits (construction overview and sequencing plan, dewatering and/or stream diversion plan, fish relocation plan, list of construction equipment, breakdown of quantities, etc.) to provide a comprehensive description along with a visual representation and illustration of the proposed construction activities (equipment staging, work access, material stockpile areas, limits of grading (cut and fill), RSP, drainage outfall structures, piers, abutments and/or foundations, water diversions, work trestles, vegetation removal, etc.) to allow each of the regulatory agencies to determine the associated permit mitigation measures within their jurisdictions and issue permits for the project.

Deliverables: One electronic copy of additionally required permit exhibits

Task 3.13: National Marine Fisheries Service Section 7 Consultation

Federal Endangered Species Act Consultation:

Under the FESA, if the project may affect a National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) threatened or endangered species, designated critical habitat, or Essential Fish Habitat under the Magnusson Stevens Act, Section 7 consultation with NMFS is required. Based on project analysis during the preparation of the NES(MI), the project at Utah Avenue (Bridge #35C0101) may have effects on federally threatened southern green sturgeon and designated critical habitat for this species. Caltrans during their review of the NES(MI), requested a Biological Assessment be prepared for the project. This effort was not included in our contract scope of work and budget; therefore, this amendment to perform this additional work is required at this time.

The environmental consultant will prepare the Section 7 consultation initiation package, including a Biological Assessment for the project. We will coordinate with the City and Caltrans for review and submittal of the Section 7 consultation initiation package to NMFS. If requested, the environmental consultant's biologist will attend up to four internal phone meetings or NMFS coordination phone meetings held as part of the consultation process. It is assumed that additional field visits and/or

City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
Additional Service Request No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
Page 4 of 8

coordination meetings with federal agency representatives will not be required to support completion of Section 7 consultation.

We will provide support to the City to streamline the FESA consultation process, including preparation of up to one supplemental information request from Caltrans or NMFS. We will also provide technical assistance to the City to refine impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, as required by NMFS to reduce project impacts on NMFS FESA species, critical habitat, and or Essential Fish Habitat to the maximum extent feasible.

Deliverables: One electronic copy of the NMFS Biological Assessment

Task 3.14: Incidental Take Permit (Optional)

Following project-level surveys and technical analysis during the preparation of the NES(MI), the project at Utah Avenue (Bridge #35C0101) may have take of the state threatened longfin smelt. Under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA), if the project may result in the ‘take’ of a state threatened, endangered, or candidate species, consultation with the CDFW is required.

If requested, we will prepare an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) application and will coordinate with the City for review and submittal of the ITP application to CDFW. If requested, the environmental consultant’s biologist will attend up to four internal phone meetings or CDFW coordination phone meetings held as part of the consultation process. We will provide support to the City to streamline the CESA consultation processes, including preparation of up to one supplemental information request by CDFW. We will also provide technical assistance to the City to refine impact avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures, as required by CDFW to reduce project impacts and potential for take of CESA species to the maximum extent feasible. It is assumed that the surveys and technical reports prepared for the project (NES[MI] and Aquatic Resource Delineation) will be sufficient to support CDFW’s issuance of an ITP.

Deliverables: One electronic copy of the CESA consultation package.

ASSUMPTIONS

This scope has been prepared based on the following assumptions:

General

- *All deliverables would be provided in electronic format (PDF or similar), and no hard copies would be required.*
- *The SOW assumes that the consultant would complete NEPA documentation and permitting for all nine bridge sites under one Federal Project Number and set of environmental documents and permits. If the City elects to separate out the bridge sites into one or more sets of projects in order to deliver some of the maintenance actions sooner than others, then the consultant would provide the associated environmental services under a revised scope of work and budget.*
- *The environmental consultant assumes 65% plans will be provided to complete the regulatory permitting with the RWQCB, USACE, and CDFW. Plans would include all work and/or features that may encroach, for any amount of time, within the jurisdictional areas.*
- *The environmental consultant assumes the project design team will provide the necessary design information to complete the regulatory permitting with the RWQCB, CDFW, and USACE. The limits of all temporary and permanent*



