

TRANSMITTAL



Houston Engineering Inc.

6901 East Fish Lake Road Suite 140
Maple Grove MN 55369
Ph 763.493.4522 Fax 763.493.5572

To: Anoka County Public Services
2100 3rd Ave, Suite 700
Anoka MN 55303

Date: 8-Jun-12
Project: Proposal for the Outlet
Diversion of Anoka County Ditch 56
Location: East Bethel MN
Project No.: P12-6112-006

Attn: Jon Olson, PE, Division Manager

We are sending to you: [x] Attached [ ] Separately [ ] By Messenger
[ ] Shop Drawings [ ] Specifications [ ] Contracts [ ] Report
[ ] Prints [ ] Correspondence [ ]

Table with 4 columns: Number Copies, Document Number, Date, Description. Row 1: 1, Proposal for Engineering Services, Outlet Relocation - Anoka County Ditch 56, Located in East Bethel MN

The above are:
[ ] Shop drawings as checked
[ ] No exceptions taken [ ] For your use [ ] For your information
[ ] Rejected [ ] For your approval [ ] For your review
[ ] Revise and resubmit [ ] For your distribution [ ] As you requested
[ ] Note markings [ ] For your processing [X] Proposal Requested

Remarks:
Please feel free to call Chris Otterness for any questions at 763-493-4522. Thank you.

cc: HEI File By: Jeanmaire Moy, Administrative Assistant
Tel: 763-493-4522



PREPARED FOR:

Anoka County  
In conjunction with  
The Coon Lake Improvement  
Association

Proposal for Engineering Services  
Outlet Relocation - Anoka County Ditch 56  
Located in East Bethel Minnesota

Coon Lake Improvement Association



HoustonEngineering Inc.

SUBMITTED BY:

Houston Engineering, Inc.  
6901 East Fish Lake Road,  
Suite 140  
Maple Grove MN 55369

June 8, 2012

Maple Grove Office

763.493.4522

763.493.5572

6901 East Fish Lake Road Suite 140 Maple Grove MN 55369



HoustonEngineering Inc.

June 8, 2012

Jon Olson, P.E.  
Division Manager  
Anoka County Public Services  
2100 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue, Suite 700  
Anoka, MN 55303-5024

Re: Proposal for the Outlet Diversion of Anoka County Ditch 56

Dear Mr. Olson:

Because work on public drainage systems is governed specifically by State statute (MS 103E), initiating a project to repair, realign, or impound these systems requires detailed and thorough Engineering Report that complies with the appropriate statutes. Missing a step in this process could result in exposure to legal challenges that may possibly scuttle your project. To minimize your risk, you need an engineering firm that not only has the technical savvy to demonstrate the benefits of project, but also has a wealth of experience in modifying and repairing public drainage systems under 103E, a firm like Houston Engineering.

Our clients across the State of Minnesota have long benefitted from our extensive experience in the repair of public drainage systems. Recent experience has included repair reports for the Rice Creek Watershed District on several Anoka County Ditches, and feasibility study for the South Washington Watershed District to restore flow to a stagnant backwater channel of the Mississippi River. This project experience, explained in further detail later in this proposal, enables us to anticipate project challenges before they occur, and reduces your risk throughout the life of your project.

As requested, we respectfully submit the following proposal for the Outlet Diversion of Anoka County Ditch 56. Please feel free to call me with any questions regarding this proposal at 763-493-4522 or e-mail at [cotterness@houstoneng.com](mailto:cotterness@houstoneng.com).

Sincerely,

HOUSTON ENGINEERING, INC.

Chris Otterness, P.E.  
Project Manager

Mark R. Deutschman, P.E., PhD  
Vice President

Cc: HEI File

Fargo P 701.237.5065 F 701.237.2101  
Bismarck P 701.323.0200 F 701.323.0300

Minot P 701.852.7931 F 701.858.5655  
Thief River Falls P 218.681.2951 F 218.681.2987

## PROJECT APPROACH AND SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Scope of Services under this Agreement includes the proposed tasks specified in the *RFP for Outlet Diversion Anoka County Ditch 56* dated May 18, 2012 and detailed project approach as follows.

