

WHATCOM COUNTY CONTRACT INFORMATION SHEET

Whatcom County Contract No. _____

Originating Department: _____	
Division/Program: (i.e. Dept. Division and Program) _____	
Contract or Grant Administrator: _____	
Contractor's / Agency Name: _____	

Is this a New Contract? If not, is this an Amendment or Renewal to an Existing Contract? Yes No
 Yes No If Amendment or Renewal, (per WCC 3.08.100 (a)) Original Contract #: _____

Does contract require Council Approval? Yes No If No, include WCC: _____
 Already approved? Council Approved Date: _____ (Exclusions see: Whatcom County Codes 3.06.010, 3.08.090 and 3.08.100)

Is this a grant agreement?
 Yes No If yes, grantor agency contract number(s): _____ CFDA#: _____

Is this contract grant funded?
 Yes No If yes, Whatcom County grant contract number(s): _____

Is this contract the result of a RFP or Bid process? Contract
 Yes No If yes, RFP and Bid number(s): _____ Cost Center: _____

Is this agreement excluded from E-Verify? No Yes If no, include Attachment D Contractor Declaration form.

If YES, indicate exclusion(s) below:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Professional services agreement for certified/licensed professional. | Goods and services provided due to an emergency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract work is for less than \$100,000. | <input type="checkbox"/> Contract for Commercial off the shelf items (COTS). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contract work is for less than 120 days. | <input type="checkbox"/> Work related subcontract less than \$25,000. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interlocal Agreement (between Governments). | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Works - Local Agency/Federally Funded FHWA. |

Contract Amount:(sum of original contract amount and any prior amendments):
 \$ _____

This Amendment Amount:
 \$ _____

Total Amended Amount:
 \$ _____

Council approval required for; all property leases, contracts or bid awards **exceeding \$40,000**, and professional service contract amendments that have an increase greater than \$10,000 or 10% of contract amount, whichever is greater, **except when:**

1. Exercising an option contained in a contract previously approved by the council.
2. Contract is for design, construction, r-o-w acquisition, prof. services, or other capital costs approved by council in a capital budget appropriation ordinance.
3. Bid or award is for supplies.
4. Equipment is included in Exhibit "B" of the Budget Ordinance.
5. Contract is for manufacturer's technical support and hardware maintenance of electronic systems and/or technical support and software maintenance from the developer of proprietary software currently used by Whatcom County.

Summary of Scope: _____

Term of Contract: _____	Expiration Date: _____
-------------------------	------------------------

- Contract Routing:
- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Prepared by: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 2. Attorney signoff: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 3. AS Finance reviewed: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 4. IT reviewed (if IT related): _____ | Date: _____ |
| 5. Contractor signed: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 6. Executive contract review: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 7. Council approved, if necessary: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 8. Executive signed: _____ | Date: _____ |
| 9. Original to Council: _____ | Date: _____ |



**Washington State
Department of Transportation**

Supplemental Agreement Number _____		Organization and Address	
Original Agreement Number		Phone:	
Project Number	Execution Date	Completion Date	
Project Title	New Maximum Amount Payable		
Description of Work			

The Local Agency of _____ desires to supplement the agreement entered in to with _____ and executed on _____ and identified as Agreement No. _____

All provisions in the basic agreement remain in effect except as expressly modified by this supplement. The changes to the agreement are described as follows:

I

Section 1, SCOPE OF WORK, is hereby changed to read:

II

Section IV, TIME FOR BEGINNING AND COMPLETION, is amended to change the number of calendar days for completion of the work to read: _____

III

Section V, PAYMENT, shall be amended as follows:

as set forth in the attached Exhibit A, and by this reference made a part of this supplement.

If you concur with this supplement and agree to the changes as stated above, please sign in the Appropriate spaces below and return to this office for final action.