City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
Additional Service Request No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
Page 5 of 8

disturbances within the RWQCB, CDFW and USACE will be provided, including, but not limited to: equipment staging, work access, material stockpile areas, limits of grading (cut and fill), RSP, drainage outfall structures, piers, abutments and/ or foundations, water diversions, work trestles (or similar), vegetation removal, etc. The project design team would provide general construction sequence descriptions of all activities that will be performed for each construction activity, including equipment usage to perform the required actions, within jurisdictional areas. Jurisdictional areas are expected to include the bed, channel, bank, and floodplain of a waterway and any associated wetland features. All materials, structures, and/ or features that will temporarily or permanently encroach and impact environmental agencies jurisdiction will be identified and quantified (volumes, dimensions, linear feet). Approximate quantities and/ or range thresholds are expected to be adequate to meet the regulatory requirements. Materials may include, but are not limited to: concrete/ reinforced concrete, asphalt, RSP, earthen fill, gravel, steel, piles, drilling mud, materials to construct water diversion, etc.

- *Up to three rounds of comments are anticipated, one from the design team, one from the City, and one from Caltrans, on each deliverable. If responses to additional comments are requested, the consultant will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*
- *Protocol-level surveys for special-status species, if required, are not included in this scope of work. It is anticipated that potential for special-status plants and wildlife species can be inferred based on the surveys originally scoped for the project. If protocol surveys are requested, the consultant will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*

Project Management

- *A maximum of 10 additional months of Project Management will be required for the NEPA phase*

NEPA

- *Requirement of a Biological Opinion is assumed to not affect the level of NEPA documentation. A CE will continue to be the appropriate level of NEPA documentation. If during project development or completion of environmental investigations, is it identified that the project would not qualify for a CE, an additional scope of work and budget will be provided to support a higher-level of documentation.*

NES(MI)

- *No additional field visits are anticipated to be necessary for completion NES(MI).*

National Marine Fisheries Service Section 7 Consultation:

- *Based on the technical analysis prepared to date, potential effects on southern green sturgeon and southern green sturgeon designated critical habitat is assumed to be limited to Colma Creek Bridge at Utah Avenue.*
- *This scope of work includes consultation with NMFS for southern green sturgeon and southern green sturgeon designated critical habitat. If additional species and/ or consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is required, GPA will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*
- *It is assumed that additional field visits with agency representatives will not be required to support completion of Section 7 consultation. If additional field visits or coordination meetings are required, GPA will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*

City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
Additional Service Request No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
Page 6 of 8

- *It is assumed the federal candidate longfin smelt will not be elevated beyond a candidate species and will not require coverage under Section 7 of the Federal Endangered Species Act.*

Incidental Take Permit:

- *Based on the technical analysis prepared to date, potential take of longfin smelt is assumed to be limited to Colma Creek Bridge at Utah Avenue. Therefore, this scope of work includes one incidental take permit to authorize the impacts on longfin smelt associated with Colma Creek Bridge at Utah Avenue. If permitting is requested or required to authorize work at additional bridge locations and/ or within additional aquatic features, the consultant will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*
- *This scope of work includes consultation with CDFW for longfin smelt. If consultation for additional species is required, the consultant will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*
- *All fees and/ or compensatory mitigation associated with the incidental take permit will be paid by the City.*
- *It is assumed that additional field visits with agency representatives will not be required to support completion CESA consultation. If additional field visits or coordination meetings are required, the consultant will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*
- *It is assumed that the technical reports and environmental documents prepared for the project (NES[MI] and Aquatic Resources Delineation Report) will be sufficient to support CDFW's issuance of an ITP for the project. If additional biological investigations would be required to support an ITP, the consultant will provide an additional scope of work and budget to support this effort.*

III. ASR No. 3 – FEE BREAKDOWN

The additional services requested for this Task Order includes the following subtask effort and hourly estimated breakdown (see Attachment 1 – Additional Services Request No.3_Fee Breakdown).

