



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

Board of Directors Agenda Summary April 13, 2011

1:30 PM Regular Meeting

**Meeting Location:
Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Training Center
1699 Sierra Avenue
Yuba City, CA**

The agenda is posted in the building of the Sutter County Superintendent of Schools Training Center, 1699 Sierra Avenue, Yuba City, CA 95993, and at the Sutter County Library, 750 Forbes Avenue, Yuba City. The agenda summary and backup materials, and approved minutes are also posted on the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency website at www.sutterbutteflood.org. Materials related to an item on this agenda and submitted to the Board of Directors after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the office of the Board Clerk at 1160 Civic Center Blvd., Yuba City, during normal business hours. In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, the meeting room is wheelchair accessible and disabled parking is available. If you have a disability and need disability related modifications or accommodations to participate in this meeting, please contact Sarah Modeste at the Sutter Butte Flood Control Office, 1227 Bridge Street, Suite C, Yuba City, CA 95993 or 530-755-9859. Requests must be made one full business day before the start of the meeting.

<u>County of Sutter</u> 1. Larry Montna 2. James Gallagher Alts. Larry Munger, Stan Cleveland	<u>County of Butte</u> 1. Bill Connelly 2. Steve Lambert
<u>City of Yuba City</u> 1. John Miller 2. John Dukes Alts. John Buckland, Tej Maan	<u>City of Gridley</u> 1. Owen Stiles Alt. Jerry Anne Fichter
<u>City of Live Oak</u> 1. Gary Baland Alt. Felicity Clark	<u>City of Biggs</u> 1. Mike Bottorff Alt. Bo Sheppard
<u>Levee District 1</u> 1. Francis Silva 2. Al Montna Alt. Barbara LeVake	<u>Levee District 9</u> 1. David Lamon 2. David Schmidl Alt. Chris Schmidl

Persons wishing to address the Board during consideration of matters listed on the agenda will be allowed to do so. Testimony should always begin with the speaker giving his or her name and place of residence. Requests for assistive listening devices or other accommodations, such as interpretive services, should be made through the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency office at (530) 755-9859. Requests should be made at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Later requests will be accommodated to the extent feasible.

1:30 PM REGULAR MEETING/CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call

Pledge of Allegiance

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar groups together those items which are considered noncontroversial or for which prior policy direction has been given to staff and that require only routine action by the Board. The Chairman will advise the audience that the matters may be adopted in total by one motion; however, the Board may, at its option or upon request of a member of the public, consider any matter separately.

- 1) Approval of the minutes for the Regular Board Meeting of March 9, 2011

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEMS

- 2) Receive and file February financial report.
- 3) Overview of the Central Valley Flood Protection Association by Executive Director Melinda Terry.
- 4) Presentation of right-of-way plan and workshop by Bender Rosenthal, Inc. and Downey Brand LLC.
- 5) Introductory presentation of the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project (FRWLRP) Environmental workshop by Jones & Stokes.
- 6) Approval of HDR Task Order 2 for design-level geotechnical investigations, borrow site assessment, additional setback evaluation, supplemental utility designs for 30% design, and additional Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA team coordination.
- 7) Approval of Bender Rosenthal's Amendment 1 to Task Order 1 for right-of-way support services.
- 8) Approval of ICF-Jones & Stokes Task Order 4 Amendment No.1 – Preparation of CEQA Categorical Exemption for Additional Geotechnical Explorations for the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project
- 9) Approval of Subtasks 3, 4 and 5 under Peterson Brustad's Task Order 7 for Feather River Levee Project Screening Analysis work and Lower Feather River Levee Setback Analysis for Alternative 3
- 10) Approval of Task Order 8 for Peterson Brustad for internal drainage study and analysis.
- 11) Review and approval of recommended CADAC charter amendments.

INFORMATIONAL AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL ITEMS

- 12) Other reports from Agency staff and consultants regarding current Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency activities.
- 13) Report (if necessary) by the Citizens' Assessment District Advisory Committee (CADAC).
- 14) Report (if necessary) by Levee District No. 1 regarding setback levee project at Star Bend (an early implementation project).
- 15) Report (if necessary) by the USACE Project Manager regarding current status of the Feasibility Study for the Sutter Basin.
- 16) Report (if necessary) by the DWR Senior Project Manager regarding current DWR activities.

CORRESPONDENCE

- 17) Report on correspondence sent by and received by the Board.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Members of the public will be allowed to address the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency's Board of Directors on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board. Any member of the audience who may wish to bring a matter before the Board that has not been placed on the agenda may do so at this time; however, State law provides that no action may be taken on any item not appearing on the posted Agenda.

ADJOURNMENT



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: William H. Edgar, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Approval of the Minutes for the Regular Board Meeting of March 9, 2011

We have attached the proposed minutes for the Board of Director's Regular meeting of March 9, 2011 for your review, modification, and/or approval.

Recommendation

We recommend that your Board approve the minutes and authorize the Chair to sign the minutes.

Thank you.

**MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SUTTER BUTTE FLOOD CONTROL AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING OF
March 9, 2011**

The Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency (Agency) Board of Directors (Board), State of California, met on the above date in Regular Session at 1:30 p.m. in the Superintendent of Schools, Training Center, 1699 Sierra Avenue, Yuba City, California.

MEMBERS PRESENT: County of Sutter: Larry Montna, Stan Cleveland
County of Butte: Steve Lambert
City of Yuba City: John Miller, John Dukes
City of Gridley: Owen Stiles
City of Live Oak: Gary Baland
City of Biggs: Mike Bottorff
Levee District 1: Francis Silva, Al Montna
Levee District 9: David Schmidl, David Lamon

MEMBERS ABSENT: Director Bill Connelly

STAFF PRESENT: Bill Edgar, Interim Executive Director; Scott Shapiro, Agency Counsel; David Peterson, Agency Engineer, Kim Floyd, Agency Public Information Officer, and Sarah Modeste, Staff Analyst

REGULAR SESSION

Chair Steve Lambert opened the meeting and led the Board and audience in the pledge.

CONSENT CALENDAR

On motion of Director Larry Montna, seconded by Director Owen Stiles, and carried by those present, with the exception of Director Stan Cleveland who abstained, the Board approved the Consent Calendar as follows:

- 1) Approval of the minutes for the Regular Board Meeting of February 9, 2011

PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, AND ACTION ITEMS

- 2) Presentation of new accounting structure and proposed new Board financial report.

Mr. Edgar presented a PowerPoint presentation of the updated accounting structure and financial reports. He provided an overview of the tracking system as well as the availability of funds and cash flow as of January 2011. Mr. Edgar said that next steps include meeting with the engineering team to determine upcoming task order estimates for completing the design phase, securing the EIP design agreement with DWR, amending the Agency's budget for fiscal year 2010-2011 and fiscal year 2011-2012, preparing a proposed budget for fiscal year 2012-2013, and ongoing evaluation of financial needs.

The design grant and State funding will likely reach the Agency in fall 2011 if the design grant is executed this spring, so the Agency will need to evaluate the anticipated cash flow to determine if short term debt would be needed in addition to the line of credit secured through the City of Yuba City. He explained that it is necessary to continue monitoring the cash flow so the project pace can be maintained.

Director John Dukes asked if the cash shortfall was anticipated to be an annual problem. Mr. Edgar responded that it will likely take place until the Agency issues debt for construction work. Director Mike Bottorff asked if the Agency could budget for the short fall annually. Mr. Edgar responded that the cash flow is a function of the available cash in the bank and that the line of credit will be used to make sure that cash is available to pay bills.

Director Dukes asked if the assessment funds will flow to the Agency throughout the year. Mr. Edgar responded that Sutter County does not operate on a teeter plan, so the County only pays once funds

are received. The Agency received the first installment of the assessment in February from the November payments.

Director Francis Silva asked how long until the Agency issues bonds. Agency Counsel Scott Shapiro responded that timing depends upon the design and environmental process because the Agency doesn't want to pay interest on money that isn't needed immediately. It would be safe to assume it will be 18 months until debt is issued.

No action taken on this item.

3) Presentation of Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project (FRWLRP) Pre-Design Formulation Report.

Chris Krivanec, HDR project manager for the design portion of the project, and Les Harder, HDR senior technical advisor, presented the recommended levee repair alternative, which is currently under review by the independent technical review board and other agencies. The PowerPoint presentation was provided to Board members at the meeting.

Director Mike Bottorff asked for additional information on the 30% design. Mr. Krivanec responded that the design is broken into four segments – 30%, 60%, 90% and final design – so comments and approval can be obtained incrementally through the design process.

Director Gary Baland asked if each of the alternatives required two unique designs. Mr. Krivanec responded that the environmental process requires viable alternatives; the first may include a fix-in-place, and the second may be a project with a larger footprint. Many of the studies for each alternative can be included in the final project design.