By: _____ By: _____

Consultant Signature

Approving Authority Signature

Date

SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT:
EXHIBIT A

WHATCOM COUNTY
SCOPE OF WORK
POINT ROBERTS DRAINAGE STUDY
PHASE 2: DEVELOP DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

BACKGROUND

Point Roberts is a community on a peninsula in the northwestern corner of Whatcom County, Washington. The community uniquely has no direct land access to other portions of the United States. Travel by land between Point Roberts and the rest of Whatcom County involves two crossings of the United States / Canada border. This has enabled the community to assume an identity independent of the larger Whatcom County, with a “small town” aesthetic and low-density development. However, this isolation has also resulted in a lack of public infrastructure in the community, especially pertaining to stormwater management. Previous planning efforts, including a 2017 update to the *Point Roberts Sub-Area Plan*, contain little guidance on stormwater management, and Whatcom County has not adopted a level of service for stormwater in Point Roberts (although all state and federal regulations apply to the community)

The purpose of the *Point Roberts Drainage Study* is to evaluate existing drainage problems in Point Roberts—some of them previously known to the County and others discovered during development of the study; to conduct field investigations, data review, and hydrologic and hydraulic assessments; and to assist the county in identifying Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs), Small Works Projects (SWPs), and Maintenance Projects (MPs) (together referred to as “projects”). This project will identify potential funding sources to finance these projects, and will, as stipulated by the available funding sources, distinguish between work to be done within the County-owned Rights-of-Way and the work to be done on private property. The project team will additionally solicit input from the Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee (PRCAC).

The project is divided into two phases. The first phase provided hydrologic analysis, hydraulic analysis, and preliminary sizing for conceptual design options to mitigate flooding caused by these drainage problems and evaluation of current conditions in the peninsula. The first phase additionally assessed available funding sources and presented the results to the Point Roberts community.

The second phase of this project will evaluate CIP costs and determine the annual revenue required to implement the CIPs under three distinct funding scenarios. Each funding scenario will present a conceptual timeline for project implementation given assumed funding sources. This scope of work describes the tasks and subtasks associated with Phase 2 of the Point Roberts Stormwater Drainage Study. The following tasks include a description of the work involved and the associated deliverable(s) for that task.

DURATION

Phase 2 assumes a duration of six (6) months, beginning in December of 2024.

FUNDING

Tetra Tech understands that this project is subject to funding restrictions that require a delineation between work performed in the public right-of-way and work performed beyond the right-of-way, and that this distinction applies to our efforts providing Engineering Consulting services. We understand that approximately 80% of the available funding must be applied to work within the public right-of-way. However, the work involved in developing a stormwater master plan must consider the entire basin as whole. Tetra

Tech will assist Whatcom County in tracking and portioning spending for this work as part of the Project Management task, and identified potential projects will make a clear distinction between projects within the public right-of-way and projects outside of the public right-of-way.

SERVICES – PHASE 1: INITIAL EVALUATION AND CONCLUSIONS

TASK 1.1 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Several project delays have impacted the Phase 1 project management budget. The original contract was assumed to have a duration of eight (8) months; however, Phase 1 work occurred over approximately 13 months. Five (5) months of additional Project Management budget is allocated to Task 1.1.

The scope of work is unchanged from Phase 1 of this project, except in the number of monthly deliverables that correlate to the project duration. Additional budget is allocated to this task under Phase 2 of the project to extend the duration of work. The additional hours for Phase 1 combined with the Phase 2 effort results in 11 months of additional Project Management Budget.

TASK 1.4 – HYDROLOGIC AND HYDRAULIC EVALUATION

The Phase 1 Scope of Work assumed that five (5) subwatersheds and up to 15 subcatchments would be necessary to characterize the peninsula's hydrology. In performing the hydrologic analysis, seven (7) subwatersheds and 29 subcatchments were identified based on information derived from a combination of topographic data, land use data, regional vegetative cover, and the stormwater system inventory. The 14 additional subcatchments required additional effort for the following work elements: subcatchment delineation; additional hydrologic model inputs; hydrologic post-processing; additional hydraulic model inflow parameters; and additional hydraulic model post-processing. Additional budget is allocated to Task 1.4 to account for the necessary extra work performed.

