

AMENDMENT EIGHT TO AGREEMENT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES
FOR
REPLACEMENT OF CLOVER CREEK BRIDGE AT FIRST STREET (14C-0015)
IN LAKE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

THIS AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT is made this _____ day of _____, 2026, by and between the County of Lake, hereinafter referred to as "COUNTY", and Consor Engineers, LLC, hereinafter referred to as "CONSULTANT".

WITNESSETH

WHEREAS, COUNTY and CONSULTANT have entered into an AGREEMENT dated February 28, 2017, Amendment One dated September 18, 2018, Amendment Two dated October 22, 2020, Amendment Three dated November 29, 2021, Amendment Four dated September 13, 2022, Amendment Five dated December 20, 2022, Amendment Six dated December 19, 2024, and Amendment Seven dated December 29, 2025, to provide preliminary and final design, environmental services, right of way, bidding and construction assistance services in order to replace the Clover Creek Bridge at First Street (14C-0015); and

WHEREAS, CONSULTANT desires to amend their budget for work on various tasks; and

WHEREAS, Article XV, Section A, "MODIFICATION", of said Agreement allows modification by written amendment executed by both parties; and

WHEREAS, COUNTY AND CONSULTANT now desire to amend said Agreement to complete the necessary work.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. **ARTICLE I, "SCOPE OF SERVICES", Section A**, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"CONSULTANT shall perform the services described in Exhibit "A" and hereby modified by Exhibit "C", attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference hereinafter called Scope of Work. In the event of a conflict between this Agreement and Exhibits "A", and "C", the provisions of this Agreement shall control."

2. **ARTICLE VI, "COMPENSATION AND TERMS OF PAYMENT", Section C**, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Compensation: The method of payment for this contract will be based on Actual Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee. COUNTY will reimburse CONSULTANT for actual costs (including labor costs, employee benefits, travel, equipment rental costs, overhead and other direct costs) incurred by

CONSULTANT in performance of the work set forth in Exhibit "A" as hereby modified by Exhibit "C". Direct Costs for Sub-consultants will be billed as actual costs. No payment will be made prior to approval of any work, nor for any work performed prior to approval of this Agreement.

CONSULTANT will not be reimbursed for actual costs that exceed the estimated wage rates, employee benefits, travel, equipment rental, overhead, and other estimated costs set forth in the approved CONSULTANT'S Cost Proposal, unless additional reimbursement is provided for by contract amendment. In no event will CONSULTANT be reimbursed for overhead costs at a rate that exceeds COUNTY's approved overhead rate set forth in the Cost Proposal. In the event that COUNTY determines that a change to the work from that specified in the Cost Proposal and contract is required, the contract time or actual costs reimbursable by COUNTY shall be adjusted by contract amendment to accommodate the changed work.

For all services CONSULTANT shall be paid in accordance with the budget set forth in Exhibit "B" as hereby modified by Exhibit "C", provided however that the total payments to CONSULTANT shall not exceed \$828,913.17 without prior written authorization by COUNTY and formal Amendment to this Agreement.

In addition to the allowable incurred costs, COUNTY will pay CONSULTANT a fixed fee of \$57,344.95. The fixed fee is nonadjustable for the term of the contract, except in the event of a significant change in the scope of work and such adjustment is made by contract amendment.

Reimbursement for transportation and subsistence costs shall not exceed the rates specified in the approved Cost Proposal.

3. **ARTICLE VII, "TERM"**, is hereby amended to read as follows:

This Agreement shall commence on the date herein above entered into and shall continue in full force and effect until December 31, 2027, unless earlier terminated as hereinafter provided. This term may be extended an appropriate period of time in case of unavoidable delays and for consideration of corresponding warranted adjustment in payment by modification of this Agreement as hereafter provided.

4. **Exhibit "C"**, of Amendment One is hereby replaced with the Exhibit "C" attached hereto.

Except as specifically modified herein, all other terms and conditions of the AGREEMENT dated February 28, 2017, Amendment One dated September 18, 2018, Amendment Two dated October 22, 2020, Amendment Three dated November 29, 2021, Amendment Four dated September 13, 2022, Amendment Five dated December 20, 2022, Amendment Six dated December 19, 2024, and Amendment Seven dated December 29, 2025, shall remain in full force and effect.

COUNTY and CONSULTANT have executed this Amendment to Agreement on the day and year first written above.