Task 3: ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES DOCUMENTATION / PERMITS

- Subtask 3.2: NEPA Approval: Updated PES, Field Review Meeting, NEPA CE Support
 - 3.2.4: Update PES Form [ASR 3]
 - 3.2.5: NEPA CE Support (OPTIONAL) [ASR 3]
- Subtask 3.3: Natural Environment Study/Minimal Impact (NESMI) & Wetland Delineation and Assessment
 - 3.3.3 Biological Resources NES (MI) Report [ASR 3]
- Subtask 3.12: CDFW 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement / RWQCB 401 Permit / ACOE 401 Permit
 - 3.12.2 Additional Permitting for Utah Ave @ Colma Creek [ASR 3]
- Subtask 3.13: National Marine Fisheries Service Section 7 Consultation [ASR 3]
- Subtask 3.14: Incidental Take Permit (Optional) [ASR 3]

Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc. is therefore submitting herein our fee proposal for additional services to incorporate a Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation and associated additional permit coordination anticipated for the Utah Ave in-water work as follows.



City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
 Additional Service Request No. 03
 Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
 Page 7 of 8

Local Assistance Procedures Manual

EXHIBIT 10-H1
Cost Proposal

EXHIBIT 10-H1 COST PROPOSAL Page 1 of 3

ACTUAL COST-PLUS-FIXED FEE OR LUMP SUM (FIRM FIXED PRICE) CONTRACTS

(DESIGN, ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES)

Note: Mark-ups are Not Allowed

Consultant **Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc.**

Project No. **12508-2020**

Contract No. **SSF ST1703 - ASR No. 3**

Subconsultant

2nd Tier Subconsultant

Date **4/19/2022**

DIRECT LABOR

Classification/Title	Name	hours	Actual Hourly Rate	Total
Principal	Ron Oen*	26	\$110.00	\$2,860.00
Associate	various		\$90.00	\$0.00
Engineering Manager	various		\$74.00	\$0.00
Senior Engineer	various		\$64.00	\$0.00
Project Engineer	various	80	\$55.00	\$4,400.00
Staff Engineer	various		\$48.00	\$0.00
Assistant Engineer	various		\$42.00	\$0.00
Junior Engineer	various		\$37.00	\$0.00
Senior Computer Drafter	various	24	\$50.00	\$1,200.00
Computer Drafter	various		\$30.00	\$0.00
Administrative Services	various	10	\$40.00	\$400.00

LABOR COSTS

a) Subtotal Direct Labor Costs

\$8,860.00

b) Anticipated Salary Increases (see page 2 for sample)

\$443.00

c) TOTAL DIRECT LABOR COSTS [(a) + (b)] **\$9,303.00**

INDIRECT COSTS

d) Fringe Benefits (Rate: **28.34%**)

e) Total Fringe Benefits

[(c) x (d)] **\$2,636.47**

Overhead

g) Overhead [(c) x (f)] **\$0.00**

h) General and Administrative

i) Gen & Admin [(c) x (h)] **\$13,004.66**

j) Total Indirect Costs [(e) + (g) + (i)] **\$15,641.13**

FIXED FEE

q) (Rate: **10.00%**)

k) TOTAL FIXED PROFIT [(c) + (j)] x (q)] **\$2,494.41**

l) CONSULTANT'S OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODC) - ITEMIZE (Add additional pages if necessary)

Description of Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Postage and Delivery Cost (Supported by Consultant Actual Costs)	0	Each	\$76.00	\$0.00
Travel/Mileage (Supported by Consultant Actual Costs)	0	Each	\$50.00	\$0.00
Reproduction and Printing Costs - Prints (Supported by Consultant Actual Costs)	0	Each	\$25.00	\$0.00
				l) TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS \$0.00

m) SUBCONSULTANTS' COSTS (Add additional pages if necessary)