TASK 1.6 – FUNDING ANALYSIS AND PHASE 1 SUMMARY REPORT

The Phase 1 Scope of Work assumed that detailed conceptual designs would not be needed to develop a range of costs for potential projects. However, detailed analysis of the drainage system in the Maple Beach neighborhood was necessary to confirm the feasibility of the conceptual design. Additional budget is allocated to Task 1.6 to account for the necessary extra work performed, including additional report writing efforts associated with Task 1.4.

SERVICES – PHASE 2: DEVELOP DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT PLAN

TASK 2.1– DRAINAGE MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

This task involves developing several scenarios that consider possible project implementation timelines and assesses the annual tax revenue required for the County to implement the Capital Improvement Projects under each scenario. Portions of Capital Improvement projects that occur within the public Right-of-Way will be clearly distinguished from the portions that occur on private property. This task also develops two reports: The *Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan* and the *Point Roberts Implementation Plan*. Work for this task includes the following elements:

1. Review available funding sources, assess funding distributions to specific projects, and prioritize Capital Improvement Projects.
 - a. Assign funding sources identified under task 1.6 to specific Capital Improvement Projects
 - b. Review County, State, and Federal sources for new grant opportunities, and document funding source requirements (for example, stormwater grants administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology may require the implementation of certain

stormwater best-management-practices that exceed the current stormwater standards in Point Roberts).

- c. Prioritize capital contribution from each source based on CIP priority developed in this task.
 - d. Up to three (3) meetings with Whatcom County to discuss project and funding priorities.
 - e. Develop a Capital Improvement Project funding source and prioritization matrix in Microsoft Excel.
 - f. Identify capital required to implement projects.
2. Update the *Phase 1 Summary Report* into the new *Point Roberts Drainage Study Report*, which will serve as a comprehensive report for the work performed for this project.
- a. Develop up to three distinct funding approaches and preliminary timelines that correspond to different funding scenarios:
 - i. Approach 1 will consider a scenario where the primary funding source is from a community-organized Stormwater District, with supplemental funding from the Whatcom County Roads Fund and grant funding on a per-project basis. CIPs will be implemented more rapidly than the other approaches and CIP implementation will prioritize projects that maximize benefit and minimize cost.

Tetra Tech will compute an approximate Stormwater District rate necessary to accomplish the Approach 1 timeline, and iteratively adjust the timeline until the rate is within an acceptable range of values. The range of acceptable values will be provided to Tetra Tech by Whatcom County.
 - ii. Approach 2 will consider a scenario where a stormwater district is not organized, but grant funding is obtained on a per-project basis to supplement the Whatcom County Roads fund. CIPs will be prioritized as part of the County-wide roster, but CIPs that are eligible for grant funding will receive a higher priority than CIPs that are not.
 - iii. Approach 3 will consider where the only funding source is the Whatcom County Roads Fund. CIPs will be implemented more slowly than the other approaches and CIPs will be prioritized as part of the County-wide roster.
 - b. Add a new report Section 1.7 to specify the project Drainage Management Plan. The Implementation Plan will include the following information for each type of drainage problem resolution:
 - i. Problems Not Resolved by the drainage study – the drainage management plan will provide general recommendations for private property owners to implement stormwater management solutions. Such problems include groundwater springs on private property, maintenance of driveway culverts, and implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices.
 - ii. Maintenance Problems – the drainage management plan will provide general recommendations for Whatcom County maintenance crews to improve their level of service in Point Roberts, including PR Community input.
 - iii. Small Works Projects (SWPs) – the drainage management plan will rank and prioritize the SWPs in consideration of estimated cost and the severity of the drainage problem to be resolved.

iv. Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs) and Special Studies:

1. The drainage management plan will rank and prioritize the CIPs in consideration of estimated cost, number of drainage problems addressed, severity and frequency of addressed drainage problems, anticipated permit complexity, and risk of impact to culturally sensitive areas. An evaluation matrix will be developed to compare each CIP and justify CIP prioritization.
 2. The drainage management plan will compare the three funding approaches. For each funding approach, Tetra Tech will compute the annual capital required to implement each scenario. Revenue forecasting will not be performed by Tetra Tech.
- c. Add a new Section 1.8 to discuss next steps and recommendations. Elements will include, but are not limited to:
- i. A recommendation that Point Roberts conduct a community survey to assess community willingness to pay into a future Point Roberts Stormwater Utility District. Presuming the community is interested in a utility district, it will be recommended that the PRCAC request a rate study from Whatcom County.
 - ii. A recommendation that the community continue to use the PRCAC to advocate for the CIPs to influence the quantity and priority of CIPs that are added to the County-wide Capital Improvement Plan.
- d. Add a new Section 1.9 to clearly express disclaimers and limitations to the drainage study. Such disclaimers may include a discussion of limitations to planning-level analysis; known data gaps; that not all drainage problems are necessarily captured and addressed by the drainage study; and/or that the drainage study does not guarantee that the drainage problems will be addressed or that any improvement projects (MPs, SWPs, CIPs) or special studies will be implemented as a result of this study; and that a cultural resources study was not performed for the Point Roberts Drainage Study project nor were associated impacts accounted for in the study.
3. Develop a stand-alone *Drainage Management Plan* report will be developed from relevant sections of the *Point Roberts Drainage Study Report*.

Assumptions

1. Tetra Tech can reasonably rely on the accuracy and completeness of the information / data provided by the Client or other third parties.
2. The different funding sources contain restrictions on how the funding may be used to support a given project. For this scope of work, the following stipulations are assumed:
 - a. Funding obtained from a community-organized stormwater district may be used for projects both inside and outside the public right-of-way. Where available, this funding will be prioritized towards work beyond the public right-of-way.
 - b. Funding obtained from grants may only be applied to specific project components covered by the grant (such as water quality treatment or low-impact development design). This funding may apply inside or outside of the public right-of-way, but will only be applied to portions of a capital improvement project specifically covered by the grant.

- c. Funding obtained from the Whatcom County Roads Fund is strictly limited to work within the public right-of-way. It is also assumed that this funding will not be used to replace or upgrade privately-owned drainage infrastructure within the right-of-way, excepting situations where the replacement is required for the overall capital project (for example, replacing a ditch and culvert system with a storm sewer system would require the removal of privately-owned driveway culverts).
3. The *Point Roberts Drainage Study* project will not conduct a rate study for this project. Revenue associated with a potential Point Roberts stormwater district will be computed by assessing capital project costs against the funding approach timeline.
4. Tetra Tech will not forecast tax revenue accrued by Whatcom County. All revenue computations performed by Tetra Tech will represent the amount of annual funding required to implement the capital projects in a given funding scenario.
5. Tetra Tech assumes one (1) round of Whatcom County review for the Capital Improvement Project Funding Source and Prioritization Matrix. Whatcom County will review and resolve contradictory comments prior to delivering comments to Tetra Tech.
6. In providing opinions of cost, financial analysis, economic feasibility projections, revenue requirements, for the project, Tetra Tech has no control over cost or price of labor and materials, unknown or latent conditions of existing equipment or structures that may affect operation or maintenance costs; competitive bidding procedures and market conditions, time or quality of performance by operating personnel or third parties; customs fees or restrictions at Canadian / United States borders; Whatcom County tax rates and policy; or other economic and operational factors that may materially affect the ultimate project cost, schedule, or project prioritization. Therefore, Tetra Tech makes no warranty that Client's actual project costs, financial aspects, economic feasibility, will not vary from Tetra Tech's opinions, analyses, projections, or estimates.
7. Tetra Tech assumes two (2) rounds of Whatcom County review for both reports (i.e., two rounds of review in total, not four rounds of review). For each round of review, Whatcom County will provide Tetra Tech a consolidated comments package. Whatcom County will review and resolve contradictory comments prior to delivering comments to Tetra Tech. Tetra Tech anticipates that the County reviews will include reviews from Whatcom County Roads, Stormwater, and Maintenance department, along with the Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee.
8. The Point Roberts Drainage Study Report will be sealed and signed by a registered Professional Engineer licensed in the State of Washington.
9. The Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan will not bear the seal or signature of a professional engineer.

