

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER  
FROM: RON WHISENAND, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR  
SUBJECT: GATEWAY DESIGN STANDARDS CONTRACT  
DATE: MARCH 6, 2007

---

Needs: For the City Council to consider allocating additional funds to expand the consultant Work Scope for the Gateway Design Standards project to include the Ad Hoc review process.

- Facts:
1. On February 6, 2007, the City Council rejected a request to supplement the budget for the Gateway Design Standards by \$30,000 and directed staff to work with Council's Ad Hoc Committee on Gateway Standards to modify the scope of work to get a final work product that was closer to the original budget.
  2. The original supplemental budget and amended Work Scope was primarily in reaction to a change in the processing of the Gateway Design Standards to include a Council, Planning Commission, and Community Ad Hoc Committee. An Ad Hoc Committee review, which resulted in extra meetings and travel was not included in the original Work Scope and contract with the firm of HDR Town Planning.
  3. Staff has worked with the consultant on optional ways to keep the costs down but compensate for extra meetings and travel associated with preparation of the Gateway Standards and Chandler Ranch Peer Review. A revised proposal was received on February 20, 2007 (attached) which proposes combining some remaining tasks that will result in fewer trips to the Paso area. The revised scope will result in a request for \$4,620 for the Gateway Design Standards and \$4,785 for CRASP Peer Review (totaling \$9,405).
  4. Staff met with the Council Ad Hoc Committee of Mayor Mecham and Councilman Picanco on February 20, 2007. The Ad Hoc Committee accepted the modified scope of work and supported the request to supplement the budget by \$10,000.

Analysis  
and

Conclusion: The Ad Hoc Committee review process has clearly changed the work scope and character of the Gateway Study. However with a few changes to the Work Scope, the gateway consultant has been able to create some cost savings. In addition, it is important to note that the earlier proposal used a higher hourly billing rate for a principle at the firm to be involved in the Ad Hoc process and all future community presentations. HDR has eliminated this supplemental charge and is keep the billing rate consistent with the original contract.

It is recognized that the Gateway Design Standards will be a key element used to shape the City's image, future economic development and preservation of the community's character. This project supports the City's Economic Strategy and General Plan. With the broader participation

of the ad hoc committee, the Gateway Design Standards will more closely express the community's design goals and vision.

Fiscal

Impacts: An additional amount, not to exceed, \$10,000 is required to supplement the budget adopted for the Gateway Design Standards project. The funding may be allocated from the General Fund.

The two year budget/four-year financial plan adopted by the Council on June 7, 2005 projected that the General Fund would experience a \$48,200 positive operating result for fiscal year 2007. Since the budget was adopted, the Council has approved the following additional General Fund "net" budget appropriations:

Reso 06-184	Carry-over Requests	\$249,800
Reso 06-081	HdL Property Tax Software	6,200
Reso 06-165	PWS Incentive Payment	14,900
Reso 06-187	13 <sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Dedication	25,000
Reso 06-199	Parking Lot Repairs	18,500
Reso 06-203	Salinas River Corridor Plan	27,000
Reso 06-103	Pioneer Park Security	40,000
Reso 06-221	School Water Bill Relief	61,000
Reso 07-008	Traffic Signal Maintenance	20,000
Reso 07-029	Storm Water Management Plan	17,000
Reso 07-033	Replacement Vehicles	<u>59,400</u>
Total YTD		<u>\$538,800</u>

These additional appropriations, net of revenues, would give rise to a \$(490,600) budgeted deficit *assuming worst case scenario* that revenues are collected at 2005 estimated levels and all expenditure appropriations are spent. Thus, this request would increase the projected General Fund operating deficit by an additional \$10,000.

Options:

- a. Adopt Resolution No. 07-xx appropriating an additional \$10,000 to budget Account No. 100-710-5224-301; or
- b. Amend, modify, or reject the above option.

Attachment:

Resolution and Revised Scope of Services

RESOLUTION NO.