COUNTY OF LAKE:

Conzor Engineers, LLC:

Chair, Board of Supervisors

Jason Jurrens, District Manager
California Transportation

ATTEST:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

SUSAN PARKER
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

LLOYD GUINTIVANO
County Counsel

By: _____

By:  _____

EXHIBIT “C”

TO

AGREEMENT FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES

FOR

REPLACEMENT OF CLOVER CREEK BRIDGE AT FIRST STREET (14C-0015)

IN LAKE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

**Amendment 8 Scope of Work – 14C0134 Clover Creek Bridge (First Street) Replacement; BRLO
5914(079)**

Revised January 9, 2026

Task 2: Project Management

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 2 (including all subtasks), the following is added.

Task 2.1: Project Management

Project Management effort has increased due to the extended project schedule. Budget to complete project management through construction support (assumed to be complete by December 2027) has been included in the cost proposal.

Budget has been added to provide QA/QC reviews of all milestone submittals. The submittal will be reviewed by our QAQC Manager. QC review comments and resolution will be documented and submitted to the County with the milestone submittal. Remaining Milestone submittals 90% PS&E and Final/100% PS&E.

Task 2.2 Progress Meetings

Additional Budget for bi-weekly progress meetings has been included. Bi-Weekly meetings are anticipated to the completion of Tasks 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, but no later than July 31, 2026.

Task 3.2: Geotechnical Investigations

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 3.2, the following is added.

Task 3.2 is modified to include additional design and geotechnical analysis related to poor subgrade soil conditions, and the need to mitigate for weak/soft conditions.

Crawford will revise the draft and final foundation reports. The following additional geotechnical services scope and fee is provided based on our December 15, 2022 video conference with Caltrans and the County regarding ground improvement using rammed aggregate columns to mitigate weak/soft subsurface foundation conditions at the project site.

Time and effort beyond that anticipated in Crawford's current budget and supplemental geotechnical services Crawford will complete for this project include the following:

- Additional geotechnical evaluation/analysis and comparison of various foundation types.
- Coordination with Consor and specialty contractor to assist in the preparation of project plans and specifications for ground improvement using rammed aggregate columns.
- Additional time/effort to incorporate recent changes to Caltrans technical standards/guidelines with respect to foundation design and report preparation.
- Additional time/effort associated to review/address Caltrans review comments.
- Additional project team consultation/conferences to address foundation design/construction, particularly with respect to ground modification.

Conсор will coordinate with Crawford, review, comment and provide design information for the revised draft and final foundation report.

No additional field exploration or laboratory testing is proposed/included in this additional geotechnical services request.

Caltrans indicated in an email on April 15, 2024 that a type selection meeting and concurrence memo are not required. These are excluded from the scope of work and budget.

Task 3.3 Hydrologic/Hydraulic Studies

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 3.3, the following is added.

HDR requests to transfer the unexpended budget from Task 6.3 to Task 3.3. The original Task 3.3 scope and fee assumed that the scope of work would begin in 2018 and be complete within that year. With the extended schedule, there have been added administrative and management costs. Standards, policies, requirements, and criteria have changed and are more stringent since the project inception. The bridge design changed to a box culvert design, which necessitated the additional analysis of a 10-year flow. Comments from CVFPB were provided piecemeal over a span of 6 months from 2022 through 2023. CVFPB requested that water surface elevations be labeled on the cross section plots in the appendix, and an additional hydraulic analysis of hypothetical blockage across the culvert: both of which are not typical comments for these projects. Caltrans provided comments to update the HEC-RAS model version to the current latest version, which requires that results be compared with previous results. Caltrans comments also resulted in revisions to the finish grade elevations, which requires that the proposed bridge hydraulic model be re-evaluated.

Task 5.1b Waterline Design/Plans

In addition to the Amendment 4 scope of work for Task 5.1b., the following is added.

The uncertainty of funding has required some additional effort to support coordination between the County and Upper Lake Water District. We anticipate that there will be ongoing changes to the plans to address ULCWD needs and funding availability. 65% plans have been developed based on design criteria provided by ULCWD. The waterline plans have been submitted to the County. Submittal to ULCWD was put on hold until the soil settlement/foundation design was worked out. We have conservatively added budget to address moderate changes to the 65% plans based on ULCWD comments and revised settlement criteria (Amendment Task 3.2). Changes resulting from a deviation from previously agreed to design criteria are not included in this scope of work.