Deliverables

Capital Improvement Project Funding Source and Prioritization Matrix, delivered as a Microsoft Excel document.

1. Draft Point Roberts Drainage Study Report, delivered as a Microsoft Word Document.
2. Final Point Roberts Drainage Study Report, delivered as a PDF document.
3. Draft Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan, delivered as a Microsoft Word Document.
4. Final Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan, delivered as a PDF document.

TASK 2.2 – PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PRESENTATION

This task involves organizing and attending a public meeting with the Point Roberts community to discuss the results of the Point Roberts Drainage Study and to provide opportunity for community input. Work for this task includes the following elements:

1. Coordinate with the Point Roberts Community Advisory Committee, including up to two (2) 2-hour virtual meetings to ensure that the Point Roberts Community has the opportunity to provide input before the *Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan* is finalized. These meetings will be attended by the Tetra Tech project manager.
2. Prepare a draft and final presentation for the public meeting documenting the project findings including maps, graphics, and other technical information.
3. Attend one (1) public meeting. The meeting will be attended by the Tetra Tech Project Manager.
 - a. Present findings to the Point Roberts Community. Tetra Tech will present jointly with Whatcom County Staff.
 - b. Solicit additional community feedback, which will be incorporated into the final version of the *Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan*.
 - c. Prepare meeting notes.
4. Tetra Tech will provide public outreach support to Whatcom County consisting of informal phone calls or virtual meetings for the purpose of strategizing public outreach. This effort will be performed by the Project Manager and will be limited to four (4) hours.

Assumptions

1. Whatcom County will organize, facilitate, and conduct the public meeting.
2. Tetra Tech assumes that the public meeting will be held in-person at a community facility in Point Roberts.
3. Whatcom County will perform public outreach necessary to inform the public of the meeting.

Deliverables

1. Presentation, as a Microsoft PowerPoint file.
2. Draft and Final meeting notes, delivered electronically via email.

TASK 2.3 – COUNTY TRAINING TO USE MODELING PROGRAMS/FILE DELIVERABLES

Tetra Tech will compile support files, input files, and output files for Point Roberts hydrologic and hydraulic models developed over the course of this project. Tetra Tech will prepare a step-by-step presentation that describes the process for developing hydrologic and hydraulic modeling for watershed scale analysis; that identifies the software used in preparation of the drainage study; that explains how the raw data is used in the analysis; and that demonstrates examples of how to apply the modeling and how to interpret the modeling reports after entering data into the models. Work for this task includes the following elements:

1. Preparation and general clean-up of data and model files, including but not limited to GIS data (shapefiles, digital terrain models, etc.), Microsoft Excel workbooks, hydrologic modeling files, and hydraulic modeling files.
2. Develop a PowerPoint Presentation to support a modeling workshop with Whatcom County. The presentation will include discussions of:
 - a. Developing hydrologic and hydraulic input data

- b. Theoretical basis of the hydrologic and hydraulic models
 - c. Developing, running, and troubleshooting hydrologic and hydraulic models
 - d. Interpreting and developing confidence in model results
3. Attend a one-day workshop at Whatcom County offices to present the model development process. The workshop agenda will include the following:
- a. Present the modeling workshop PowerPoint.
 - b. Live demonstrations and / or hand-on workshops for modeling up to three (3) specific locations in Point Roberts.