Director John Dukes asked if the slurry wall and rehabilitation work will bring the levees to the 1957 profile. Mr. Harder responded that that would not be the case in all areas. He explained that HDR is designing to meet the 200-year or 100-year protection and that in the past DWR has stated that it will not fund work beyond the 200-year protection levels, thus leaving the costs to the local agencies.

Director Mike Bottorff asked for an explanation of geomorphology. Mr. Harder responded that it is, simply stated, the study of landforms. Director Al Montna asked why additional borings would be needed. Mr. Harder responded that the previous borings were not evenly distributed, and therefore not all were useful, but that the design team is sensitive to the Agency's finances and will only request additional borings when necessary.

Director Dukes asked what water source would be used to fill the canals. Mr. Harder responded that, currently, the team plans to use wells, but would evaluate the options throughout the remainder of the design phase.

Director Bottorff asked what type of material would be used to modify the levees. Mr. Harder responded that it would be modified soil that meets DWR criteria.

Mr. Harder explained that the Agency may need to engage in extended conversations with the approval agencies, including the Corps, DWR, and the Central Valley Flood Protection Board because they will probably not accept all of the cost reduction measures that we are recommending.

Mr. Edgar requested that the Board provide Agency staff with guidance to proceed with the optimized alternative, as presented by HDR.

A motion was made by Director John Dukes to provide guidance to proceed with the optimized alternative as presented by HDR. Director Owen Stiles and was carried by those present.

4) Approval of a flood risk resolution as required for State EIP funding.

Agency Counsel Scott Shapiro explained that the Agency, as well as the member agencies, need to adopt resolutions stating that there is a flood risk in their jurisdictions.

The staff will work with the cities and counties to ensure that the resolutions are also adopted by member agencies.

Resolution 11-001-SBFCA, a resolution to the Board of Directors of the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency approval the flood risk resolution as required by the State of California to obtain State Elp funding was adopted on the motion of Director Francis Silva, and seconded by Director Larry Montna and carried by those present as it appears on the record at Page 2011-1.

- 5) Approval of first two (2) subtasks under Task Order 7 to Peterson Brustad Inc:
- a. Hydraulic analysis for alternative setbacks suggested by HDR Design Team in the Pre-Design Formulation Report – Limited to 92 Hours - \$12,738
 - b. Hydraulic modeling technical support as required (modeling for appeals, requests from FEMA and USACE, and requests from the HDR Design Team) – Limited to 110 hours - \$15,125.
- Mr. Edgar stated that Task Order 7 was approved at the February meeting, and these sub tasks fall under that Task Order. Mr. Edgar stated that he would like the Board's approval to authorize this work.

There was no public comment.

A motion was made by Director John Miller to approve the two subtasks for Peterson Brustad Inc. to complete hydraulic analysis for alternative setbacks and hydraulic modeling technical support. The motion was seconded by Director David Lamon and was carried by those present.

- 6) Selection and approval of a contract with a title company to perform title and escrow services.
- Mr. Edgar explained that staff thought that the preparation of title reports and escrow services could be completed by a local company. The Board authorized staff to issue a request for proposals at the February 2011 meeting, and three companies responded. One company was located in Sutter County, one in Butte County, and one is Sacramento.

Agency Counsel Scott Shapiro explained that the title company would help identify property ownership, and provide escrow services should a property be needed. While the Agency does not desire to obtain additional land, State guidelines are very clear that the State will pay 100 percent of the costs to obtain land that it should have already obtained.

The request for proposals was provided to numerous companies within Sutter and Butte Counties, as well as one company in Sacramento. One company from Sutter County, and one from Butte County submitted, however both stated that they were unable to provide title work outside their county. Agency staff recommends that Bidwell complete work for Butte County and North State for Sutter County.

At a discussion with several members making up an ad hoc committee, members stated that it is preferred to work with local companies, but not at the expense of the project. The committee recommended:

1. Selects all three responding firms (North State, Bidwell and Fidelity National) as vendors for the title and escrow services.
2. Directs staff to negotiate and execute service agreements with all three vendors on a time and materials basis.
3. Directs staff to authorize services from the three vendors in a total amount not to exceed \$100,000 with work to be allocated by staff between the three vendors based on the Board's goal of keeping work local and based on the vendor's capabilities.
4. Directs staff to return in May or June to report on the status of service and to obtain additional financial authorization from the Board to continue the services as needed in support of the project.

Director John Dukes asked if the State would also pay for title and escrow services for property it should have previously purchased. Mr. Shapiro stated that that was the case.

Madison Wiggins said that title insurance is based on the size of the property, and escrow is approximately \$400-\$500 per parcels.

Director Al Montna expressed his desire to get the work done, and the need to keep work moving forward, and encouraged the consultants to provide the work to the company able to complete the work most efficiently.

Director Gary Baland requested clarification on which company would be the prime. Mr. Shaipro explained that now, a contract would be executed with each of the companies, and a prime would no longer be required.

No public comment.

A motion was made by Director Al Montna to accept the ad hoc committee's four-step recommendation. The motion was seconded by Director John Dukes and was carried by those present.

- 7) **Approval of the Chair, or his designated representative, to represent the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency at a press conference coordinated by the Pacific Legal Foundation supporting the delisting of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle.**

Mr. Edgar explained that this item was brought up by alternate member Barbara LeVake, and asked that the Agency chair be in attendance at the event.

A motion was made by Director Owen Stiles to approve Chair Steve Lambert attendance at the press conference coordinated by the Pacific Legal Foundation supporting the delisting of the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle. The motion was seconded by Director John Dukes and was carried by those present.

INFORMATIONAL AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL ITEMS

- 8) **Other Reports from Agency staff and consultants regarding current Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency activities.**

Mr. Edgar explained that the Director of Engineering job posting has been circulated to more than 100 agencies and organizations, and the application period ends on March 21, 2011.

Public Outreach Manager Kim Floyd explained that three community open houses will be held at the end of April and that a newsletter will be mailed to residents announcing the open house locations and times. She added that on May 4 and 5 the Water Education Foundation will be conducting levee tours throughout the Sacramento Valley, and the Agency will be participating in the tour once it reaches Sutter County.

No Action Taken on this Item

- 9) **Report (if necessary) by the Citizens' Assessment District Advisory Committee (CADAC).**

Nothing to report at this time.

No Action Taken on this Item

- 10) **Report by Levee District No. 1 regarding setback levee project at Star Bend (an early implementation project).**

No report at this time.

No Action Taken on this Item

- 11) **Report by the United States Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) project manager re: current status of the Feasibility Study for the Sutter Basin.**

No report at this time.

No Action Taken on this Item

- 12) **Report (if necessary) by the Dept. of Water Resources (DWR) Senior Project Manager regarding DWR activities.**

No report at this time.

No Action Taken on this item

CORRESPONDENCE

- 13) **Response to Correspondence Received**

Mr. Edgar stated that there was no correspondence to be considered at this meeting.

No Action Taken on this item

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business coming before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

STEVE LAMBERT, CHAIR

ATTEST BY: _____
SARAH MODESTE, STAFF ANALYST



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: William H. Edgar, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Receive and File February Financial Report.

We have attached the February monthly financial report for the 2010-2011 fiscal year.

The financial report includes the following:

- Reconciliation of Total Working Capital as of February 28, 2011 as compared to the SBFCA Board's Adopted Budget
- Summary Statement of Cumulative Activities through February 28, 2011
- Summary of the Operating and Capital Contracts/Task Orders amounts paid to date for current contracts
- Latest summary cash flow protections
- The check register for the month of February for the 2010-2011 fiscal year

This is an informational item.

Recommendation

We recommend that your Board receive and file this item.

Thank you.



Yuba City
Finance Department
Memorandum

Date: April 13, 2011

To: Board Members, Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
William Edgar, Executive Director

From: Robin Bertagna, CPA *RB*
Finance Director, City of Yuba City

Subject: Monthly Financial Report: February, 2011

Attached is the Monthly Financial Report for the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency for the month of February of fiscal year 2010-2011.

This financial report includes the following information prepared by SBFCA:

- Reconciliation of total working capital as of February 28, 2011 compared to the SBFCA Board's Adopted Budget: This statement also shows the cumulative expenditures paid to date versus the expenditures invoiced to date (Exhibit A).
- Summary statement of cumulative activities through February 28, 2011: This statement shows the expenditures by fund and by the major expenditure category – Operations & Capital (USACE Study, EIP, and the Star Bend Payment). This statement also shows the amounts received and expended to date, as compared to the SBFCA Board's Adopted Budget for the 2010-11 Fiscal Year. This statement has been reconciled by SBFCA staff to the City of Yuba City's financial system (Exhibit B).
- Summary of the Operating and Capital Contract/Task Order amounts paid to date for contracts with activity in FY 10/11: This summary provides a comparison to the current contract/task order authority amounts (Exhibit C).
- Latest summary cash flow projections prepared by SBFCA (Exhibit D).