Task 5.3 Prepare PS&E

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 5.3, the following is added.

With respect to the foundation improvements described in Task 3.2, Conсор will:

- Coordinate with Crawford to update the Foundation Report and address outstanding Caltrans comments (attached to Shu-Shang's 12/22/22 email).
- Update the Type Selection Report to include items from Shu-Shang's 12/21/22 email
- Update Design including design calcs as necessary and incorporating plan changes.

- Update Ind Check calcs and review plans.

Conсор will redesign the Glenn property frontage in order to eliminate the need for a Temporary Construction Easement. The change in design will be reflected in the PS&E.

The County has indicated a preference to modify the structural section of the roadway to minimize disturbed soils to be less than 5000 sf (threshold for requiring water quality treatment BMP's per the MS4 permit). Conсор will modify the structural section and design to minimize the area that will trigger the treatment threshold. Further design or consideration for water quality treatment BMP design will not be pursued by Conсор. Conсор will evaluate the change in flows directed to existing drainage features, and make recommendations for managing the additional flow. Improvements to and analysis of existing drainage systems beyond the limits of the project are not included.

County comments on the 65% plans were received, incorporated and a revised 65% set of plans were submitted in 2020. Conсор received additional comments from the County July 31, 2024. We anticipate addressing these comments in a 95% PS&E package as the next submittal. The schedule, scope and budget are dependent on final direction from the County regarding the Glenn property.

We have not included effort to change the major geometric design aspects of the road (typical section, horizontal and vertical alignment). Design has progressed based on multiple reviews and discussions with the County. Any changes to these aspects would require additional budget (not included) to re-design construction details, grades and evaluate project footprint, and a revised 65% set of plans would need to be developed.

Task 6: Permits

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 6 (including subtasks, except as noted), the following is added.

Task 6.1: Environmental Permits

Task 6.1 The Environmental permits were approved in 2023 and 2024 by the various resource agencies. The budget for this task modified to include unanticipated updates to permit applications and resubmittal to address changes to the project description and drawings resulting from the rammed aggregate pier ground improvements.

Galloway requests that unspent budget from Task 6.1.A (not needed) be reallocated to the following effort for Task 6.1.

CWA 404

The current permit covers the activities described in the December 7, 2020 plans. The USACE should be notified of the change in techniques to included rammed aggregate pier construction and because of the proposed listing of northwestern pond turtle coordination with the USACE should occur. This proposed listing and notification may trigger the need for a Biological Assessment (See task 9)

CDFW 1600

The current agreement includes the statement that “natural backfill” will be used under the box culvert. Due to the change in techniques to include rammed aggregate pier construction, CDFW should be notified. This notification may result in a simple email confirmation or the need to amend the agreement. Budget is included to amend the agreement. Consor will provide additional project features and construction method descriptions. Gallaway will prepare the amended agreement or application and coordinate with CDFW.

Task 6.1.A: Clear Lake Hitch ITP

This task is no longer required, and is removed from the scope of work. Budget assigned to this task has been reallocated as noted in Tasks 6.1 and 6.3

Task 6.2 Central Valley Flood Protection Board (CVFPB) Encroachment Permit

Conсор will revise the CVFPB Permit application to include the rammed aggregate pier construction in the project description. A revised set of plans will be provided along with a copy of the updated Foundation Report and Bridge Design Hydraulic Study Report.

The application has been submitted, and comments from the CVFPB were incorporated, and additional design information and analysis was provided. This amendment assumes one more submittal to include utility relocation plans (provided by others) and a revised project description. Consor will respond to one round of comments from the County and CVFPB to be responded to concurrently.

Conсор will submit utility relocation plans to CVFPB as requested. Separate CVFPB permit applications required for utility facilities within the CVFPB jurisdiction are not included in this scope of work. The utility owners will be responsible for obtaining their own permits.

Task 6.3: Post Construction WQ Treatment Design

This task was initially amended into the contract scope of work and budget with Amendment 1 in 2018. Since then the county has changed the approach to compliance with this permit three times. Budget for this task was expended on coordination, preliminary analysis and conceptual design. In October 2019 the County directed Consor to proceed with a project design that would minimize disturbed area to less than 5000 sf (no stormwater treatment required). In 2020, the County changed its position, and directed Consor to change the design such that the disturbed area exceeded 5000 sf, and the treatment would be required. In July 2020 the Consor team provided calculations and costs for treatment BMP’s that were discussed, and recommended. In November 2020, the County took over the responsibility for the design and analysis of the stormwater treatment BMPs, and for compliance with the Phase II MS4 permit. No progress was made by the County. This County action items was documented in the monthly progress reports. In June 2024, the County directed consor to change the design to minimize disturbed area to less than 5000 sf (no stormwater treatment required). Consor will revise the PS&E accordingly under task 5.3.