Assumptions

- 1. The modeling demonstration / workshop examples will be identified and agreed upon by Tetra Tech and Whatcom County during the course of developing the workshop presentation.
- 2. The workshop will be attended by one Tetra Tech staff.

Deliverables

- 1. Point Roberts hydrologic model input files.
- 2. Point Roberts hydrologic data developed by Tetra Tech (e.g., subwatershed boundaries) as shapefiles.
- 3. Point Roberts hydraulic model input and output files.
- 4. Point Roberts hydraulic modeling geometries (i.e., pipes, ditches, junctions, etc.) as shapefiles.
- 5. Workshop PowerPoint presentation.

TASK 2.4– ADDITIONAL, UNANTICIPATED, URGENT, OR SPECIAL SERVICES

This task includes unanticipated services that are time sensitive and crucial to maintaining the project schedule and progress work. Work performed under this task is limited and will not exceed 100 hours. Work performed under this task will require specific, prior authorization from Whatcom County. Written authorization may be granted only after the Consultant submits both a written scope and costs for the additional work, which is reviewed and specifically negotiated by Whatcom County.


Assumptions

- 1. The Consultant may plan for the following to address this Task – Up to 75 hours of Project Management, Engineering, Project Control, or Administrative services. 60 hours are reserved for work within the Right-of-Way, and the remaining 15 hours are reserved for work outside of the Right-of-Way.

Deliverables


- 1. Reports, estimates, drawings, special inspections, field services, public outreach, and documentation as appropriate and agreed to by Whatcom County and Tetra Tech.

SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT:
EXHIBIT B

 Exhibit B - Prime Consultant Cost Computations Phase 2 Fee		Labor Plan Resource						Price Summary / Totals				
Point Roberts Drainage Study Bill Rate > 297.20 234.63 187.70 156.42 140.78 172.06 Proj Area >	Eng Eng Eng Eng Eng Admin	TETRA TECH						Task Pricing Totals \$ 86,783				
		Senior Project Manager, QA/QC	Civil Engineer VI	Project Manager, Civil Engineer IV	Civil Engineer III	Civil Engineer II	Admin III	Labor	Mat'ls	Travel	Task Pricing Totals	
Submitted to: Whatcom County Public Works Contract Type: T&M	Total Labor Hrs	483	27	9	241	51	129	26	\$ 85,983	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 86,783
Task 1.1 - Project Management		64	-	-	44	-	-	20	\$ 11,700	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,700
Project Administration		20	-	-	16	-	-	4	\$ 3,691	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,691
Invoicing and Progress Reports		36	-	-	20	-	-	16	\$ 6,507	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,507
Quality Assurance		8	-	-	8	-	-	-	\$ 1,502	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,502
Task 1.4 - Hydrologic and Hydraulic Evaluation		71	1	-	26	12	32	-	\$ 11,559	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,559
Additional Hydrologic Evaluation for Additional Subcatchments		32	-	-	8	12	12	-	\$ 5,068	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,068
Additional Hydraulic Evaluation for Additional Subcatchments		16	-	-	8	-	8	-	\$ 2,628	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,628
Additional Problem Identification		23	1	-	10	-	12	-	\$ 3,864	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,864