Additionally, a check register reflecting all checks issued on behalf of the Agency between February 1, 2011 through February 28, 2011 is included.

This item is informational only, no action is required. Please review and file.

Thank you.

SBFCA BUDGET

TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL RECONCILIATION

<u>Line Item Description</u>	<u>2010-11 Budget</u>	<u>Rec'd/Paid Month Ending February 2011</u>	<u>Rec'd/Invoiced to Date</u>
Working Capital Beginning of Period			
Operational Fund 730	282,908	282,908	282,908
Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study	(26,259)	(26,259)	(26,259)
Capital Fund 731 - EIP	332,905	332,905	332,905
Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend	2,569,885	2,569,885	2,569,885
Total Working Capital Beginning of Period	3,159,439	3,159,439	3,159,439
Transfers			
Operational Fund 730	700,000	700,000	700,000
Capital Fund 731			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study</i>			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP</i>	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
<i>Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend</i>	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)
Subtotal Capital Fund	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)
	-	-	-
Revenues			
Operational Fund 730	750,000	753,300	753,300
Capital Fund 731			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study</i>	1,067,495	81,357	81,357
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP (Local Funding)</i>	5,299,360	2,902,238	2,902,238
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP (State Funding)</i>	2,269,702	-	-
<i>Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend</i>	-	-	-
Subtotal Capital Fund	8,636,557	2,983,595	2,983,595
Total Revenues Operating & Capital	9,386,557	3,736,895	3,736,895
Expenses			
Operational Fund 730	758,025	237,981	237,981
Capital Fund 731			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study</i>	1,121,882	159,493	278,818
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP</i>	5,900,070	1,744,821	2,218,720
<i>Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend</i>	1,000,000	-	-
Subtotal Capital Fund	8,021,951	1,904,313	2,497,537
Total Expenses Operating & Capital	8,779,976	2,142,294	2,735,518
Working Capital End of Period			
Operational Fund 730	974,883	1,498,227	1,498,227
Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study	(80,646)	(104,395)	(223,720)
Capital Fund 731 - EIP	1,901,897	1,390,322	916,423
Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend	969,885	1,969,885	1,969,885
Total Working Capital End of Period	3,766,020	4,754,040	4,160,816

SBFCA BUDGET TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL RECONCILIATION

<u>Line Item Description</u>	<u>2010-11 Budget</u>	<u>Rec'd/Paid Month Ending February 2011</u>	<u>Rec'd/Invoiced to Date</u>
Working Capital Beginning of Period			
Operational Fund 730	282,908	282,908	282,908
Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study	(26,259)	(26,259)	(26,259)
Capital Fund 731 - EIP	332,905	332,905	332,905
Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend	2,569,885	2,569,885	2,569,885
Total Working Capital Beginning of Period	3,159,439	3,159,439	3,159,439
Transfers			
Operational Fund 730	700,000	700,000	700,000
Capital Fund 731			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study</i>			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP</i>	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
<i>Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend</i>	(600,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)
Subtotal Capital Fund	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)
	-	-	-
Revenues			
Operational Fund 730	750,000	753,300	753,300
Capital Fund 731			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study</i>	1,067,495	81,357	81,357
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP (Local Funding)</i>	5,299,360	2,902,238	2,902,238
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP (State Funding)</i>	2,269,702	-	-
<i>Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend</i>	-	-	-
Subtotal Capital Fund	8,636,557	2,983,595	2,983,595
Total Revenues Operating & Capital	9,386,557	3,736,895	3,736,895
Expenses			
Operational Fund 730	758,025	237,981	237,981
Capital Fund 731			
<i>Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study</i>	1,121,882	159,493	278,818
<i>Capital Fund 731 - EIP</i>	5,900,070	1,744,821	2,218,720
<i>Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend</i>	1,000,000	-	-
Subtotal Capital Fund	8,021,951	1,904,313	2,497,537
Total Expenses Operating & Capital	8,779,976	2,142,294	2,735,518
Working Capital End of Period			
Operational Fund 730	974,883	1,498,227	1,498,227
Capital Fund 731 - USACE Study	(80,646)	(104,395)	(223,720)
Capital Fund 731 - EIP	1,901,897	1,390,322	916,423
Capital Fund 731 - Star Bend	969,885	1,969,885	1,969,885
Total Working Capital End of Period	3,766,020	4,754,040	4,160,816

SUTTER BUTTE FLOOD CONTROL AGENCY
 SUMMARY OF OPERATING AND CAPITAL CONTRACT/TASK ORDER AMOUNTS PAID
 2010-11 FISCAL YEAR
 AS OF MONTH ENDING FEBRUARY 2011
 3/23/2011

	OPERATING CONTRACT AMOUNTS PAID COMPARED TO CONTRACT AMOUNTS				USACE STUDY				CAPITAL TASK ORDER AMOUNTS PAID COMPARED TO TASK ORDER AMOUNTS			
	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amounts	% of Contract Encumbered	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amount	% of Contract Encumbered	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amount	% of Contract Encumbered
GENERAL OPERATIONS												
Board of Senior Consultants:												
RiverSmith Engineering Inc	-	4,284	40,000	11%								
G. Silk Geotech. Eng. Consult., LLC	-	-	40,000	0%								
Donald H. Babbitt, P.E.	-	2,560	40,000	6%								
Capitol Finance Group, LLC	-	30,724	75,000	41%								
Downey Brand, LLP	279,536	169,371	622,500	71%								
Edgar & Associates LLP												
Original Contract (Prior 2/9/11)	377,420	123,719	515,719	97%								
Current Contract (Approved 2/9/11)	-	-	110,000	0%								
Kennedy Modeste Communications	-	20,099	75,000	27%								
Kim Floyd Communications, Inc	-	17,597	120,000	15%								
Lincoln Crow (Terminated 10/15/10)	166,469	33,587	189,956	100%								
KNN Public Finance	-	11,809	75,000	15%								
PHARMACEUTICALS (IP Business Breakthrough)												
Assessment District Formation	331,986.04	93,036.67	441,090	96%								
Assessment District Administration	-	4,928	110,000	4%								
Peterson Brunsad, Inc	465,376	223,445	844,000	82%								
Subtotal-General Operations	1,670,636	734,959	3,308,265	71%								

	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amount	% of Contract Encumbered	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amount	% of Contract Encumbered
CAPITAL SOFT COSTS								
Bender Rosenthal, Inc:								
Task Order 1-30% Design Support Ser.	-	39,239	100,000	39%				
HDR Engineering, Inc:								
Task Order 1-30% Design	-	905,483	2,896,515	31%				
ICE Jones and Stokes:								
USACE STUDY:								
Task Order 3-Invem. of Rec. Opp.	47,022	-	47,030	8				100%
Task Order 2-Invem. of Eco Sys. Opp.	76,041	-	76,046	5				100%
Task Order 5-Envir/w/ Proj. Cond Rept.	-	60,678	334,719	18%				
Subtotal-USACE Study	123,063	60,678	459,795	40%				
EARLY IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT:								
Task Order 3-Cul Ret-Cont-Amn.	-	-	-	-				
Task Order 4-Cat.Extern-Add.Borings	-	-	-	-				
Task Order 6-Prel Envir./Plan.Rept.	-	-	-	-				
Task Order 7-Prep-Envir/ Rept.	-	-	-	-				
Subtotal-EIP	-	-	-	-				
Peterson Brunsad, Inc:								
USACE STUDY:								
Task Order 2 (Plus 5 Amends.)-Hydr. Des.	333,575	58,783	445,357	88%				
Subtotal-USACE Study	333,575	58,783	445,357	88%				
EARLY IMPLEMENTATION PROJECT:								
Task Order 1-EIP Prel Design	-	112,700	112,700	100%				
Task Order 3-Funding Rec.Doc.	47,930	36,960	84,900	100%				
Task Orders 4, 5 & 6-EIP Prog.Mgt.	-	147,380	147,600	100%				
Task Order 7-Misc.Tech Support	-	-	100,000	0%				
Subtotal-EIP	47,930	179,540	440,200	77%				
Subtotal-Capital Soft Costs	456,638	1,064,182	3,903,667	39%				

	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amount	% of Contract Encumbered	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered Prior to 2010-11	2010-11 Paid/Encumbered to Date	Max to Encumber Contract Amount	% of Contract Encumbered
Subtotal-General Operations	1,670,636	734,959	3,308,265	71%				
Subtotal-Capital Soft Costs	456,638	1,064,182	3,903,667	39%				
Subtotal-Operating and Capital Contract/TASK ORDER AMOUNTS PAID	2,127,274	1,800,141	7,211,932	71%				