Conсор’s budget for this task was exceeded by \$3000 over the course of the above coordination. We propose to reallocate \$1085 from Optional Task 6.1.A (not required) to Task 6.3 to cover a portion of the budget overage. We are requesting additional budget to cover the remaining overage.

HDR did not expend their task 6.3 budget, and are requesting that the remaining budget be reallocated to Task 3.3.

This amendment is based on the decision to modify the design to eliminate the need for stormwater treatment BMPs. Drainage design will be finalized by Consor. Neither analysis nor improvements to the existing stormdrain system outside the footprint of the project is included.

Task 6.4 Biological Assessment for Northwestern Pond Turtle

It is possible that the northwestern pond turtle may be listed under the federal endangered species act and consultation with USFWS could be required at that time. Depending on the preference of the USACE and USFWS, a Biological Assessment in support of Section 7 consultation and a Biological Opinion may be required for NEPA revalidation.

However, recent informal consultation with Caltrans Environmental staff has indicated that the site may not represent potential habitat for NPT. Additionally, there is large scale change at federal lead agencies and the likelihood of any new species being listed in the near-term future is low. For those reasons, the scope will be deferred and only included at a later date if absolutely required.

Task 7: Right of Way Services

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 7 (including all subtasks), the following is added.

Consor has provided additional design support and prepared exhibits for use in discussions with property owners regarding specific impacts to the parcels. The Glenn property required a re-design of the frontage in order to demonstrate how the project could be built without obtaining a TCE from the owner. Additional staking was performed for the Manuel property upon approval of the county.

This amendment is based on all right of way acquisitions being complete except for:

- Salcido – County to sign final documents, no additional consultant effort required.
- Glenn – County will negotiate with the owner. The TCE will not be acquired, and the frontage to this property will be redesigned to avoid the need for a TCE (see Task 5.3).

After these two properties are cleared, no additional right of way support is anticipated.

Task 8.1 Utility Coordination

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 8.1, the following is added.

Consor will develop a partial removal detail consistent with AT&T's intended resolution of the underground conflict. The original scope assumed relocation plans would be provided by owners, as is typical for utility relocation work. Additional effort with AT&T has been required due to their lack of responsiveness to provide a relocation plan.

This scope of work assumes that the previously submitted PG&E relocation plan is approved and will not change. It further assumes that the approach to the AT&T relocation/protect in place will be finalized without further effort by Consor.

The waterline design being prepared by Consor will be completed (currently at 65% design) in accordance with the scope of work. Consor participated and worked with the county and the Upper Lake County Water District to request HBP funding for the waterline relocation, and then to obtain other sources of funding. Ultimately the County was not successful in obtaining funding for this work. Currently there is no funding identified for the waterline relocation construction. Consor has not included additional budget or effort to coordinate with Upper Lake County Water District other than PS&E review and responding to comments. Funding coordination is assumed to be performed by others.

If the relocation concept or design for any of the utilities changes from what has been submitted to the County to date, an amendment may be required.

Task 8.2 Report of Investigation and Utility Agreement

The original contract included preparing one report of Investigation (ROI) and one Utility Agreement (UA) we anticipate that two are needed. One for AT&T and one for ULCWD. The budget has been increased accordingly, and accounts for escalation of the original contract budget.

Task 10 Construction Support

In addition to the original scope of work for Task 10 (including all subtasks), the following is added.

Additional budget to match anticipated effort has been included in the cost proposal. Increases are resulting from 1) anticipated submittals and RFI that are likely with the current design (specifically the rammed aggregate piers, waterline construction, and adding construction support from Crawford) and 2) escalation of costs since the original budget was developed in 2017 and as amended in 2022.

Crawford's services consist of responding to contractor Request for Information (RFI) submittals, up to four (8 hour) days plus travel for a field representative to be on-site to observe rammed aggregate pier installation and shallow foundations, review verification test results and consultation with the design team. The field observations services will be on an as-needed basis at the request of Consor. Field observation will be supplemented by principal/senior level engineering consultation and supervision of the field representative. Our on-site observations will be documented in a Daily Field Report (DFR). Materials testing and construction observation other than that described above is understood to be performed by others and is strictly excluded from this scope of services.