### **Phase 1: Engineering Report**

The purpose of this phase is to prepare and present an Engineer's Report, meeting the requirements of MS 103E that will determine the benefits, costs, and impacts of diverting the primary flow of CD 56 into channel east of Thielen Boulevard on Coon Lake.

To determine the benefits and impacts of the proposed project, we will first create a SWMM hydrology/hydraulics model of the existing CD 56 drainage system, then modify this model to simulate the outlet diversion. These models can be then simulated for a single rainfall event to compare existing vs. proposed 100-year, 24-hour flood elevations and to size the outlet structure. Impacts to the public drainage system and adjacent properties will be determined through this analysis.

Next, we can use the SWMM models to simulate the rainfall over a "typical" summer to determine the change in flows to the channel east of Thielen Boulevard. From these calculated inflows, residence times for the existing and proposed conditions will be determined to demonstrate the effectiveness of the outlet diversion, which can be constituted as a local benefit. The result from the SWMM model can also be used to calculate changes in sediment loading from CD 56 into Coon Lake, which can be constituted as a public benefit.

This analysis will form the basis of our Engineer's Report, which will not only discuss the costs, benefits, and impacts of the project as required under MS 103E.227, but also provide a preliminary design. The report will then be presented at a public hearing, and then followed with a memorandum detailing the responses from the hearing and providing a recommendation for implementation.

#### **Deliverables:**

- ✓ Engineer's Report, including preliminary cost estimate and concept designs;
- ✓ Notice of Public Hearing;
- ✓ Presentation of the report at a public hearing; and
- ✓ A memorandum summarizing the proceedings and recommending an implementation strategy
- ✓ Meetings with the Public Works Committee and the County Board

## **Phase 2: Final Design Services**

This phase will consist of preparation of 75% complete and 95% complete plan sets and specifications for the outlet diversion. We will also subcontract a geotechnical firm to complete an investigation of soils at the proposed diversion. This phase will conclude with preparation of permit applications on behalf of the County. We are assuming that permit applications will consist of a Work in Waters/Wetlands Joint Notification permit and an MPCA Construction Stormwater permit.

### **Deliverables:**

- ✓ Geotechnical report;
- ✓ 75% complete plans;
- ✓ 95% complete plans including a traffic control plan;
- ✓ Preliminary and final cost estimate;
- ✓ Project specifications;
- ✓ Design Meetings (3); and
- ✓ Permit applications

## **Phase 3: Construction Services**

We will assist you with letting, managing, observing, and documenting the project. Construction observation will be provided during all critical phases of construction. We will employ the services of a material testing laboratory to verify the compaction densities in the roadway to be patched and to test the concrete for the curbing.

### **Deliverables:**

- ✓ Bid addenda;
- ✓ Bid tabulation;
- ✓ Recommendation for award;
- ✓ One-time construction staking;
- ✓ Preconstruction meeting;
- ✓ Construction observation (assumes 32 hours of observation);
- ✓ Compaction testing on roadway patch;
- ✓ Concrete testing on curb replacement;
- ✓ Pay and work certifications; and
- ✓ Record drawings.

## ADDITIONAL SERVICES

The approach described within the Scope of Services section provides the necessary component for the feasibility analysis and construction of the Outlet Diversion of Anoka County Ditch 56. However, services that are excluded from the attached budget may be provided to Anoka County at an additional cost. These services include:

- Additional meetings (the scope currently includes 7 meetings);
- Analysis of additional project locations; and
- Wetland mitigation plan

We do not anticipate these services are needed at the present time. At the County's request, Houston Engineering will provide an Additional Services Request and Contract detailing revisions to the project scope and budget.

## ASSUMPTIONS

The costs estimated below are based on the following assumptions:

- Anoka County will provide survey data of the site;
- Geotechnical examination will consist of two soil borings at the proposed storm sewer site;
- An Engineer's Report will be prepared with one project location, and will include one revision to the report;
- Project construction will consist of a storm sewer under Thielen Boulevard and an channel diversion structure in the existing CD 56 open channel;
- Permitting activities will consist solely of application preparation;
- Construction stakes will be only set once (all other staking to be provided by the Contractor; and
- 32 hours of construction observation will be required

## SUMMARY OF COSTS AND SCHEDULE

The costs and estimated schedule for this project have been summarized for these tasks as listed below. A full breakdown of estimated costs can be viewed in the attached budget spreadsheet.