SUNGARD PENTAMATION, INC. - FUND ACCOUNTING
 DATE: 03/02/11
 TIME: 10:27:56

PAGE NUMBER: 1
 ACCTPA21

CITY OF YUBA CITY
 CHECK REGISTER - BY FUND

SELECTION CRITERIA: transact.fund in ("730", "731") and transact.ck_date between "02/01/2011" and "02/28/2011"
 ACCOUNTING PERIOD: 9/11

FUND - 730 - FLOOD CONTROL AGENCY

CASH ACCT	CHECK NO	ISSUE DT	VENDOR	FUND/DEPT	ACCT	DESCRIPTION	SALES TAX	AMOUNT
10100	171842	02/17/11	EDGAR & ASSOCIATES	7350	62701	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	3078.96
10100	171868	02/17/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	7350	62701	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	1001.02
10100	171868	02/17/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	7350	62701	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	806.35
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	1807.37
10100	171869	02/17/11	KIM FLOYD COMMUNICA	7350	62701	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	1123.97
10100	171903	02/17/11	PARSONS BRINCKERHOF	7350	62701	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	4927.80
10100	171966	02/24/11	AT&T	7350	62201	DP/1-8 TO 2-7-11	0.00	72.25
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNNEY BRAND ATTORN	7350	62730	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	3314.22
10100	172027	02/24/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	7350	62701	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	824.50
10100	172072	02/24/11	PETERSON, BRUSTAD,	7350	62701	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	10826.49
10100	172118	02/24/11	Y-S ECONOMIC DEVELO	7350	63201	CR/MARCH 2011 RENT	0.00	500.00
10100	172132	02/28/11	OFFICE DEPOT	7350	62501	SBFCA/TONER	0.00	8.81
TOTAL CASH ACCOUNT							0.00	26484.37
TOTAL FUND							0.00	26484.37

SELECTION CRITERIA: transact.fund in ("730","731") and transact.ck_date between "02/01/2011" and "02/28/2011"
 ACCOUNTING PERIOD: 9/11

FUND - 731 - SBFCA CAPITAL FUND

CASH ACCT	CHECK NO	ISSUE DT	VENDOR	FUND/DEPT	ACCT	DESCRIPTION	SALES TAX	AMOUNT
10100	171829	02/17/11	CAPITOL PUBLIC FINA	996001	66521	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6059.38
10100	171829	02/17/11	CAPITOL PUBLIC FINA	995001	66521	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6059.37
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	12118.75
10100	171842	02/17/11	EDGAR & ASSOCIATES	996001	66301	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6157.91
10100	171842	02/17/11	EDGAR & ASSOCIATES	995001	66301	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6157.92
10100	171842	02/17/11	EDGAR & ASSOCIATES	941064	65629	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	1887.40
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	14203.23
10100	171865	02/17/11	JONES & STOKES	995001	66403	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	1419.78
10100	171865	02/17/11	JONES & STOKES	996001	66403	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	1419.79
10100	171865	02/17/11	JONES & STOKES	941064	65632	SBFCA/OCT 2010 SERV	0.00	5474.16
10100	171865	02/17/11	JONES & STOKES	995001	66402	SBFCA/OCT 2010 SERV	0.00	202.87
10100	171865	02/17/11	JONES & STOKES	996001	66402	SBFCA/OCT 2010 SERV	0.00	202.87
10100	171865	02/17/11	JONES & STOKES	941064	65634	SBFCA/OCT 2010 SERV	0.00	8192.20
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	16911.67
10100	171868	02/17/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	996001	66302	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	2002.04
10100	171868	02/17/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	995001	66302	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	2002.04
10100	171868	02/17/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	996001	66302	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	1612.70
10100	171868	02/17/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	995001	66302	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	1612.71
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	7229.49
10100	171869	02/17/11	KIM FLOYD COMMUNICA	996001	66331	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	2247.94
10100	171869	02/17/11	KIM FLOYD COMMUNICA	995001	66331	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	2247.94
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	4495.88
10100	171994	02/24/11	DONALD H. BABBITT	996001	66704	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	977.15
10100	171994	02/24/11	DONALD H. BABBITT	995001	66604	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	57.47
10100	171994	02/24/11	DONALD H. BABBITT	996001	66604	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	57.47
10100	171994	02/24/11	DONALD H. BABBITT	995001	66704	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	977.15
10100	171994	02/24/11	DONALD H. BABBITT	996001	66804	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	490.76
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	2560.00
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	995001	66512	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	2898.40
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	996001	66321	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	5568.00
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	995001	66321	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	5568.00
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	941064	65630	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	1275.00
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	996001	66322	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6628.43
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	995001	66322	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6628.43
10100	171995	02/24/11	DOWNEY BRAND ATTORN	996001	66512	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	2898.40
TOTAL CHECK							0.00	31464.66
10100	172025	02/24/11	JONES & STOKES	996001	66411	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	2308.95
10100	172025	02/24/11	JONES & STOKES	995001	66411	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	2308.95
10100	172025	02/24/11	JONES & STOKES	995001	66401	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	8678.00
10100	172025	02/24/11	JONES & STOKES	996001	66401	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	8677.99
10100	172025	02/24/11	JONES & STOKES	941064	65632	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	48854.44

SELECTION CRITERIA: transact.fund in ("730", "731") and transact.ck_date between "02/01/2011" and "02/28/2011"
 ACCOUNTING PERIOD: 9/11

FUND - 731 - SBFCA CAPITAL FUND

CASH ACCT	CHECK NO	ISSUE DT	VENDOR	FUND/DEPT	ACCT	DESCRIPTION	SALES TAX	AMOUNT
TOTAL CHECK								70828.33
10100	172027	02/24/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	996001	66302	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	1649.00
10100	172027	02/24/11	KENNEDY MODESTE COM	995001	66302	SBFCA/DEC 2010 SERV	0.00	1648.99
TOTAL CHECK								3297.99
10100	172072	02/24/11	PETERSON, BRUSTAD,	941064	65631	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	6635.70
10100	172072	02/24/11	PETERSON, BRUSTAD,	996001	66341	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	21652.99
10100	172072	02/24/11	PETERSON, BRUSTAD,	995001	66341	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	21652.99
10100	172072	02/24/11	PETERSON, BRUSTAD,	991067	65621	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	3843.00
10100	172072	02/24/11	PETERSON, BRUSTAD,	941064	65610	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	5932.50
TOTAL CHECK								59717.18
10100	172084	02/24/11	RIVERSMITH ENGINEER	995001	66604	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	96.18
10100	172084	02/24/11	RIVERSMITH ENGINEER	996001	66604	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	96.18
10100	172084	02/24/11	RIVERSMITH ENGINEER	995001	66704	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	1635.20
10100	172084	02/24/11	RIVERSMITH ENGINEER	996001	66704	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	1635.20
10100	172084	02/24/11	RIVERSMITH ENGINEER	996001	66804	SBFCA/JAN 2011 SERV	0.00	821.24
TOTAL CHECK								4284.00
10100	172128	02/28/11	HDR ENGINEERING INC	995001	66802	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	77080.78
10100	172128	02/28/11	HDR ENGINEERING INC	995001	66602	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	9026.93
10100	172128	02/28/11	HDR ENGINEERING INC	996001	66702	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	153478.02
10100	172128	02/28/11	HDR ENGINEERING INC	996001	66602	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	9026.94
10100	172128	02/28/11	HDR ENGINEERING INC	995001	66702	SBFCA/NOV 2010 SERV	0.00	153478.02
TOTAL CHECK								402090.69
10100	172132	02/28/11	OFFICE DEPOT	996001	66311	SBFCA/TONER	0.00	17.61
10100	172132	02/28/11	OFFICE DEPOT	995001	66311	SBFCA/TONER	0.00	17.61
TOTAL CHECK								35.22
TOTAL CASH ACCOUNT								629237.09
TOTAL FUND								629237.09
TOTAL REPORT								655721.46



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: William H. Edgar, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Overview of the Central Valley Flood Protection Association by Executive Director Melinda Terry

This time has been set aside on the agenda for a presentation on the Central Valley Flood Protection Association by Executive Director Melinda Terry. The Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency is a member of the Association.

Copies of the presentation will be provided at the Board meeting, if applicable.

Thank you.



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Scott Shapiro, General Counsel

SUBJECT: Presentation of Right of Way Plan and Workshop by Bender Rosenthal, Inc. and Downey Brand LLC.