Subconsultant 1: HMH	1	\$7,284	\$7,284.00
Subconsultant 2: GPA	1	\$77,867	\$77,867.00
Subconsultant 3:			\$0.00
Subconsultant 4:			\$0.00
		m) TOTAL SUBCONSULTANTS' COSTS	\$85,151.00

n) TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS INCLUDING SUBCONSULTANTS [(l) + (m)] **\$85,151**

TOTAL COST [(c) + (j) + (k) + (n)] **\$112,590**

NOTES:

1. Key personnel **must** be marked with an asterisk (*) and employees that are subject to prevailing wage requirements must be marked with two asterisks (**). All cost must comply with the Federal cost principles. Subconsultants will provide their own cost proposals.
2. The cost proposal format shall not be amended. Indirect cost rates shall be updated on an annual basis in accordance with the consultant's annual accounting period and established by a cognizant agency or accepted by Caltrans.
3. Anticipated salary increases calculation (page 2) must accompany.

City of South San Francisco BPMP, South San Francisco, CA
Additional Service Request No. 03
Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation & Permits for Utah Ave In-Water Work

April 19, 2022
Page 8 of 8

Proposed Additional Budget

The role of BCA is the prime and structures consultant, the role of HMH is the civil, traffic, water quality and survey subconsultant, and the role of GPA is the environmental subconsultant. We estimate that the additional budget required to perform the extra work associated with Additional Service Request No. 03 to incorporate a Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation and associated additional permit coordination anticipated for the Utah Ave in-water work is as follows:

➤ Additional Services Request No. 3	
○ BCA	\$27,439.00
○ HMH	\$7,284.00
○ <u>GPA</u>	<u>\$77,867.00</u>
TOTAL ADDITIONAL PROPOSED BUDGET	\$112,590.00

If approved, the additional budget of **\$112,590.00** for SSF BPMP Additional Services Request No. 3 will be added to the currently negotiated and approved budget as follows.

➤ Original SSF BPMP Contract Agreement (10/14/2020)	\$200,000.00
➤ 1 st Amendment SSF BPMP (05/10/2021)	\$ 31,666.00
➤ <u>SSF BPMP ASR No. 3</u>	<u>\$112,590.00</u>

Design Services (PE Funding Phase) Proposed Budget **\$344,256.00**

We look forward to working with you on this project. Should you have any questions or require any additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me on my cell phone at (408) 781-4549, or by email at roen@biggscardosa.com.

Enclosure:

- Attachment 1 – Additional Services Request No.3_Fee Breakdown 04/19/22

Sincerely,

BIGGS CARDOSA
ASSOCIATES, INC.



Ron Oen, PE, QSD
Principal

Attachment 1 - Additional Services Request No.3_Fee Breakdown 04/19/2022

EXHIBIT 10-H1 COST PROPOSAL Page 1 of 3

ACTUAL COST-PLUS-FIXED FEE OR LUMP SUM (FIRM FIXED PRICE) CONTRACTS
(DESIGN, ENGINEERING AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES)

Note: Mark-ups are Not Allowed

Consultant	Biggs Cardosa Associates, Inc.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prime Consultant	<input type="checkbox"/> Subconsultant	<input type="checkbox"/> 2nd Tier Subconsultant
Project No.	12508-2020	Contract No.	SSF ST1703 - ASR No. 3	Date 4/19/2022

