McMillan, Acquanette (Netta)

From: William M. Paparian
Sent: Thursday, November 5, 2026 7:38 PM
To: PublicComment-AutoResponse; cityclerk; Jomsky, Mark
Subject: Agenda Item 10 – Authorization to Amend Contract No. 33343 with Frame Group LLC and Increase the Total Not-to-Exceed Amount to $1,450,000

[!] **CAUTION:** This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you ***know*** the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button (PAB). For more information about the PAB view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

I submit this written comment on the staff recommendation to amend Contract No. 33343 with Frame Group LLC, increasing the not-to-exceed amount by $1,200,000 to a total of $1,450,000. This is a nearly six-fold increase over the original $250,000 contract, yet it appears on the consent calendar with only limited public information on results achieved to date.

The scale of this increase does not pass a basic smell test. A jump from $250,000 to $1.45 million in a matter of months, supported primarily by qualitative descriptions of activity rather than quantified results, detailed calculations, or independent verification, raises legitimate questions about necessity and value that the public record does not resolve.

This item should not advance without direct examination. It fits a recurring pattern in which large outside consulting contracts are approved with minimal substantive questioning, little disclosure of measurable results, and limited opportunity for public or Council review. Placing an increase of this magnitude on the consent calendar further restricts that scrutiny and should not substitute for a full discussion of necessity, value, and fiscal exposure.

I respectfully request that the Council pull Agenda Item 10 from the consent calendar and require clear answers to the following questions before any vote:

Results and value so far

- What specific, measurable results has Frame Group produced under the original $250,000 contract (e.g., additional eligible costs identified, RFI responses completed, project worksheets advanced, insurance claims prepared, or dollars obligated/recovered)?
- Can staff provide a side-by-side comparison of claimed eligible costs or recoveries with and without the consultant's input, or any independent verification of those figures?
- How much of the original $250,000 has been spent, and on what deliverables?

Justification for the increase

- What is the detailed scope of work and estimated hours/rates for the additional $1.2 million? How was the $1.2 million figure calculated?
- Which specific projects (beyond the general references to Don Benito Reservoir and the Police Training Center) drive the need, and what technical work remains?
- What happens if the amendment is denied or reduced—what recovery risks or delays does staff quantify?

Cost recovery and fiscal impact

- What portion of the $1.45 million total is realistically expected to be offset by insurance claim preparation coverage, FEMA management cost reimbursements (the 5% cap), or other sources, and on what timeline?
- Has any insurance or FEMA reimbursement related to these consulting costs already been received?
- What is the net General Fund exposure if offsets fall short of the estimates in the agenda report?

Procurement, oversight, and alternatives

- Was the original selection competitive (16 proposals), and does the large amendment effectively sole-source expanded work without further competition?
- What performance metrics, reporting requirements, and termination provisions are in the contract or amendment?
- Has the City considered or compared the cost of building more in-house capacity versus continued reliance on the consultant?
- How will progress and invoices be monitored and reported to the Council going forward?

Broader context

- How does this consulting cost compare to the estimated total recoverable damages for the city facilities involved?
- Are there any conflicts of interest or related-party issues with Frame Group or its partner Imperium Consulting Group?

These questions go directly to whether the increase is necessary, whether the City has received measurable value, and whether the fiscal risk is acceptable. Approving the amendment on the consent calendar without answers would continue a pattern that leaves the public without adequate assurance that large consulting expenditures are justified. I ask that the Council pull the item and require written responses before taking action.

Mayor Gordo and members of the City Council, you were elected by the citizens of Pasadena to serve as stewards of the public's money. That role carries a fiduciary duty to the people who placed their trust in you—to ask hard questions, to demand evidence of value, and to protect the public purse from expenditures that have not been fully justified. I call upon you to fulfill that duty here: pull Agenda Item 10 from the consent calendar, require written answers to the questions above, and do not approve this increase until the necessity, results, and net cost to the City have been clearly demonstrated.

Thank you for your consideration.

William M. Paparian
Former Mayor and Councilmember