

Design Workgroup Meeting Notes
May 4, 2021

Attendees:

Hoopa-Justin Alvarez, Chad Martel, Shaun Green, Fred Meyer, John Bair
Yurok-Aaron Martin, DJ Bandrowski,
TRRP-Todd Buxton, Oliver Rodgers, Brandt Gutermuth, James Lee, Chad Abel
State- Mark Smelser, Trevor Morgan, Ken Lindke
USFWS- Conor Shea
NOAA- Roman Pittman

When is the best time to engage TMC in the design process?

Post VE study so TMC can add their thoughts when the design is still plastic and large changes are still cost effective. Again at the 90% design for buy in.

30% and 65% 90% may be too late

How accurate can the budget projection be at 30%?

Probably +/- 30% can be more.

We need to make sure that the design workgroup buys into all the designs so that the TMC has confidence in the product, and people need to work with and brief their TMC reps along the way. The cost estimate at 30% design should be done by a sub group with experience putting together implementation budgets

Where are cost estimates done and by whom?

-There are a couple cost estimates, one is the designer estimate, an independent government estimate, and a contractor estimate. The initial estimate is based on 30% and so seeing changes from 30% to 100% should not be surprising.

In the past we used unit cost estimate but that is different than the detailed budget that happens at the end.

Long ago in a galaxy not far away Kent at the request of DJ (as implementation director) made a budget spreadsheet to inform the ED at the 10% level. It was not intended to be part of the design report. Logan had created a design template. DJ will send it to Brandt.

We need cost estimates to help evaluate different design alternatives. We should build in current rates and then build in inflation.

There is a need for separation between the design team and the contractor.

What TMC struggles with is the lack of competitive bid to ensure we have the best cost per unit effort. So any internal checks would help make them more comfortable.

How do we scale projects to a finite budget?

Challenges:

We must maximize the amount of habitat in any area we work in.

We need to be able to hit a moving budget target.

We are working on designs so far out that we may need to account for inflation

Solutions-

Break up the design features into XXXX cu yds groups within a larger design.

If we set a minimum budget assumption to shoot for, once we make a budget estimate we can figure out how to break the project up close to the 30% level.

Oliver was looking for documentation of the evolution of the project design and how we went from simple feathered edges with no LWD to the more extensive in channel work we do now.

There are three areas of budget expenditure- administration, science, implementation we need to make sure that cost are covered across all those components. We can't just do implementation in the absence of science and visa versa. So what is the balance.

We are stuck in a lack of information stage because we don't have enough information on a target budget allocation.

Quick recap- there needs to be a adaptive review, we need to reestablish the guidance on the split between the three budget categories (Admin, Science, Implementation).

What we are doing with Chapman this year doing reveg after civil leaves makes the work more challenging but can assist with breaking up budgets. We may end up with full separation between these crews in the future.

In the future site enhancements may be the best bang for the buck rather than completing more of the last 47 sites. Also working on a long range plan.

There was a discussion of low hanging fruit with sites that would require less excavation to make them more functional floodplains. This could be done during the off season.

Not all features are created equal considering gains and costs to build.

There is a balance between creating habitat and creating riverine features.

The design team should draft a letter from the program partnership for when we apply for outside funding to supplement restoration dollars.

We can also use TRRP cost share to bolster the cost share well above what is required.

Next steps-

Chad will draft a letter to accompany grant applications for soft money- include the loss of funds for TRRP to dispute the rich kid on the restoration block image, also include the cost share and the collaborative nature of the project. This will be a mostly generic letter or a template that has a insert project name here. It would be from all partner agencies not just TRRP.

Justin and Chad will draft a summary/recommendation for TMC to be circulated for workgroup approval.