This time has been set aside on the agenda for a presentation on the right of way plan for the levee rehabilitation project and for a workshop to answer any questions of the Board. The presentation will be made by Madison Wiggins of Bender Rosenthal and by Scott McElhern of Downey Brand.

Copies of the presentation will be provided at the Board meeting.

Thank you.



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Scott Shapiro, General Counsel

SUBJECT: Presentation of Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project (FRWLRP)
Environmental Workshop by ICF/Jones & Stokes

This time has been set aside on the agenda for a presentation on the environmental process required for the levee rehabilitation project and for a workshop to answer any questions of the Board. The presentation will be made by Chris Elliott and Ingrid Norgaard of ICF/Jones & Stokes.

Copies of the presentation will be provided at the Board meeting.

Thank you.



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: William H. Edgar, Executive Director
Dave Peterson, Agency Engineer

SUBJECT: Approval of HDR Task Order 2 for design-level geotechnical investigations, borrow site assessment, additional setback evaluation, supplemental utility designs for 30% design, and additional Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA team coordination

Recommendation

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Task Order No. 2 to the capital budget contract with HDR Engineering Inc. (HDR) for design-level geotechnical investigations, borrow site assessment, additional setback evaluation, supplemental utility designs for 30% design, and additional Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA team coordination related to implementation of the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project.

Background

At the July 14, 2010 meeting the Board approved HDR's Master Agreement and Task Order 1 for preliminary design of the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project. Task Order 1 consists of pre-design and 30% design activities, with 30% design scheduled to be completed in June 2011. Staff's goal is to move this project along quickly, provided DWR EIP funding can be secured in a timely manner. We are targeting bringing HDR's task order for final design before the board at the July 2011 meeting. However, HDR is recommending that we begin some critical path field investigations ahead of that time:

1. Design-level geotechnical investigations
2. Borrow investigations
3. Additional setback evaluations
4. Supplemental utility designs for 30% design
5. In addition to the field investigations, SBFCA has requested that HDR be more involved in coordination meetings with funding and regulatory agencies, the Board of Senior Consultants (BOSC), the SBFCA Board, and other SBFCA technical team members, including an expanded role for Dr. Les Harder than was included in the scope of Task Order 1. Task Order 2 provides budget for this additional effort.

A brief summary of the proposed work under HDR Task Order 2 follows:

Task 1 – Project Management

HDR's Project Manager will manage the design contract scope, schedule and budget .

Task 2 – Pre-design – Feather River Levee Improvements

Supplemental Setback Assessment for Segment 7 – The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is evaluating a 900+/- acre habitat restoration project near the confluence with the Sutter Bypass. HDR will analyze costs of a setback alternative that follows the boundary of the proposed CDFG project, compared to fix in place.

Task 3 – 30% Plans and Specifications

1. Supplemental Utility Designs for 30% Plans – Utility coordination efforts in Task Order 1 identified additional utility crossings. Task includes developing additional design plans for additional utility crossings.
2. Geotechnical Explorations for Design
 - a. 128 geotechnical explorations – combination of borings and cone penetration tests.
 - b. Planning, permitting and coordination for geotechnical explorations.
 - c. Geotechnical data report for design.
3. Borrow Site Assessment and Report. Identify and evaluate properties suitable for providing borrow material for the project.

Task 7 – Agency, ITR Board, and SBFCA Team Coordination

Additional coordination efforts with agencies, ITR Board and SBFCA team.

Proposed Budget

The proposed budget for Task Order 2 is a not to exceed \$1,659,225. Please note that as of the time this staff report was prepared, HDR was still refining the geotechnical explorations and borrow investigation portions of their budget. We expect the overall cost of the task order to be reduced as a result. A final negotiated task order will be handed out at the board meeting for your consideration.

Other Related Actions

The drilling proposed in this task order will require additional CEQA and right of way work, so staff has prepared task orders for ICF and BRI, respectively.

The setback cost analysis in this task order will require analysis of hydraulic impacts of the setback, so staff has prepared a subtask under PBI's previously approved Task Order 7.

Thank you.

6-A

**SCOPE AND FEE ESTIMATE FOR
ENGINEERING DESIGN SERVICES
TASK ORDER 2**

Feather River West Levee Improvements

**Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Yuba City, California**



April 4, 2011

HDR

2365 Iron Point Road, Suite 300
Folsom, CA 95630

Contents

- Introduction..... 2**
- Scope of Work..... 2**
- Task 1. Project Management and Coordination 2**
 - 1.1 Project Management..... 2
- Task 2. Pre-design - Feather River Levee Improvements 2**
 - 2.6.10 Supplemental Setback Assessment for Segment 7 2
- Task 3. Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)..... 3**
 - 3.4 30% PS&E and Design Documentation 3
 - 3.4.2 Supplemental Utility Designs for 30% Plans 3
 - 3.4.3 Landside Water Level Delineation 4
 - 3.5 60% PS&E and Design Documentation 4
 - 3.5.1 Not Used for this Task Order 4
 - 3.5.2 Remaining Geotechnical Explorations..... 4
 - 3.5.2.2 Planning, Permitting & Coordination for Geotechnical Explorations..... 4
 - 3.5.2.3 Geotechnical Explorations for Design 4
 - 3.5.2.4 Geotechnical Data Report for Design 6
 - 3.5.6 Borrow Site Assessment and Report..... 7
- Task 7. Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA Team Coordination..... 7**
 - 7.1 Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA Team Coordination 7

Introduction

The Feather River West Levee (FRWL) rehabilitation project encompasses roughly 44 miles of levee from the Sutter Bypass to Thermalito Afterbay through Sutter and Butte Counties. HDR completed geotechnical and civil analyses and generated a Pre-Design Formulation Report (PFR) for the west bank of the FRWL as a part of Task Order 1 that was approved by the Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency (SBFCA) board on July 14, 2010. The following scope outlines our understanding of the additional work that is necessary to move into the next phase of the FRWL rehabilitation project.

Scope of Work

The work outlined in this scope has been divided into tasks in accordance with the work break down structure (WBS) shown on the attached schedule and consistent with our previously approved contract. The additional work outlined in this scope includes activities that fall within the following previously defined tasks:

- ◆ Project Management and Coordination
- ◆ Pre-design – Feather River Levee Improvements
- ◆ Plans, Specifications and Estimates

An additional task has been added to allow for coordination with Agencies, the ITR Board and the SBFCA Team.

Task 1. Project Management and Coordination

1.1 Project Management

HDR's project manager will manage the design contract scope, schedule and budget for all HDR Team project activities outlined for Task Order 2. Project management will also occur at the task level for each team as shown on the attached breakdown of hours. In addition, the project manager will coordinate with the Client, the subconsultant teams, agencies and stakeholders throughout the duration of the project. The project manager will oversee HDR's efforts for all segments of work in Task Order 2.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ Contract duration for Task Order 2 is through July 2011.

Task 2. Pre-design - Feather River Levee Improvements

2.6.10 Supplemental Setback Assessment for Segment 7

The HDR Team understands that the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) is evaluating a potential 900+/- acre habitat restoration project near the confluence of the Sutter Bypass and the Feather River right bank in Sutter County. HDR will coordinate with the CDFG to gain a better understanding of CDFG's project and to determine the potential benefits that may be gained by incorporating CDFG's project into the FRWL project. Similar to the setback analysis performed by HDR for the Pre-Design Formulation Report, HDR will determine the economic feasibility of the setback by comparing the cost of the setback to the fix-in-place cost for the portions of the levees being replaced.

Deliverables:

- ◆ Technical Memorandum including a figure illustrating the setback alignment, a discussion of the results, and cost estimates for the setback levee and fix-in-place alternatives.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ The fix-in-place cost estimates for the Sutter Bypass left bank levee will be performed by HDR based upon preliminary levee assessments performed to date by the DWR as part of the Non-Urban Levee Program
- ◆ No additional problem identification for the Sutter Bypass left bank levee is anticipated as part of this scope.
- ◆ It is assumed that other members of the SBFCA team will perform any related hydraulic analyses and flood damage reduction estimates for the setback.
- ◆ It is assumed that other members of the SBFCA team will perform any related real estate and environmental analyses for the setback.
- ◆ This setback analysis will not be included in the Pre Design Formulation Report.

Task 3. Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)**3.4 30% PS&E and Design Documentation****3.4.2 Supplemental Utility Designs for 30% Plans**

The HDR team will incorporate into the 30% design effort additional relocations for pipe crossings as outlined below and will remove crossings that fall within reaches that do not require levee rehabilitation. In total, 7 new additional crossings will be added and 6 crossings will be removed from the 30% design effort.

This work will be completed consistent with our scope outlined in Task Order 1.