<u>Phase</u>		<u>Cost</u>	<u>Est. Completion Date</u>
Phase 1	Engineering Report	\$26,200	September 30, 2012
Phase 2	Final Design	\$28,200	January 31, 2013
Phase 3	Construction Services	\$11,800	July 1, 2013
	<u>Expenses</u>	<u>\$ 800</u>	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$67,000</b>	

Note: Estimated completion dates noted above are variable and depend on several factors, including the project start date (schedule above assumes a July 1 start), review turnaround times, timing and availability of stakeholders to meeting, and permitting response times.

### SIGNATURES:

Authorization to proceed with this Outlet Diversion of Anoka County Ditch 56 shall be effective upon the signatures of authorized representatives of Anoka County and Houston Engineering, Inc.

### SCOPE OF SERVICES CONCURRENCE

#### Anoka County

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Houston Engineering, Inc.

By: Mark R. Deutschman

Name: Mark R. Deutschman, Ph.D.

Title: Vice President

Date: June 8, 2012



**PROJECT TEAM**

---

**Chris Otterness, PE**  
**Role: Project Manager**

Chris Otterness works as a Project Manager for variety of water resources and construction projects, particularly with public drainage systems managed by counties and watershed districts. His effectiveness as a project manager is derived from his ability to communicate effectively with a wide-ranging spectrum of individuals and organizations, including County Boards, contractors, other engineers, and most importantly the general public. Chris recently designed a realignment of the Anoka/Washington Judicial Ditch 4 public drainage system for the combined purposes of drainage, wetland enhancement, and water quality improvements. Chris has a wide variety of experience leading construction projects, including public drainage system repairs, landfill expansions, housing developments, urban street construction, culvert replacements and Best Management Practice installations.

**Mark Deutschman, PhD, PE**  
**Role: Principal-In-Charge**

Mark Deutschman is a Vice President with more than 25 years of experience in public drainage system repair, water quality, watershed management, and surface water quality modeling. Mark has a unique ability to lead large, diverse stakeholder groups to resolve complex drainage, water resource, and water quality related problems. As a civil engineer Mark has been responsible for managing and implementing a range of projects including the planning, designing and construction of flood damage reduction projects, drainage system improvement projects, stormwater system assessments and master plans.

**Mike Lawrence, PE**  
**Role: Realignment Effectiveness**

Mike Lawrence is a licensed civil engineer specializing in water resources engineering. Mike has experience in all phases of a water resource project, including feasibility analysis, grant acquisition, plan preparation, bid letting, contract management, and construction observation. Mike's role in this project will be to analyze and quantify the effectiveness of routing additional drainage area into the stagnant channel area. He recently performed a similar study for the South Washington Watershed District on the Grey Cloud Slough, a backwater of the Mississippi River. Mike's analysis conclusively determined that reconnecting the upstream end of the slough to the river will decrease the residence time enough to substantially reduce the growth of algal blooms in the slough.

**Nancy Stowe, PE**  
**Role: Hydrologic Modeling**

Nancy Stowe has extensive experience in providing water resources engineering services, including the completion of hydrologic, hydraulic, and water quality studies to find solutions to the vast array of water resource issues encountered in today's landscape. Nancy's primary value to this project is her experience in modeling open channel County Ditch systems for both hydrology and water quality. Most recently, Nancy developed a SWMM hydrology/hydraulics model of the Anoka County Ditch 10-22-32 public drainage system in Lino Lakes and a P8 water quality model of the Anoka/Washington Judicial Ditch 3 system in Hugo and Centerville.



## REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS

### RICE CREEK WATERSHED DISTRICT ACD-15 / JD-4 REPAIR REPORT AND CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

**Client:** Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD)

**Contact:** Mr. Phil Belfiori, Administrator (763-398-3070)

**Services rendered:** Drainage System Repair, Funding by Water Management District, Wetlands Analysis, Stakeholder Involvement



*JD 4 within the Houle WMA*

The RCWD manages many public drainage systems serving agricultural lands, including Anoka County Ditch 15 (ACD 15) and Anoka-Washington Judicial Ditch 4 (JD 4). The RCWD retained Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) to prepare this Repair Report, meeting the requirements of MS 103E, evaluating conceptual repair alternatives addressing the District's goals for the system, including agricultural drainage capacity, water quality and quantity, ecological preservation, and cost. Six alternatives were hydrologically modeled for current and future land uses, and then evaluated through a cost/benefit analysis. HEI recommended a multi-faceted solution to the Board of Managers, comprised of ditch repair, open channel realignment to avoid high value/sensitive wetland, wetland restoration, and regular ditch maintenance. HEI subsequently assisted the District in permitting, developed a funding mechanism for the project, and created construction plans and specifications.

#### Client Benefits:

- The repair report is sensitive to a wide variety of needs, including agricultural, ecological, and financial interests.
- Board of Managers was able to compare, contrast, and ultimately select a preferred alternative to repair their public drainage system, which serves as a decision-making tool for them to use for future ditch repair proceedings.
- The presentation at the public hearing utilized layperson's terminology and phrasing to convey the concepts of the repair to a diverse audience with a wide range of interests and knowledge of the subject matter.

### GREY CLOUD SLOUGH MEANDER RESTORATION

**Client:** South Washington Watershed District (SWWD)

**Contact:** Mr. Malt Moore, Administrator (651-714-3729)

**Services rendered:** Water Quality Project Feasibility Study

Grey Cloud Slough is a meander, or "side channel", of the Mississippi River. The inlet to the meander is located near Mississippi River Mile 827.6. The meander became hydrologically altered compared to the historical condition following the construction of Grey Cloud Island Drive, which resulted in reduced flow through the meander. Culverts replaced the original bridge, and during an emergency road raise in 1965 flow through the meander was completely stopped. This resulted in the stagnation of water and a decline in water quality as evidenced by an increase in the number and severity of algal blooms, the degradation of fish habitat, the reduction of diversity in the fish community, and an increase in the number of invasive species. The restoration of the Grey Cloud Slough was identified as a priority



*Grey Cloud Slough*

project by the South Washington Watershed District in addition to several state and federal agencies. South Washington Watershed District retained Houston Engineering (HEI) to prepare a feasibility study to restore flow in to the Slough. Several alternatives were analyzed for a variety of design criteria including fish passage, geomorphic stability, water quality, and recreational navigability. A HEC-RAS model for the Mississippi River and the Grey Cloud Slough was created and used for the analyses. The feasibility study was then used as a tool to by stakeholders to select the preferred alternative and decide upon allocations for funding construction

#### Client Benefits:

- A detailed report and cost estimates for various alternatives aided the decision making process between stakeholders.
- A thorough analysis of alternatives for numerous criteria will help the project move forward through various agencies.

## REPRESENTATIVE PROJECTS

### ANOKA COUNTY DITCH 31 AND 46 REPAIR REPORTS

**Client:** Rice Creek Watershed District (RCWD)

**Contact:** Mr. Phil Belfiori, Administrator (763-398-3070)

**Services rendered:** 103E Public Drainage System Repair, Wetland impact Analysis



*Anoka County Ditch 31 in Columbus, Minnesota*

The RCWD has developed an integrated resource management approach to addressing the need to repair their public drainage systems, while considering the consequences to resources resulting from repair. This approach, known as a Resource Management Plan (RMP), balances competing issues related to providing agricultural drainage, accommodates the need for additional conveyance as land develops, and considers adverse and/or beneficial consequences to natural resources and water quality. RCWD retained Houston Engineering, Inc. (HEI) to prepare repair reports meeting the requirements of MS 103E for two Anoka County Ditch systems as part of the Columbus RMP. Four alternatives were modeled and analyzed for each public drainage system. The Engineer's Recommended Alternatives included realignment of portions of the public drainage system and a legal modification to the outlet of ACD 31 into Howard Lake.

#### Client Benefits:

- Costs, benefits, and impacts were clearly defined not only to meet the requirements of MS 103E but also to lay a groundwork for future permitting and cost allocation processes.
- The Engineer's Recommended Alternatives utilized a selective approach to repair of the public drainage system to minimize impacts while maximizing the drainage benefit to agricultural lands.
- SWMM modeling of the public drainage systems not only enables a quantification of wetland impacts through season-long simulations but also provides a base model for future water quality modeling.