A RESOLUTION OF  
THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES  
ALLOCATING ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO EXPAND THE SCOPE OF WORK  
OF THE CONSULTANTS, HDR TOWN PLANNING AND  
CRAWFORD MULTARI & CLARK ASSOCIATES  
TO PREPARE THE GATEWAY DESIGN STANDARDS

WHEREAS, on June 20, 2006 the City Council selected the professional consulting firms of HDR/Town Planning and Crawford Multari & Clark Associates to prepare Gateway Design Standards; and

WHEREAS, the budget allocation for the contracted Scope of Work for the Gateway Design Standards is \$60,000; and

WHEREAS, the City Council requested additional services including: several Council and Stakeholder Ad Hoc Committee meetings; and more input on the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Peer Review; and

WHEREAS, the additional requested services for this project would be amount not to exceed \$10,000; and

WHEREAS, the expanded work scope is found to be necessary to provide broader input into the Gateway Design Standard process; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Update, 2003 and the 2006 Paso Robles Economic Strategy contain policies and statements that support preparation and implementation of Gateway Design Standards; and

WHEREAS, the City has received a revised budget estimate for the proposed amended Scope of Work from the consulting firms of HDR/Town Planning and Crawford Multari & Clark Associates to provide for the additional services requested to prepare Gateway Design Standards, in the amount of \$10,000, which is included in Exhibit A.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Council of the City of Paso Robles does hereby approve a supplemental budget appropriation for \$10,000 from General Fund Reserves to Budget Account No. 100-710-5224-301 to fund this amended Scope of Work to prepare Gateway Design Standards (this is a “not to exceed” authorization).

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 6th day of March, 2007 by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

\_\_\_\_\_  
FRANK R. MECHAM, MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
DEBORAH ROBINSON, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

20 February 2007

City of Paso Robles  
Community Development Department  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Attn: Ron Whisenand, Director

Re: Paso Robles Gateways and Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Peer Review  
Proposed Scope and Fee Amendment

Dear Ron,

Per our previous correspondence on this matter, we propose the following amendments to the scope of our agreement for this project.

**Paso Robles Gateways**

The Ad Hoc Committee process was not contemplated when we prepared the scope of services for this project, and we request additional compensation for our time in participating in that process which, by the way, we find to be very productive. Four Ad Hoc Committee meetings either have occurred or are contemplated:

Task 2.1: confirm gateways	5 hours @ \$220/hr = \$1,100
Task 2.2: present designs	Combined with staff meeting, no additional charge
Task 2.4/2.5: present code	8 hours @ \$220/hr = \$1,760
<u>Task 3.1: brief council, present</u>	<u>8 hours @ \$220/hr = \$1,760</u>
<b>Additional Fee Requested</b>	<b>\$4,620</b>

**Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Peer Review**

Our proposal contemplated our meeting with staff one or two times and preparing a report, and we included a budget of \$7,500 in our proposal. Our time spent on the peer review to date is:

Document review and recommendation diagrams:	19 hours @ \$155/hr = \$2,945
Document review	3 hours @ \$220/hr = \$660
<u>Attendance of 3 meetings</u>	<u>15 hours @ \$220/hr = \$3,300</u>
<i>Total to date</i>	<i>\$6,905</i>

The process for this review is quite different from what we had anticipated when we made our proposal to you initially. As with the Ad Hoc Committee process on the Gateway project, we think that the process that has unfolded is a good process, it just requires significantly more of our time. Instead of just preparing a report on the Draft Specific Plan as it existed when we were hired, we have been working interactively with the applicant to develop an improved master plan, on which revisions to the Specific Plan will then be based.

So initially we provided comments and recommendations on the plan as it existed at the time, and since then have been meeting with the applicants and your staff to improve the plan. We have not received drawings to review in advance of these meetings, so I have just provided comments on the fly, which I am very accustomed to doing. But it would be more cost effective for the City if we received drawings that I – and others who bill at lower rates than I do – could review them and provide written comments. This would also avoid travel time and expense, although I have been billing for much less than all my travel time to date.

I would suggest that the following additional scope and fee be added to allow us to complete this peer review.

Document review and report	12 hours @ \$155/hr = \$1,860
Document review	6 hours @ \$220/hr = \$1,320
Attendance of 2 meetings	10 hours @ \$220/hr = \$2,200

To complete	\$5,380
Remaining per contract	\$ 595

**Additional Fee Requested \$4,785**

Please let me know if you have any questions about this proposal. We very much appreciate the opportunity to work with the City of Paso Robles on these interesting projects.

Yours Truly,

HDR TOWN PLANNING



David Sargent, AIA, CNU  
Principal

Accepted and Agreed

City of Paso Robles

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signed

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

HDR Engineering, Inc.

Michael Greenberg, PE  
Vice President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