For this project, Crawford assumes 50 hours for a field representative, 40 hours for a Senior Engineer and 22 hours for a Principal/Senior management professional. Actual hours may vary depending on factors unknown at this time. The scope for this task is based on construction details known at this time.

Exhibit 10-H1 Cost Proposal Page 1 of 3

Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee or lump sum or Firm Fixed Price contracts
(Design, Engineering and Environmental Studies)

Note: Mark-ups are Not Allowed

Prime Consultant Subconsultant 2nd Tier Subconsultant

Project: First St Bridge over Clover Creek Amendment 8

Consultant Conсор North America, Inc.

Project No. N17L010CA.00

Contract No. N/A

Date

1/9/2026

DIRECT LABOR

Classification/Title	Name	Initials	Hours	Actual Hourly Rate	Range	Total
Principal Engineer	Jurens, Jason	JPJ	4	\$ 120.17	\$80 - \$135	\$ 480.68
Principal Engineer	Kait, Maxwell	MK	129	\$ 100.99	\$80 - \$135	\$ 13,027.71
Principal Engineer	McCauley, Scott	SAM	108	\$ 98.92	\$80 - \$135	\$ 10,683.36
Senior Engineer	Mitchell, Andrew	AKM	172	\$ 92.13	\$55 - \$125	\$ 15,846.36
Engineering Designer	Dambacher, Mason	MRD	44	\$ 45.86	\$35 - \$95	\$ 2,017.84
Engineering Designer	Cajegas, Cyam	CJC	32	\$ 57.98	\$35 - \$95	\$ 1,855.36
CAD Technician	Kenny, Patrick	PSK	120	\$ 48.60	\$30 - \$65	\$ 5,832.00
Senior CAD Designer	Maechler, Bob	BRM	0	\$ 64.32	\$39 - \$75	\$ -
Senior Engineer	Pohll, Martin	MNP	8	\$ 97.38	\$55 - \$125	\$ 779.04
Survey Project Manager	Survey Project Manager	PrSu	0	\$ 53.14	\$45 - \$75	\$ -
Senior Survey Project Manager	Senior Survey Project Manager	SuMa	24	\$ 85.68	\$65 - \$95	\$ 2,056.32
Principal Engineer	Morgan, Dace	DBM	44	\$ 95.21	\$80 - \$135	\$ 4,189.24
Student Intern	Student Intern	StIn	0	\$ 23.00	\$18 - \$31	\$ -
Engineering Designer	Kravets, Jackson	JHK	116	\$ 46.11	\$35 - \$95	\$ 5,348.76
Engineering Designer	Edgar, Mahala	MAE	0	\$ 43.03	\$35 - \$95	\$ -
Professional Engineer	Kotsyubuk, Igor	ILK	0	\$ 66.58	\$45 - \$100	\$ -
Engineering Designer	Zubarev, Aleksandr	AAZ	0	\$ 47.36	\$35 - \$95	\$ -
CAD Technician	CAD Technician	CADt	0	\$ 43.00	\$30 - \$65	\$ -
Principal Engineer	Young, Gregory	GRY	0	\$ 106.19	\$80 - \$135	\$ -
Engineering Designer	Carlson, Neil	NJC	0	\$ 39.86	\$35 - \$95	\$ -
Senior Engineer	Eaton, Tyler	TZE	0	\$ 81.43	\$55 - \$125	\$ -
Principal Engineer	Scroggs, Linda	LS	12	\$ 86.54	\$80 - \$135	\$ 1,038.48
Professional Engineer	Arias, David	DA	24	\$ 57.50	\$45 - \$100	\$ 1,380.00
Engineering Designer	McNulty, Katelyn	KM	40	\$ 38.94	\$35 - \$95	\$ 1,557.60
		0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Project Accountant	Project Accountant	AdAs	12	\$ 41.19	\$20 - \$60	\$ 494.28
		Subtotal:	889			\$ 66,587.03