### CHISAGO COUNTY DITCH 9 REPAIR PROJECT

**Client:** Chisago County

**Contact:** Mr. Joe Triplett, County Engineer (651-257-1300)

**Services rendered:** Public Drainage System Repair, Erosion Repair

Chisago County Ditch 9 was established in 1905 and constructed in 1906. Due to major gully erosion and sediment transport, the channel profile is about 20 feet lower than the original ditch in certain locations, and in others, the channel has been filled with sediment to an elevation about 14 feet higher than the original ditch profile. A large gully developed where Ditch 9 passes over Chippewa Hill (see photo). Chisago County retained Houston Engineering to investigate County Ditch 9 within Section 11 of Sunrise Township. Houston conducted a field review of the ditch and determined the progression of gully erosion and sediment deposition. Alternatives were evaluated, and the selected alternative involved restoring the channel to the condition to which it was constructed downstream from the gully. This alternative included clearing and excavation, adopting a new grade line for a reach of the ditch, and provisions to install two drop structures to lower the ditch grade from the existing level to the original ditch grade.



*Eroding Bank Gully of County Ditch 9*

#### Client Benefits:

- Houston Engineering provided alternatives that allowed completing ditch repairs while maintaining the existing gully profile.

**ESTIMATED BUDGET  
ANOKA COUNTY DITCH 56 OUTLET RELOCATION**



Rates ==> \$150 \$124 \$106 \$100 \$110 \$55

Date Prepared: May 15, 2012  
Date Revised: June 6, 2012  
Checked by: MRD

Total Estimated Labor \$66,200  
Total Estimated Expenses \$766  
Total Estimated Budget \$66,966

TASK DESCRIPTION	Senior Project Manager	Project Engineer	Field Crew	Geotechnical Subconsultant	Senior Designer	Admin. Assistant	Total Labor	
							Hours	Dollars
<b>ANOKA COUNTY DITCH 56 OUTLET RELOCATION</b>	16	337	12	60	130	8	563	\$66,200
<b>Phase 1 - Engineering Report</b>	6	172	4	0	28	8	218	\$26,172
Analysis and Report Preparation	5	134	4	0	28	8	179	\$21,310
Project Kickoff/Obtain County Data	2	4	4	0	2	0	10	\$1,500
Field Survey / Site Visit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0
Existing Conditions Hydrologic Model	0	24	0	0	0	0	24	\$3,120
Proposed Conditions Hydrologic Model	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$1,040
Preliminary Design of Infrastructure	1	16	0	0	16	0	16	\$2,080
Preliminary Opinion of Probable Construction Cost	0	8	0	0	2	0	2	\$260
Determination of Public Benefit	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	\$520
Preliminary Report	0	50	0	0	8	8	66	\$8,150
Revisions and Final Report	0	16	0	0	0	0	16	\$2,080
<b>Public Hearing &amp; Recommendations</b>	1	38	0	0	0	0	39	\$4,862
Notice of Public Hearing	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	\$520
Public Hearing	0	12	0	0	8	0	12	\$1,524
Summary of proceedings and recommendation	1	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$1,040
Public Works Committee Meeting	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$1,040
County Board Meeting	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	\$768
<b>Phase 2 - Final Design Services</b>	8	127	0	40	66	0	241	\$28,208
<b>75% Plans</b>	0	31	0	40	42	0	113	\$12,454
Cover	0	1	0	0	4	0	5	\$620
Existing Conditions/Demolitions	0	1	0	0	4	0	5	\$620
Plan and Profile	0	4	0	0	8	0	12	\$1,524
Sheet Pile structural design and panel layout	0	4	0	0	8	0	12	\$1,524
SWPPP	0	1	0	0	4	0	5	\$620
Details	0	2	0	0	8	0	10	\$1,276
Traffic Plan	0	4	0	0	4	0	8	\$1,040
Geotechnical evaluation	0	2	0	40	0	0	42	\$5,252
Preliminary cost estimate	0	4	0	0	2	0	6	\$768
Design Meeting	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$1,040
<b>95% Plans and Specifications</b>	8	60	0	0	16	0	84	\$10,400
Revisions to plans	4	8	0	0	8	0	20	\$2,520
Project Manual - Division 0	0	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$1,040
Project Specifications - Division 1 and 2	4	16	0	0	0	0	16	\$2,080
Design Meetings (2)	0	16	0	0	4	0	20	\$2,520
Final Cost estimate	0	4	0	0	8	0	12	\$1,524
Final revisions	0	8	0	0	8	0	16	\$2,080
<b>Permitting</b>	0	36	0	0	8	0	44	\$5,344
WCA Joint Notification Form	0	32	0	0	8	0	40	\$5,040
NPDES	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	\$520
<b>Phase 3 - Construction Services</b>	2	38	8	20	36	0	104	\$11,820
<b>Bidding</b>	2	18	0	0	0	0	20	\$2,532
Questions from bidders / Addenda	2	10	0	0	0	0	12	\$1,524
Bid tabulation	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	\$520
Recommendation to Board	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	\$520
<b>Construction Management</b>	0	18	0	0	32	0	50	\$5,752
Preconstruction Meeting	0	4	0	0	32	0	36	\$4,464
Construction Observation	0	4	0	0	0	0	4	\$520
Payments and certification	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	\$768
<b>Survey / Geotechnical</b>	0	2	8	20	4	0	34	\$3,536
Staking	0	2	4	0	0	0	6	\$768
Record Drawings	0	0	0	20	0	0	20	\$2,532
Geotechnical testing	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	\$520