Deliverables:

- ◆ 30% Plans as outlined in Task Order 1 including the revised utility crossings as outlined below.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ The following utility crossings have been deleted from the scope outlined in Task Order 1:
 - ◆ Tudor Mutual Water Company – 2-30 Inch (510+22) – No work required
 - ◆ Yuba City Wastewater Treatment Plant – 36 Inch (828+56) – No Penetration
 - ◆ Sutter Main Canal – Canal Relocation – Reach 21 (1428+50 to 1433+83) – no work
 - ◆ Sutter Main Canal – Canal Relocation – Reach 22 (1433+83 to 1510+00) – no work
 - ◆ Sutter Main Canal – Canal Relocation – Reach 31 (1902+00 to 1958+00) – no work
 - ◆ Gridley Wastewater Treatment Plant Ponds (1817+00 to 1823+00) – no work
- ◆ The following utility crossings have been added to the scope outlined in Task Order 1:
 - ◆ Hamatani Ranch Storm Drainage PS – 20 Inch (52+25)
 - ◆ Hamatani Ranch Sacramento Avenue PS – 24 Inch (Sta 124+338)
 - ◆ South Yuba City Seepage Interceptor PS – 24 Inch (Sta 862+53)
 - ◆ Micheli Storm Drainage Pump Station – 20 Inch (1314+79)
 - ◆ 2-60 Inch Storm Drainage Pipe (Sta 1767+62)
 - ◆ 36 Inch Storm Drainage Pipe Crossing (Sta 1934+52)
 - ◆ 2-60 Inch Storm Drainage Pipe Crossing (Sta 1961+10.54)

3.4.3 Landside Water Level Delineation

HDR will compare the water surface elevations (WSE) along the FRWL to normal ground elevations along the landside of the levee. A table will be generated that identifies stations, 200-yr WSEs, normal landside elevations, and depths from WSE to normal landside ground.

Deliverables:

- ◆ Table to show water depths relative to normal landside ground

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ WSE will be based on the table provided by PBI, Inc. on October 8, 2010 and will be projected to intersect the landside of the levee
- ◆ Water depths will be reported at the same stations provided in PBI's table
- ◆ HDR will look at normal ground between the stations identified in PBI's table to verify that normal ground is consistent between them. Additional water depths will be reported if water depths are found to vary between the stations identified in PBI's table
- ◆ No hydraulic modeling is included as a part of this task

3.5 60% PS&E and Design Documentation

3.5.1 Not Used for this Task Order

Not a part of this Task Order (shown here for reference only).

3.5.2 Remaining Geotechnical Explorations

3.5.2.2 Planning, Permitting & Coordination for Geotechnical Explorations

The HDR team will coordinate with SBFCA, the ITR Board, USACE and DWR to refine the draft subsurface exploration plan attached to this Task Order. The team will also coordinate with the SBFCA right-of-entry (ROE) and environmental teams to locate exploration sites and corresponding access routes. HDR will perform a site reconnaissance and identify exploration locations for USA clearance, coordinate with USA, and obtain necessary permits from Sutter and Butte Counties for prior to starting explorations.

Exhibits identifying exploration locations will be prepared in GIS and provided to the SBFCA team in PDF format. The exhibits will identify the exploration locations and show adjacent parcel lines and APN information on aerial imagery.

Deliverables:

- ◆ 8.5x11 color exhibits identifying exploration locations.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ Coordination with land owners and granting of ROEs to be handled by other SBFCA team members.
- ◆ Environmental clearances will be provided by other SBFCA team members.
- ◆ Aerial imagery, parcel line and APN information will be based on the DWR GIS data previously provided to HDR. Additional parcel information, if needed, would be provided by other SBFCA team members.

3.5.2.3 Geotechnical Explorations for Design

The HDR team will retain a drilling sub-contractor to perform between 120 and 130 explorations along the landside toe, levee crown, and waterside toe of along the west bank of the FRWL. These additional

explorations are intended to support the optimized design features (optimized alternative as shown in the PFR) which will result in significant construction cost savings.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ Geotechnical explorations are based on the following rationale:

As a part of Task Order 1, it was anticipated that rehabilitation (where needed) would consist of cutoff walls and that approximately 50 additional explorations (after Task Order 1) would be needed to finalize the design of cutoff walls for the FRWL Project. During Task Order 1, and the preparation of the PFR, project optimization efforts resulted in proposed rehabilitation measures for some reaches or portions of reaches being seepage berms instead of cutoff walls. This optimization effort resulted in significant construction cost savings but will require more explorations than originally anticipated as explained below.

Generally, fewer subsurface explorations are needed to design a cutoff wall than to design most other levee rehabilitation measures (e.g., seepage berm, relief wells, drainage relief trench) because explorations to support design of a cutoff wall are mostly needed to identify the soil stratigraphy under the levee. Most other rehabilitation measures depend not only on stratigraphy under the levee, but also on how that stratigraphy varies to the landside of the levee (at the levee toe and further away in the landside "field"). More explorations are needed to characterize stratigraphy both under the levee and to the landside of the levee, as opposed to just under the levee itself, for most other rehabilitation measures.

In addition, project optimization efforts also included a more aggressive approach to the design cutoff wall depths. This approach would result in the construction of shorter cutoff wall and significant construction cost savings. Where possible, cutoff walls will be design to extend down to only an intermediate impermeable layer (i.e., aquiclude), cutting off the overlying permeable layer, but leaving a permeable layer underneath. This approach is appropriate and defensible provided that it can be shown that the intermediate impermeable layer is laterally contiguous (both along the levee axis and to the landside of the levee). To confirm the laterally contiguous nature of the intermediate impermeable layer requires additional exploration to the landside of the levee. These additional explorations are needed where this aggressive approach to wall depth was employed.

Project optimization efforts also included changing the approach to levee geometry corrections. Instead of reconstructing levee waterside slopes to 3:1 (H:V), existing waterside slopes will be reconstructed back to preconstruction conditions that, for some locations, are notably steeper than 3:1. This more aggressive approach to waterside slope angle requires that additional geotechnical data be obtained for the waterside slopes to confirm that rapid drawdown condition criteria are satisfied.

Some additional explorations also are needed at locations of anomalous conditions. For example, an existing cutoff wall is present within the levee along much of Yuba City, but there are gaps in the wall (i.e., areas where the wall was not installed) where the levee alignment intersects the two Feather River bridge crossings between Yuba City and Marysville. Conditions at these cutoff wall gaps must be explored in order to design rehabilitation for these anomalous conditions. Another example of anomalous conditions is the two locations of suspected undocumented levee breaches or near-breaches (e.g., a pond that appears to be a remnant of a breach-induced scour hole). Such occurrences can lead to subsurface conditions that are altered in a manner that they are more critical than other subsurface conditions along the reach. These locations require exploration to confirm that proposed rehabilitation measures are adequate to address conditions at these anomalous locations.

In summary, the above-described approach generally resulted in explorations intended to address one or more of the following needs:

1. To evaluate depth of a proposed cutoff wall at a key location.
2. To evaluate stratigraphy for design of a seepage berm.
3. To evaluate waterside slope conditions for rapid drawdown.
4. To evaluate an intermediate impermeable layer (aquiclude) to confirm it is laterally contiguous.

5. To evaluate anomalous conditions.

The attached table lists all of the planned explorations and the rationale for each. The table also identifies the planned type of exploration and the anticipated approximate depth of each exploration. The HDR Team has planned for cone penetration test (CPT) exploration instead of exploratory borings wherever feasible because CPT exploration is less expensive than borings. CPT exploration has some limitations (e.g., CPT typically cannot penetrate gravel layers), and these limitations prohibit further utilization than that shown in the exploration plan table.

- ◆ Geotechnical drilling (i.e., borings) will be performed at some exploration locations and CPT soundings will be performed at others, depending on anticipated conditions and the type of information sought in the explorations. Explorations are expected to range in depth from approximately 20 feet deep to approximately 140 feet deep. Exploration types, depths, and rationale are discussed further below.
- ◆ Drill rig hammer calibrations will be performed on-site as needed to calibrate hammer efficiencies. Recently performed calibrations will be used if possible.
- ◆ Each exploratory boring will be logged by a geologist or engineer from the HDR Team (i.e., a logger). The loggers will prepare field boring logs and collect soil samples for characterization and/or laboratory testing from the material obtained during drilling. Loggers will also direct CPT soundings, select depths for CPT sample collection, and select depths for porewater pressure dissipation testing.
- ◆ At the completion of each boring or CPT sounding, the boring or sounding will be backfilled with cement-bentonite grout. Cuttings from drilling will be dispersed locally on-site as allowed; wet/slurry materials from drilling will be placed in drums. Drummed materials will be delivered to and stored during the exploration program at a location to be identified by SBFCA (Drummed materials during the TO1 exploration program were stored at the LD1 yard). The drummed materials will be hauled to and disposed of at a facility that accepts non-hazardous drummed soil materials (as was done during TO1).
- ◆ Geotechnical laboratory testing will be conducted on selected samples obtained from the field exploration. The laboratory testing will be performed to verify the field characterizations and to develop engineering properties of the subsurface layers.
- ◆ Exploration locations will not be surveyed by the HDR Team other than by using handheld GPS units and correlating with existing LiDAR strip maps.
- ◆ Other SBFCA team members will provide biological, cultural, and ROE services for the subsurface explorations program.