LABOR COSTS

a) Subtotal Direct Labor Costs

\$ 66,587.03

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

\$ -

c) **Total Direct Labor Costs [(a) + (b)]** \$ 66,587.03

INDIRECT COSTS

d) Fringe Benefits (Rate: 39.00%):

e) Total Fringe Benefits [(c) x (d)] \$ 25,968.94

f) Overhead (Rate: 115.80%):

g) Overhead [(c) x (f)] \$ 77,107.78

h) General and Administrative (Rate: 0.00%):

i) Gen & Admin [(c) x (h)] \$ -

j) **Total Indirect Costs [(e) + (g) + (i)]** \$ 103,076.72

FIXED FEE

k) **TOTAL FIXED FEE [(c) + (j)] x fixed fee 10.00%** \$ 16,966.38

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

Description of Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Mileage Costs	160	Miles	\$ 0.670	\$ 107.20
Per Diem/Hotel		Day	\$ -	\$ -
Equipment Rental and Supplies		EA	\$ -	\$ -
Permit Fees		EA	\$ -	\$ -
Vendor Reproduction				\$ -
Vellum		EA		\$ -
8 1/2 X 11 Reproduction		EA		\$ -
11 X 17 Reproduction		EA		\$ -
Mounting Boards for Presentations		EA		\$ -
Newsletters (Translation and printing)		EA		\$ -
Title Report		EA	\$ 850.00	\$ -
Miscellaneous	1	EA	\$ 6.77	\$ 6.77
l) TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS				\$ 113.97

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

Crawford				\$ 42,777.51
HDR				\$ -
Gallaway				\$ 10,678.39
0				\$ -
m) TOTAL SUBCONSULTANTS' COSTS				\$ 53,455.90
n) Total Other Direct Costs INCLUDING SUBCONSULTANTS [(l)+(m)]				\$ 53,569.87
TOTAL COST [(c) + (j) + (k) + (n)]				\$ 240,200.00

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 costs 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 remain fixed for the life of the contract.
- Anticipated salary increases calculation (page 2) must accompany.

Exhibit 10-H1 Cost Proposal Page 2 of 3
Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee or Lump Sum or Firm Fixed Price Contracts
(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	Total Hours per Cost		Avg Hourly	5 Year Contract Duration
Cost Proposal	Proposal		Rate	
\$ 66,587.03	885	=	\$75.24	Year 1 Avg Hourly Rate

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	\$75.24	+	5%	=	\$79.00	Year 2 Avg Hourly Rate
Year 2	\$79.00	+	5%	=	\$82.95	Year 3 Avg Hourly Rate
Year 3	\$82.95	+	5%	=	\$87.10	Year 4 Avg Hourly Rate
Year 4	\$87.10	+	5%	=	\$91.46	Year 5 Avg Hourly Rate

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

	Estimated % Completed		Total Hours per Cost		Total Hours	
	Each Year		Proposal		per Year	
Year 1	50.00%	*	885	=	443	Estimated Hours Year 1
Year 2	50.00%	*	885	=	443	Estimated Hours Year 2
Year 3	0.00%	*	885	=	0	Estimated Hours Year 3
Year 4	0.00%	*	885	=	0	Estimated Hours Year 4
Year 5	0.00%	*	885	=	0	Estimated Hours Year 5
	Total		Total	=	885	

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

	Avg Hourly Rate		Estimated hours		Cost per	
	(calculated above)		(calculated above)		Year	
Year 1	\$75.24	*	443	=	\$33,293.52	Estimated Hours Year 1
Year 2	\$79.00	*	443	=	\$34,957.50	Estimated Hours Year 2
Year 3	\$82.95	*	0	=	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 3
Year 4	\$87.10	*	0	=	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 4
Year 5	\$91.46	*	0	=	\$0.00	Estimated Hours Year 5
	Total Direct Labor Cost with Escalation			=	\$68,251.02	
	Direct Labor Subtotal before Escalation			=	\$ 66,587.03	
	Estimated total of Direct Labor Salary Increase			=	\$1,663.99	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. Generally 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 Service
6. 48 Code of Federal Regulations Part 9904 - Cost 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 approved or Caltrans accepted Indirect Cost Rate(s).