Task 1.6 - Funding Analysis and Phase 1 Summary Report		67	-	-	17	21	29	-	\$ 10,558	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,558
Additional Report Documentation for Problems & Resolutions		55	-	-	13	13	29	-	\$ 8,556	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,556
Additional Funding Analysis for Detailed Concept Designs		12	-	-	4	8	-	-	\$ 2,002	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,002
Task 2.1 - Drainage Management and Implementation Plans		131	12	-	66	-	53	-	\$ 23,416	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 23,416
1. Funding Source Review and CIP Prioritization		44	3	-	20	-	21	-	\$ 7,602	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,602
Review and assign funding sources to CIPs; Prioritize CIPs		8	-	-	4	-	4	-	\$ 1,314	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,314
Meetings with Whatcom County		8	-	-	3	-	5	-	\$ 1,267	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,267
Funding and Prioritization Matrix		22	3	-	7	-	12	-	\$ 3,895	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,895
Identify required capital for project implementation		6	-	-	6	-	-	-	\$ 1,126	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,126
2. Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan		69	7	-	40	-	22	-	\$ 12,686	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,686
Develop funding approaches		12	2	-	10	-	-	-	\$ 2,471	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,471
Draft Drainage Management Plan		34	2	-	20	-	12	-	\$ 6,038	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,038
Final Drainage Management Plan		23	3	-	10	-	10	-	\$ 4,176	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,176
3. Stand-Alone Implementation Plan		18	2	-	6	-	10	-	\$ 3,128	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,128
Draft Implementation Plan		9	1	-	2	-	6	-	\$ 1,517	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,517
Final Implementation Plan		9	1	-	4	-	4	-	\$ 1,611	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,611
Task 2.2 - Public Outreach and Presentation		37	2	-	35	-	-	-	\$ 7,164	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 7,564
Virtual Meetings		10	-	-	10	-	-	-	\$ 1,877	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,877
Develop Public Presentation		11	2	-	9	-	-	-	\$ 2,284	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,284
Public Meeting		12	-	-	12	-	-	-	\$ 2,252	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 2,652
Public Outreach Support		4	-	-	4	-	-	-	\$ 751	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 751
Task 2.3 - County Training to Use Modeling Programs/Files Deliverables		38	3	-	35	-	-	-	\$ 7,461	\$ -	\$ 400	\$ 7,861
Prepare model files for transfer		8	-	-	8	-	-	-	\$ 1,502	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,502
Develop workshop presentation		16	3	-	13	-	-	-	\$ 3,332	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,332
Modeling Workshop		14	-	-	14	-	-	-	\$ 2,628	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 3,028
Task 2.4 - Additional, Unanticipated, Urgent, or Special Services		75	9	9	18	18	15	6	\$ 14,125	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,125
Additional, Unanticipated, Urgent, or Special Services		75	9	9	18	18	15	6	\$ 14,125	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 14,125
Totals		483	27	9	241	51	129	26	\$ 85,983	\$ -	\$ 800	\$ 86,783