3.5.2.4 Geotechnical Data Report for Design

The HDR Team will prepare a geotechnical data report to present the results of the subsurface explorations and laboratory testing completed for the project. Field boring logs will be updated based on laboratory test results and finalized versions of the boring logs will be presented in the data report. Laboratory test results from drilling and CPT samples tested will be included in the data report. A draft version of the report will be prepared for the Agency to review. The HDR Team will respond to Agency comments and finalize the report.

Deliverables:

- ◆ Two hard copies and 10 electronic copies of the Geotechnical Data Report.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ No geotechnical analyses are included as a part of this task.

3.5.6 Borrow Site Assessment and Report

The HDR team will complete a borrow site assessment for the FRWL rehabilitation project. HDR will coordinate with other SBFCA team members including the real estate, environmental, and public outreach teams to identify properties that may be available for use as potential borrow sites. HDR will evaluate each site to determine its suitability for providing borrow material for the project. The borrow site assessment will identify the locations of the potential borrow sites, the likely yield from each site, the improvements necessary to return the sites to their current use after borrow activities are completed, and permitting requirements.

Deliverables:

- ◆ Two hard copies and 10 electronic copies of the Borrow Site Assessment Report & figures.
- ◆ Preliminary plan view and cross section drawings (at approximately 30% detail) for each site will be provided to illustrate the pre-project and post-project conditions.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ Up to six potential borrow sites will be included in the assessment. An initial screening will be completed to identify up to two potential borrow sites (one north of Yuba City, and one south of Yuba city). In addition, the four detention basins that have been identified (two in Live Oak and two in Yuba City) will be considered in the assessment.
- ◆ Up to four meetings are anticipated (one with each respective land owner) to discuss the potential for using each property.
- ◆ Environmental and Real Estate assessments will be provided by other SBFCA team members.
- ◆ The borrow site assessment will be based on the borrow quantities (amount of fill needed) determined for the Optimized Alternative as outlined in HDR's Pre-Design Formulation Report dated February 2011.
- ◆ Geotechnical explorations or field visits are not included as part of this assessment.
- ◆ Obtaining permits for borrow sites is not included in this scope.

Task 7. Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA Team Coordination**7.1 Agency, ITR Board and SBFCA Team Coordination**

The HDR Team will coordinate with agencies and local organizations (USACE, DWR, CVFPB, Sutter County, Yuba City, canal operators, Levee Districts, Maintenance Areas, etc.), the ITR Board, and other members of the SBFCA team (including the environmental, public outreach and real estate teams) as needed and as directed by SBFCA to discuss design issues, meet program needs and to help facilitate project approvals. This task includes attending regular SBFCA Board meetings and sub-committee, preparing and making presentations to the Board, attending public outreach meetings, and other meetings as needed.

Comments/Assumptions:

- ◆ Contract duration is through July 2011.
- ◆ Up to 20 meetings have been assumed for Agency coordination.
- ◆ Up to 2 meetings have been assumed for ITR coordination.

- ◆ Up to 30 meetings have been assumed for coordination with other SBFCA team members, environmental public workshops, meeting with landowners, and public outreach meetings.
- ◆ Up to 4 presentations to the board have been assumed.



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 1, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: William H. Edgar, Executive Director
Dave Peterson, Agency Engineer

SUBJECT: Approval of Bender Rosenthal, Inc (BRI) Amendment No. 1 to Task Order 1 for right of entry support for HDR's Task Order 2 geotechnical explorations, coordination of acquisition of up to 225 preliminary title reports and coordination and attendance at various meetings.

Recommendation

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 1 to Task Order 1 to the capital budget contract with BRI for right of entry support for HDR's Task Order 2 geotechnical explorations, coordination of acquisition of up to 225 preliminary title reports and coordination and attendance at various meetings related to implementation of the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project.

Background

At the September 8, 2010 meeting the Board approved BRI's Master Agreement and Task Order 1 for preliminary right-of-way support services for the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project. Task Order 1 consists of right-of-entry support for HDR's Task Order 1 geotechnical exploration, right-of-way constraints analysis, right-of-way manual, project meetings, early acquisition assistance and miscellaneous right-of-way services. Staff's goal is to move this project along quickly, provided DWR EIP funding can be secured in a timely manner. We are bringing BRI's Amendment No. 1 to the board concurrently with HDR's Task Order 2 as it supplements the proposed explorations:

Project Management and meeting attendance
Right-of-entry support for HDR's Task Order 2 explorations
Coordination of preliminary title reports
Completion of right-of-way manual

A brief summary of the proposed work under Amendment No. 1 follows:

Task 1 – Project Management and Meeting Attendance

BRI's Project Manager will manage the contract scope, schedule and budget. Includes monthly progress reports and attendance at miscellaneous meetings as requested for SBFCA staff.

Task 2 – Right-of-Entry Support for HDR's Task Order 2 Explorations

Acquisition of up to 79 right-of-entry agreements for the proposed geotechnical explorations.

Task 3 – Coordination of Preliminary Title Reports

Coordination of acquisition, distribution and review of up to 225 preliminary title reports.

Task 4 – Right-of-Way Manual

Completion of right-of-way manual partially developed under BRI's Task Order 1.

Proposed Budget

The proposed budget for Amendment No. 1 to Task Order 1 is a not to exceed \$188,740 so if approved, the revised Task Order 1 budget will be increased to \$288,740.

Other Related Actions

The explorations supported by this Task Order are included in HDR's Task Order 2. A majority of this effort is contingent on the approval of HDR's Task Order 2.



April 5, 2011

Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Attn: William Edgar, Executive Director via Karl Brustad, R/W Manager
1227 Bridge Street
Yuba City, CA 95991-3618

Re: Bender Rosenthal, Inc. Task Order 1, Amendment 1

Dear Mr. Edgar:

This proposal has been requested to support additional right of way services beyond those identified in Task Order 1 dated September 8, 2010. The additional services include right of entry support for HDR's Task Order 2 explorations, acquisition of preliminary title reports and meetings. Task Order 1, Amendment 1 is intended to cover R/W support services through December 2011.

Task Order 1 Amendment 1 Scope and Proposed Budget:

Task 1 Rights of Entry ("ROE") for up to 79 parcels

Scope: BRI proposes to develop all necessary contracts and letters based on industry standard documents. We will meet with the owners, and convey documents until either an impasse has been reached or the Right of Entry is signed. Three contacts with property owners are included in this scope. If a Right of Entry is not signed by the property owner, BRI will provide all necessary documentation to SBFCA to file a request with the courts for a Right of Entry.

Steps within the Right of Entry process are outlined below:

1. Review the project, purpose of ROEs and design with team;
2. Preparation of Right of Entry's and cover letter documents;
3. Phone contact with property owner to set up time to meet and discuss the proposed Right of Entry;
4. Meet with the property owners to discuss the project in general; review of maps and project descriptions with the property owner and obtain signed ROE;
5. ROE activities are based on settlement by the third contact. A recommendation to SBFCA will be made after impasse has been reached;
6. Deliver signed ROE or deliver a memorandum explaining impasse or unclosed (ie: impasse) calls.

Deliverables:

- Signed Right of Entry(s), or Memorandum explaining impasse with contact log for up to 79 parcels.

Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Contract Change, Task Order 1, Amendment 1
April 5, 2011
Page 2

Assumptions/work provided by others:

- Line list of necessary parcels to be provided by others;
- Maps with boring locations and APN listed, exhibits, details of work on owners property to be provided by others;
- Attendance to additional Client called meetings will be at standard mileage and hourly rates;
- Bi-lingual services are not included but are available via scope change.

CHANGE IN SCOPE

- The addition of or deletion of requested parcels;
- Legal support for court ordered entries;
- Excessive contacts to property owners outside of typical (three contacts).

$$79 \quad X \quad \$1,150 \text{ each} \quad = \quad \$90,850$$

Task 2 Preliminary Title Reports

Scope:

BRI proposes to obtain, review and distribute up to 225 preliminary title reports (“PTR”) for the “minimum footprint”.

Steps for processing PTRs:

1. BRI will order, retain electronic and hard copies of each PTR and related backup documents;
2. Electronic copies of PTR and related backup documents to be provided to PBI for distribution to R/W Engineer or design engineer.