Prime Consultant or Subconsultant Certifying:

Name: Jason Jurrens, P.E. Title *: Regional Manager

Signature :  Date of Certification (mm/dd/yyyy): 1/9/2026

Email: jason.jurrens@consoreng.com Phone Number: 916.368.9181

Address: 11017 Coblerock Drive Suite 100 Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

*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 services the consultant is providing under the proposed contract:

Project Management, design, PS&E and construction support

COST PROPOSAL 1

COST-PLUS-FIXED FEE OR LUMP SUM OR FIRM FIXED PRICE CONTRACTS

Note: Mark-ups are Not Allowed

Prime Consultant Subconsultant 2nd Tier Subconsultant

Consultant **Crawford & Associates, Inc.**

Project No. _____ Contract No. _____ Date **9/16/2025**

Project Name **Clover Creek Box Culver at First Street- Geotechnical and Const Support & Obs Services**

DIRECT LABOR

Classification/Title	Name	Hours	Actual Hourly Rate	Total
Principal *	Benjamin Crawford	0.0	\$70.30	\$ -
Principal *	Eric Nichols	52.0	\$59.09	\$ 3,072.68
Principal *	Shawn Leyva	0.0	\$62.00	\$ -
Senior Project Manager	Chris Trumbull	12.0	\$72.50	\$ 870.00
Project Manager II	TBD	0.0	\$54.85	\$ -
Project Manager I	TBD	0.0	\$52.88	\$ -
Senior Engineer / Geologist	TBD	104.0	\$46.43	\$ 4,828.72
Project Engineer II / Geologist	TBD	0.0	\$42.00	\$ -
Project Engineer I / Geologist	TBD	70.0	\$37.50	\$ 2,625.00
Staff Engineer / Geologist	TBD	0.0	\$32.88	\$ -
Drafter	TBD	0.0	\$32.00	\$ -
Senior Project Coordinator	TBD	0.0	\$36.75	\$ -
Project Coordinator	TBD	0.0	\$29.00	\$ -
Administrative Assistant	TBD	14.0	\$29.75	\$ 416.50
Special Inspector	TBD	0.0	\$44.50	\$ -
Senior Technician	TBD	0.0	\$38.50	\$ -
Staff Technician	TBD	0.0	\$33.48	\$ -
Special Inspector I (Masonry) **	TBD	0.0	\$52.48	\$ -
Special Inspector II (Welding) **	TBD	0.0	\$51.05	\$ -
Laborer Technician **	TBD	0.0	\$37.63	\$ -
Soils/Asphalt Technician **	TBD	0.0	\$48.25	\$ -
Concrete Technician **	TBD	0.0	\$45.58	\$ -

252

LABOR COSTS

a) Subtotal Direct Labor Costs	\$ 11,812.90
b) Anticipated Salary Increases (see page 2 for calculation)	\$ 0.00
c) TOTAL DIRECT LABOR COSTS [(a) + (b)]	\$ 11,812.90

INDIRECT COSTS

d) Fringe Benefits	Rate: 88.29% e) Total Fringe Benefits [(c) x (d)]	\$ 10,429.61
f) Overhead	Rate: 116.79% g) Overhead [(c) x (f)]	\$ 13,796.29
h) General & Administrative	Rate: 20.00% i) Gen & Admin [(c) x (h)]	\$ 2,362.58
Combined ICR %:	225.08%	
j) TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS [(e) + (g) + (i)]		\$ 26,588.48

FIXED FEE	k) TOTAL FIXED FEE [(c) + (j)] x fixed fee 10%]	\$ 3,840.14
------------------	--	-------------

I) CONSULTANT'S OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODC) - ITEMIZE

Description of Item	Quantity	Unit	Unit Cost	Total
Mileage (Current IRS Rate)	800	Mile	\$ 0.67	\$ 536.00
Vehicle Charge	0	Day	\$ 25.00	\$ -
Per Diem (Lodging)	0	Day	\$ -	\$ -
Per Diem (Meals)	0	Day	\$ -	\$ -
Encroachment Permit	0	Cost	\$ -	\$ -
				\$ 536.00

m) SUBCONSULTANT'S COSTS (Add additional pages if necessary)

Subconsultant 1:	\$ -
Subconsultant 2:	\$ -
m) TOTAL SUBCONSULTANT'S COSTS	\$ -

n) TOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS INCLUDING SUBCONSULTANTS [(l) + (m)]	\$ 536.00
TOTAL COST [(c) + (j) + (k) + (n)]	\$ 42,777.51

** Indicates prevailing wage work

CALCULATIONS FOR ANTICIPATED SALARY INCREASE

1. Calculate Average Hourly Rate for 1st Year of the Contract (Direct labor subtotal divided by total hours)

Direct Labor Subtotal per Cost Proposal	Total Hours per Cost Proposal	=	Avg Hourly Rate	5 Year Contract Duration
<u>\$11,812.90</u>	<u>252</u>		<u>46.88</u>	Year 1 Avg Hourly Rate