DIRECT LABOR

Classification/Title	Name	hours	Actual Hourly Rate	Total
Principal	Ron Oen*	26	\$110.00	\$2,860.00
Associate	various		\$90.00	\$0.00
Engineering Manager	various		\$74.00	\$0.00
Senior Engineer	various		\$64.00	\$0.00
Project Engineer	various	80	\$55.00	\$4,400.00
Staff Engineer	various		\$48.00	\$0.00
Assistant Engineer	various		\$42.00	\$0.00
Junior Engineer	various		\$37.00	\$0.00
Senior Computer Drafter	various	24	\$50.00	\$1,200.00
Computer Drafter	various		\$30.00	\$0.00
Administrative Services	various	10	\$40.00	\$400.00

LABOR COSTS

a) Subtotal Direct Labor Costs
b) Anticipated Salary Increases (see page 2 for sample)

30	
	\$8,860.00
	\$443.00

c) TOTAL DIRECT LABOR COSTS [(a) + (b)] \$9,303.00

INDIRECT COSTS

d) Fringe Benefits (Rate: <u>28.34%</u>)	e) Total Fringe Benefits [(c) x (d)] \$2,636.47
Overhead (Rate: <u>0.00%</u>)	g) Overhead [(c) x (f)] \$0.00
h) General and Administrative (Rate: <u>139.79%</u>)	i) Gen & Admin [(c) x (h)] \$13,004.66

j) Total Indirect Costs [(e) + (g) + (i)] \$15,641.13

FIXED FEE

q) (Rate: 10.00%) k) TOTAL FIXED PROFIT [(c) + (j)] x (q)] \$2,494.41

l) CONSULTANT'S OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODC) - ITEMIZE (Add additional pages if necessary)

Description of Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Postage and Delivery Cost (Supported by Consultant Actual Costs)	0	Each	\$76.00	\$0.00
Travel/Mileage (Supported by Consultant Actual Costs)	0	Each	\$50.00	\$0.00
Reproduction and Printing Costs - Prints (Supported by Consultant Actual Costs)	0	Each	\$25.00	\$0.00

l) TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS \$0.00

m) SUBCONSULTANTS' COSTS (Add additional pages if necessary)

Subconsultant 1: HMH	1	\$7,284	\$7,284.00
Subconsultant 2: GPA	1	\$77,867	\$77,867.00
Subconsultant 3:			\$0.00
Subconsultant 4:			\$0.00

m) TOTAL SUBCONSULTANTS' COSTS \$85,151.00

n) TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS INCLUDING SUBCONSULTANTS [(l) + (m)] \$85,151

TOTAL COST [(c) + (j) + (k) + (n)] \$112,590

NOTES:

- Key personnel **must** be marked with an asterisk (*) and employees that are subject to prevailing wage requirements must be marked with two asterisks (**). All cost must comply with the Federal cost principles. Subconsultants will provide their own cost proposals.
- The cost proposal format shall not be amended. Indirect cost rates shall be updated on an annual basis in accordance with the consultant's annual accounting period and established by a cognizant agency or accepted by Caltrans.
- Anticipated salary increases calculation (page 2) must accompany.

EXHIBIT 10-H1 COST PROPOSAL Page 2 of 3
ACTUAL COST-PLUS-FIXED FEE OR LUMP SUM (FIRM FIXED PRICE) CONTRACTS
 (SAMPLE CALCULATIONS FOR ANTICIPATED SALARY INCREASES)

1. Calculate Average Hourly Rate for 1st year of the contract (Direct Labor Subtotal divided by total hours)

Direct Labor <u>Subtotal</u> per Cost Proposal	Total Hours per Cost Proposal	Avg Hourly Rate	1 Year Contract Duration Rate
\$8,860.00	140	=	\$63.29

2. Calculate hourly rate for all years (Increase the Average Hourly Rate for a year by proposed escalation %)

Avg Hourly Rate	Proposed Escalation	Year 1 Avg hourly Rate	Year 2 Avg hourly Rate	Year 3 Avg hourly Rate	Year 4 Avg hourly Rate
Year 1 \$63.29	+	5.0%	=	\$66.45	Year 2 Avg hourly Rate
Year 2 \$66.45	+	5.0%	=	\$69.77	Year 3 Avg hourly Rate
Year 3 \$69.77	+	5.0%	=	\$73.26	Year 4 Avg hourly Rate
Year 4 \$73.26	+	5.0%	=	\$76.92	Rate