Budget Narrative

- Contract amounts shall not exceed the total budget referenced (above). As consideration for services provided in Exhibit A, Scope of Work, the County agrees to compensate the contractor according to the hourly rates provided in the project budget (Exhibit B). Other reasonable expenses incurred in the course of performing the duties herein shall be reimbursed including mileage at the current GSA rate. Lodging and per diem shall not exceed the GSA rate for the location where services are provided. Other expenditures such as printing, postage, and telephone charges shall be reimbursed at actual cost plus 10%. Expense reimbursement requests must be accompanied by copies of paid invoices. Any work performed prior to the effective date or continuing after the completion date of the contract, unless otherwise agreed upon in writing, will be at the contractor's expense.
- Hourly rates are subject to annual cost of living increases based on Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue CPI-W with County approval.

 Exhibit B - Prime Consultant Cost Computations Contract Budget Summary		Price Summary / Totals			
Point Roberts Drainage Study					
Submitted to: Whatcom County Public Works					
Contract Type: T&M					
Project Phases / Tasks		Original Contract	Mod1 (No Cost)	Mod2	Task Pricing Totals
		\$ 128,745	\$ -	\$ 86,783	\$ 215,528
Task 1.1 - Project Management		\$ 8,511		\$ 11,700	\$ 20,211
Project Administration		\$ 2,586		\$ 3,691	\$ 6,277
Invoicing and Progress Reports		\$ 5,034		\$ 6,507	\$ 11,541
Quality Assurance		\$ 891		\$ 1,502	\$ 2,392
					\$ -
Task 1.2 - Review of Existing Information and Initial Project Identification		\$ 31,836		\$ -	\$ 31,836
Full Day Site Visits & County Kickoff Meeting		\$ 11,958		\$ -	\$ 11,958
Existing Data Review		\$ 8,641		\$ -	\$ 8,641
Community Coordination		\$ 1,654		\$ -	\$ 1,654
Project Identification and Cost Estimations		\$ 9,583		\$ -	\$ 9,583
					\$ -
Task 1.3 - Survey Support		\$ 2,411		\$ -	\$ 2,411
Title Report Review		\$ 477		\$ -	\$ 477
Survey Area Identification		\$ 732		\$ -	\$ 732
Review of Survey Documents		\$ 1,203		\$ -	\$ 1,203
					\$ -
Task 1.4 - Hydrologic and Hydraulic Evaluation		\$ 43,966		\$ 11,559	\$ 55,525
Hydrologic Modeling		\$ 14,699		\$ 5,068	\$ 19,767
Hydraulic Modeling		\$ 12,337		\$ 2,628	\$ 14,965
Problem Identification and Evaluation		\$ 16,931		\$ 3,864	\$ 20,794
					\$ -
Task 1.5 - Public Meeting and Outreach		\$ 15,110		\$ -	\$ 15,110
Public Outreach Plan Development		\$ 1,781		\$ -	\$ 1,781
Public Outreach Presentation and Meetings		\$ 12,069		\$ -	\$ 12,069
Public Outreach Support		\$ 1,260		\$ -	\$ 1,260
					\$ -
Task 1.6 - Funding Analysis and Phase 1 Summary Report		\$ 18,510		\$ 10,558	\$ 29,068
Funding Analysis		\$ 5,096		\$ 8,556	\$ 13,652
Phase 1 Summary Report		\$ 12,587		\$ 2,002	\$ 14,589
Design Workshop		\$ 827		\$ -	\$ 827
					\$ -
Task 1.7 - Additional, Unanticipated, Urgent, or Special Services		\$ 8,402		\$ -	\$ 8,402
Additional, Unanticipated, Urgent, or Special Services		\$ 8,402		\$ -	\$ 8,402
					\$ -
Task 2.1 - Drainage Management and Implementation Plans				\$ 23,416	\$ 23,416
CIP Prioritization				\$ 7,602	\$ 7,602
Point Roberts Drainage Management Plan				\$ 12,686	\$ 12,686
Stand-Alone Implementation Plan				\$ 3,128	\$ 3,128
					\$ -
Task 2.2 - Public Outreach and Presentation				\$ 7,564	\$ 7,564
Virtual Meetings				\$ 1,877	\$ 1,877
Develop Public Presentation				\$ 2,284	\$ 2,284
Public Meeting				\$ 2,652	\$ 2,652
Public Outreach Support				\$ 751	\$ 751
					\$ -
Task 2.3 - County Training to Use Modeling Programs/Files Deliverables				\$ 7,861	\$ 7,861
Model file clean-up				\$ 1,502	\$ 1,502
Develop workshop presentation				\$ 3,332	\$ 3,332
Modeling Workshop				\$ 3,028	\$ 3,028
					\$ -
Task 2.4 - Additional, Unanticipated, Urgent, or Special Services				\$ 14,125	\$ 14,125
Additional, Unanticipated, Urgent, or Special Services				\$ 14,125	\$ 14,125
					\$ -
Totals		\$ 128,745	\$ -	\$ 86,783	\$ 215,528

Budget Narrative

- Contract amounts shall not exceed the total budget referenced (above). As consideration for services provided in Exhibit A, Scope of Work, the County agrees to compensate the contractor according to the hourly rates provided in the project budget (Exhibit B). Other reasonable expenses incurred in the course of performing the duties herein shall be reimbursed including mileage at the current GSA rate. Lodging and per diem shall not exceed the GSA rate for the location where services are provided. Other expenditures such as printing, postage, and telephone charges shall be
- Hourly rates are subject to annual cost of living increases based on Seattle-Tacoma-Bellevue CPI-W with County approval.