**2012 FEE SCHEDULE**

The following is a schedule of hourly rates and charges for engineering and surveying services offered by Houston Engineering, Inc.

Senior Project Manager	150.00 per hour	Computer Technician	108.00 per hour
Project Manager	137.00 per hour	Senior Administrative Assistant	61.00 per hour
Project Engineer	124.00 per hour	Administrative Assistant	55.00 per hour
Professional Engineer	111.00 per hour		
Design Engineer	99.00 per hour		
Graduate Engineer	88.00 per hour		
Legislative/Grant Specialist	127.00 per hour		
Expert Witness	165.00 per hour		
		<u>Chargeable Expenses</u>	
Senior Environmental Project Manager	151.00 per hour	Subsistence	Actual Cost
Senior Environmental Scientist	131.00 per hour	Travel Vehicles –	
Environmental Scientist	113.00 per hour	2-wheel drive	IRS Standard Mileage Rate
Scientist	98.00 per hour	4-wheel drive	IRS Standard Mileage Rate + \$0.20 per mile
Graduate Scientist	88.00 per hour	GPS Equipment	\$25.00 per hour per unit
Senior Designer	110.00 per hour	Robotic Total Station	\$20.00 per hour
Designer	93.00 per hour	All Terrain Vehicle	
Senior Land Surveyor	122.00 per hour	Snowmobile / Boat	\$15.00 per hour
Land Surveyor	103.00 per hour	Long distance telephone, facsimile, overnight mail and postage	Actual Cost
Graduate Land Surveyor	88.00 per hour	Cost of surveying materials, printing, special equipment, and other materials required for the job	Actual Cost
Senior Construction Engineer	122.00 per hour	Sub-Consultants	Actual Cost + 10%
Construction Engineer	103.00 per hour		
Graduate Construction Engineer	88.00 per hour		
Senior Technician	88.00 per hour		
Technician	80.00 per hour		
Graduate Technician	69.00 per hour		
Technician Intern	61.00 per hour		
Senior GIS Project Manager	130.00 per hour		
GIS Project Manager	115.00 per hour		
GIS Developer	105.00 per hour		
GIS Specialist	88.00 per hour		
GIS Technician/Developer II	77.00 per hour		
GIS Technician I	67.00 per hour		
Surveyors: One-person crew	106.00 per hour		
Two-person crew	132.00 per hour		
Three-person crew	164.00 per hour		
Four-person crew	187.00 per hour		
CADD Manager	88.00 per hour		
CADD Supervisor	80.00 per hour		
Senior CADD Operator	69.00 per hour		
CADD Operator	61.00 per hour		