3. Calculate estimated hours per year (Multiply estimate % each year by total hours)

Estimated % Completed Each Year	Total Hours per Cost Proposal	Total Hours per Year	
Year 1 0.00%	*	140.0	= 0.0 Estimated Hours Year 1
Year 2 100.00%	*	140.0	= 140.0 Estimated Hours Year 2
Year 3 0.00%	*	140.0	= 0.0 Estimated Hours Year 3
Year 4 0.00%	*	140.0	= 0.0 Estimated Hours Year 4
Year 5 0.00%	*	140.0	= 0.0 Estimated Hours Year 5
Total 100%	Total		= 140.0

4. Calculate Total Costs including Escalation (Multiply Average Hourly Rate by the number of hours)

Avg Hourly Rate (calculated above)	Estimated hours (calculated above)	Cost per Year	
Year 1 \$63.29	*	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 1
Year 2 \$66.45	*	\$9,303.00	Estimated Hours Year 2
Year 3 \$69.77	*	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 3
Year 4 \$73.26	*	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 4
Year 5 \$76.92	*	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 5
	Total Direct Labor Cost with Escalation	= \$9,303.00	
	Direct Labor Subtotal before Escalation	= \$8,860.00	
	Estimated total of Direct Labor Salary Increase	= \$443.00	Transfer to Page 1

NOTES:

1. This is not the only way to estimate salary increases. Other methods will be accepted if they clearly indicate the % increase, the # of years of the contract, and a breakdown of the labor to be performed each year.
2. An estimation that is based on direct labor multiplied by salary increase % multiplied by the # of years is not acceptable. (i.e. \$250,000 x 2% x 5 yrs = \$25,000 is not an acceptable methodology)
3. This assumes that one year will be worked at the rate on the cost proposal before salary increases are granted.
4. Calculations for anticipated salary escalation must be provided.

EXHIBIT 10-H1 COST PROPOSAL Page 3 of 3

Certification of Direct Costs:

I, the undersigned, certify to the best of my knowledge and belief that all direct costs identified on the cost proposal(s) in this contract are actual, reasonable, allowable, and allocable to the contract in accordance with the contract terms and the following requirements:

1. General Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)
2. Terms and conditions of the contract
3. [Title 23 United States Code Section 112](#) - Letting of Contracts
4. [48 Code of Federal Regulations Part 31](#) - Contract Cost Principles and Procedures
5. [23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 172](#) - Procurement, Management, and Administration of Engineering and Design Related Services
6. [48 Code of Federal Regulations Part 9904](#) - Costs Accounting Standards Board (when applicable)

All costs must be applied consistently and fairly to all contracts. All documentation of compliance must be retained in the project files and be in compliance with applicable federal and state requirements. Costs that are noncompliant with the federal and state requirements are not eligible for reimbursement.

Local governments are responsible for applying only cognizant agency or Caltrans accepted Indirect Cost Rate(s)

Prime Consultant or Subconsultant Certifying:Name: Ron OenTitle*: PrincipalSignature: Date of Certification (mm/dd/yyyy): 4/19/2022Email: roen@biggscardosa.comPhone Number: (408) 296-5515Address: 865 The Alameda, San Jose, CA 95126

*An individual executive or financial officer of the consultant's or subconsultant's organization at a level no lower than a Vice President or a Chief Financial Officer, or equivalent, who has authority to represent the financial information utilized to establish the cost proposal for the contract.

List of services the consultant is providing under the proposed contract:

ADDITIONAL SERVICES REQUEST No. 3 - additional scope required to incorporate a Biological Assessment, Section 7 Consultation and associated additional permit coordination anticipated for the Utah Ave in-water work.