Assumptions/work provided by others:

1. PTR invoices to be paid directly by SBFCA;
2. Line list of necessary PTRs to be provided by others.

$$\text{Assumption: } 225 \text{ reports @ } 2 \text{ hours @ } \$150 \quad = \quad \$67,500$$

Task 3 Meetings

Scope: BRI will attend meetings as requested to include one EIP meeting per month, weekly r/w meetings each month, and Board meetings as needed. Additional meetings BRI requested to attend will be billed at BRI standard hourly rates and mileage rates.

Also included in this Task are Monthly Progress Reports required by SBFCA for invoices, miscellaneous staff reports, emails and correspondence.

Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Contract Change, Task Order 1, Amendment 1
April 5, 2011
Page 3

Estimated meeting:

9 EIP meetings	X	2 hrs	X	\$180	=	\$3,240
36 weekly R/W	X	1 hr	X	\$180	=	\$6,480
4 Board Meetings	X	8 hrs	X	\$180	=	\$5,760

Reports, email and other correspondence

9 mths. X 4 weeks X 2 hrs/wk X \$180	=	<u>\$12,960</u>
--------------------------------------	---	-----------------

\$28,440

Task 4 R/W Manual Completion

Scope: Continue developing the processes, procedures, roles and responsibilities for SBFCA right of way program. This scope of work will identify authorizations with the organizations, help facilitate required resolutions, develop for approval by SBFCA and DWR right of way documents (purchase agreements, easements, temporary easements, escrow instructions etc.) and will set forth the condemnation process and time line.

Deliverable(s):

*Right of Way Manual, including all forms, documents and procedures.

\$ 1,950

SUBTOTAL Task Order 1 Amendment 1 Budget Request:

\$188,740

SCHEDULE AND FEES

Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Contract Change, Task Order 1, Amendment 1
April 5, 2011
Page 4

Our proposed fee is based on scope provided as summarized below:

Task Order 2		
Task	Task Estimate	Total
1. Right of Entry	79 x 10 hrs x \$115/hr	\$90,850
2. Preliminary Title Reports	225 x 2hrs x \$150/hr	\$67,500
3. Meetings/Reports	9 EIP x 2hrs x \$180/hr 36 R/W x 1hr x \$180/hr 4 Board x 8 hr x \$180/hr 36 weeks x 2hrs/wk x \$180	\$28,440
4. R/W Manual Completion	13 hrs x \$150	\$1,950
Total Budget:		\$188,740

The following are the assumptions behind the budget:

1. The actual costs may differ from task to task, but the overall budget will not exceed the "Total Budget shown in the above chart.

Sincerely,

Cydney Bender Reents, President
Bender Rosenthal, Inc.

Attachment: BRI 2011 Fee Schedule

Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency
Contract Change, Task Order 1, Amendment 1
April 5, 2011
Page 5
2011 FEE SCHEDULE

Below are our standard 2011 rates for additional services required. These costs may vary depending on changes in the scope in work:

Stephen A. Rosenthal, MAI	\$200/hr.*
Cydney G. Bender, MAI	\$200/hr.*
David Wraa, MAI	\$200/hr.*
Steve Parent, MAI	\$200/hr.*
Bob Morrison	\$200/hr.
Senior Project Manager	\$150/hr.
Quality Control Auditor	\$140/hr.
Senior Appraiser	\$125/hr.
Relocation Specialist	\$125/hr.
Senior Acquisition Agent	\$115/hr.
Acquisition Agent	\$105/hr.
Appraiser	\$ 100/hr.
Other Associated Professional Staff	\$ 90/hr.
Researchers	\$ 75/hr.
Administrative/Production	\$ 65/hr.

*\$400 per hour for court or briefing preparation, depositions, any pre-trial conferences, court appearances, etc., should these ever become necessary.

Rates for appraisal services vary based on land use and type of acquisition. Appraisal services are generally completed a lump sum basis rather than hourly.



Sutter Butte Flood Control Agency

A Partnership for Flood Safety

April 13, 2011

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: William H. Edgar, Executive Director

SUBJECT: ICF-Jones & Stokes Task Order 4 Amendment No.1 – Preparation of CEQA Categorical Exemption for Additional Geotechnical Explorations for the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project

Recommendation

Authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No.1 to Task Order No.4 for miscellaneous technical support services related to implementation of the Feather River West Levee Rehabilitation Project.

Background

In November and December 2008, SBFCA completed a competitive process to select a consulting firm to undertake environmental planning and compliance work associated with the Feasibility Study and the FRWLRP. From that process, ICF-Jones & Stokes was selected as the most qualified consultant, and in January 2009, the SBFCA Board approved a master agreement with ICF-Jones & Stokes. The master agreement provides general contractual "boiler plate" language, and refers to task orders which will be executed as needed to complete work. Each task order includes a scope of work, fee, schedule, and special provisions related to the task order that are not included in the master agreement.

To support the FRWLRP engineering design effort, the HDR design team determined that on-site geotechnical explorations needed to be conducted at various locations along the levee. Before conducting these geotechnical explorations, SBFCA was required to demonstrate compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). On August 6, 2010, the SBFCA Executive Director executed Task Order No. 4 with ICF-Jones & Stokes in the amount of \$11,620 to provide the environmental review and CEQA compliance needed for these geotechnical explorations. ICF-Jones & Stokes completed their work and the geotechnical explorations were carried out.

The HDR design team is now recommending that an additional 128 geotechnical explorations be undertaken. SBFCA is required to demonstrate compliance with the CEQA for these additional geotechnical explorations. Therefore it is recommended that the Board Chair authorize the Executive Director to execute Amendment No. 1 to allow ICF-Jones & Stokes to provide the necessary environmental review and CEQA compliance for these proposed additional geotechnical explorations.

Proposed Budget

The proposed budget for Amendment No.1 to Task Order 4 is \$14,300, so if approved, the revised Task Order 4 budget will be increased to \$25,920.

ICF Jones & Stokes
Task Order 4 - Amendment No. 1
Categorical Exemption for Supplemental Geotechnical
Investigations

This Task Order Amendment is associated with the Master Agreement between the Sutter-Butte Flood Control Agency and ICF Jones & Stokes, dated February 11, 2009, and Task Order No. 4 dated August 6, 2010.

Scope of Work

Objective. To supplement knowledge of subsurface conditions for problem identification and alternatives analysis, additional geotechnical data is needed for 128 locations in the Sutter Basin study area. As approval of this work constitutes a discretionary action, SBFCA is required to demonstrate compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This scope of work would provide CEQA documentation in the form of a Categorical Exemption (CatEx).

Assumptions and Uncertainties. It is assumed that environmental clearances do not exist that would provide coverage for the supplemental geotechnical investigations, necessitating a stand-alone document for this purpose. Supporting engineering documentation will be provided by others, including data for the 128 investigation sites. It is assumed that there is flexibility in locating the specific sites to avoid potential effects on environmental resources, especially wildlife habitat and cultural resources. A companion scope of work (Task Order 3) provides a cultural resources constraints analysis to inform and substantiate this CatEx. Permission to enter property will be provided by SBFCA.

Methods. ICF Jones & Stokes will coordinate with the engineering team to review the proposed locations for the 128 investigation sites. Based on information gathered in a separate task order, ICF Jones & Stokes' staff will provide input to the investigation plan to avoid cultural resources. ICF Jones & Stokes' staff will use aerial photography (supplied by the engineering team) and reconnaissance-level field studies to provide input to the investigation plan to avoid sensitive habitats. The work and CEQA clearance will be documented with a Notice of Exemption under the provisions of CEQA Section 15306 for Information Collection. A draft CatEx form will be completed by ICF Jones & Stokes for SBFCA review, followed by revisions and submittal to SBFCA for signature. ICF Jones & Stokes will file the CatEx with the State Clearinghouse and county clerks.

Deliverables. Draft and final CatEx form.

Data Needs. Location plan for the 128 sites, geo-referenced on an aerial photo background.

Schedule

The draft CatEx will be provided for review within 45 calendar days of award of this Task Order Amendment. SBFCA will provide comments on the draft document to the Contractor within 5 calendar days. The final document will be furnished to SBFCA within 1 day of receiving comments and the completion of this Task Order. The CatEx will be filed within 1 day of receiving signature.

Budget

The budget for this Task Order Amendment is not-to-exceed \$14,300 based on the provision of the Master Agreement. An assumed breakdown of work effort is provided on Table 1.

Points of Contact

SBFCA: Dave Peterson (as consultant), dpeterson@phieng.com, 916-608-2212

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be duly executed as of the day and year first written above.

SUTTER BUTTE FLOOD CONTROL AGENCY

CONSULTANT

By: _____

By:  _____

DATED: _____

By: _____