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	\$46.88	+	5.0%	=	\$49.22	Year 2 Avg Hourly Rate
Year 2	\$49.22	+	5.0%	=	\$51.68	Year 3 Avg Hourly Rate
Year 3	\$51.68	+	5.0%	=	\$54.27	Year 4 Avg Hourly Rate
Year 4	\$54.27	+	5.0%	=	\$56.98	Year 5 Avg Hourly 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	100%	*	252	=	252.00	Est Hours Year 1
Year 2	0%	*	252	=	0.00	Est Hours Year 2
Year 3	0%	*	252	=	0.00	Est Hours Year 3
Year 4	0%	*	252	=	0.00	Est Hours Year 4
Year 5	0%	*	252	=	0.00	Est Hours Year 5
Total	100%		Total	=	252.00	

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	\$46.88	*	252	=	\$11,812.90	Est Hours Year 1
Year 2	\$49.22	*	0	=	\$0.00	Est Hours Year 2
Year 3	\$51.68	*	0	=	\$0.00	Est Hours Year 3
Year 4	\$54.27	*	0	=	\$0.00	Est Hours Year 4
Year 5	\$56.98	*	0	=	\$0.00	Est Hours Year 5
Total Direct Labor Cost with Escalation				=	\$11,812.90	
Direct Labor Subtotal before Escalation				=	\$11,812.90	
Estimated Total of Direct Labor Salary Increase				=	<u>\$0.00</u>	<i>(Transfers to Page 1)</i>

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 years = \$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.

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. Generally 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
6. 48 Code of Federal Regulations Part 9904 - Cost 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 approved or Caltrans accepted In direct Cost Rate(s).

Prime Consultant or Subconsultant Certifying:

Name: Benjamin D. Crawford Title *: President

Signature :  Date of Certification: 9/16/2025

Email: ben.crawford@crawford-inc.com Phone Number: (916) 455-4225

Address: Crawford & Associates, Inc., 4701 Freeport Blvd., Sacramento, CA 95822

*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 services the consultant is providing under the proposed contract:

Geotechnical Engineering Services - Construction Support and Observation

COST PROPOSAL

CONTRACT No. _____
 CONSULTANT Galloway Enterprises, Inc

Date 19-Sep-25

DIRECT LABOR

Classification	Name	Range	Hours	Initial Hourly Rate	Total
Sr. Biologist/Project Manager	Jessica Sellers/ Nick Perazzo		9.0 @	\$ 35.00	\$ 315.00
Sr. Planner/Sr. Project Manager	Kevin Sevier		22.0 @	\$ 46.00	\$ 1,012.00
planner	Anthony McLaughlin		58.0 @	\$ 43.00	\$ 2,494.00
GIS Analyst 1	Staff		10.0 @	\$ 43.00	\$ 430.00
Administrator / Clerical	Ganna Kleppe		3.0 @	\$ 28.00	\$ 84.00
			@	\$	\$
Subtotal Direct Labor Costs					\$ 4,335.00

Total Direct Labor Costs \$ 4,335.00

FRINGE BENEFITS
 Fringe Benefits

	Rate	Total	
	34.00%	\$ 1,473.90	
Total Fringe Benefits			\$ <u>1,473.90</u>

INDIRECT COSTS

Overhead/General and Administrative

	87.00%	\$ 3,771.45	
Total Indirect Costs			\$ <u>3,771.45</u>

FEE

\$ 958.04

Direct Cost

Mileage (@.70/mi)

200 miles

\$	<u>140.00</u>
\$	<u> </u>

Total Direct Costs \$
 \$ 140.00

TOTAL COSTS

\$ 10,678.39


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. Generally 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 Service
6. 48 Code of Federal Regulations Part 9904 - Cost 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:	<u>Kevin Sevier</u>	Title *:	<u>Vice President</u>
Signature:	<u></u>	Date of Certification:	<u>9/19/2025</u>
Email:	<u>Kevin Sevier</u>	Phone number:	<u>530-332-9909</u>
Address:	<u>117 Meyers Street, Suite 120, Chico, CA 95928</u>		

* 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 services the consultant is providing under the proposed contract:

Environmental Consulting
