

PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST

PROJECT ID. 0214000004

DISTRICT/EA 02-4G490 PPNO 3538 PGM Doc. PGM Del FY 2016 PROG CODE 20.XX.201.010

Cty Rte PM Description

PROJECT (SCOPE) DESCRIPTION: SHASTA 044 45.1/45.5 In Shasta County near Viola from 1.5 miles to 1.1 miles west of North Battle Creek Reservoir Road. Curve realignment.

DOES THIS PROJECT INVOLVE PROPOSITION 1B FUND(S)? NO YES TYPE(S) (CMIA, Route 99, STIP, SHOPP, etc.)

SCOPE, COST & SCHEDULE CHANGES

TYPE OF REQUEST: PGM COST PGM YEAR SCOPE SPLIT / COMBINE OTHER:

COMPONENT Change (\$'s in 1,000's)

	EXISTING (PROGRAMMED)		PROPOSED		COST EXPENDED to Date % COMPLETE			COST CHANGE			
	Value	FY	Value	FY	Expended	% Expended	% Complete	Value	Value%	Yrs	Type
PA&ED	\$ 374	15/16	\$ 494	15/16	\$ 494	132 %	100%	\$120	32%	0	C
PS&E	\$ 226	15/16	\$ 480	15/16	\$ 90	40%	35%	\$254	112%	0	A
R/W SUP	\$ 94	15/16	\$ 188	15/16	\$ 11	12%	0%	\$94	100%	0	A
CON SUP	\$ 286	15/16	\$ 527	15/16	\$ 0	0%	0%	\$241	84%	0	A
R/W CAP	\$ 50	15/16	\$ 288	15/16	\$ 1	1%	0%	\$238	476%	0	A
CON CAP	\$ 1,550	15/16	\$ 2,300	15/16	\$ 0	0%	0%	\$750	48%	0	A
Total	\$ 2,580		\$4,277		\$596			\$1,697	66%		

WHAT PHASE IS THE PROJECT IN? PRE-PGM DELIVERY YR PGM DELIVERY YR & PRE VOTE POST VOTE
 This project is currently in the zero phase

Cost Change Type	Description	Data Systems Changed	
	Cost Change Request Types	Programmed Budget	Approved Cost
A	Programming Cost Change	CTIPS	AMS Advantage
B	Headquarters Cost Approval		AMS Advantage
C	District Cost Documentation		
NA	No Change Proposed		
	Supplemental Funds Requests		
SFR	Supplemental Funds Request		AMS Advantage If Expenditures < 100%

Cty - Rte - PM - Description

New Project Description: SHA- 44- 44.9:45.5 In Shasta County near Viola from 1.7 miles to 1.1 miles west of North Battle Creek Reservoir Road.

"010" Safety Project? Yes No

(Only If Revised)

Project
Performance

EXISTING (PROGRAMMED)		PROPOSED		PERFORMANCE CHANGE		
18 Value	Collisions Units	18 Value	Collisions Units	0 Value	Collisions Units	0%

(SHOPP PRIMARY PERFORMANCE
OUTPUT BY PROGRAM CODE)

1.) WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?

This PCR proposes to extend post mile limits, increase support estimates and construction capital estimate.

2.) COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING REGARDING THE LATEST TWO COST ESTIMATES.

(\$'s in 1,000's.)

1. ESTIMATE DATE: 10/14

Con Capital \$2,220,

RW Capital \$288.

2. ESTIMATE DATE: 09/13

Con Capital \$1,550

RW Capital \$50.

3.) WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE?

This change is necessary in order to meet the need and purpose of the proposed project. The request is for increases in support costs as well as capital costs. Support costs were baselined utilizing generic template hours based on similar project history. This initial resourcing technique is done in order to expedite the K phase of the project with the understanding that the estimated resources will be estimated from bottoms up and a PCR will most likely be required. This risk is covered in the PID milestone Risk Plan (attached).

The increase in construction capital and right of way capital are due to extending the project limits as well as additional costs for hauling the majority of the roadway excavation quantities to a disposal site. Initially the earthwork for the project was to be balanced within the limits of the project. Now that the project has been developed the earthwork cannot be balanced within the project limits and excess material will have to be hauled off the project. This has increased the cost of the construction earthwork due to the additional haul as well as the right of way capital and support to procure disposal site. The Capital Cost increases for Construction capital and Right of Way capital can be funded from the projects revised Safety Index (SI). The new SI for the project is 388.

4.) WHEN WAS THE CHANGE DISCOVERED?

This change was discovered in October 2014. Since the change was identified, all functional areas have been updating their respective estimates for both capital and support. All estimates for capital and support have now been updated and additional dollars were included in support costs to reflect the increase cost of labor cost reflected in the newly revised cost matrix.

5.) WHAT HAS BEEN DONE TO MINIMIZE ANY CHANGE?

The team has increased the embankment area in order to minimize excess material that will be hauled off the project.

6.) WHAT CAN BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE PROGRAMMED FUNDS?

There are no buildable alternatives that would meet the need and purpose of the project.

7.) IF THE SCOPE IS REDUCED OR SPLIT, WOULD THE REMOVED WORK NEED TO BE REPROGRAMMED OR ADDED TO ANOTHER PROJECT?

Yes, the project limits would have to be reduced and the remaining work would have to be completed under a different project.

8.) IS A SUPPLEMENTAL SCOPING DOCUMENT NEEDED? IF YES, STATUS?

Not necessary. The approved Project Report included this change.

9.) WAS A VALUE ANALYSIS STUDY CONDUCTED? EXPLAIN THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY OR WHY A STUDY WAS NOT CONDUCTED?

No. This project does not meet the requirements for a VA study.

10.) COST - WHERE WILL THE REQUIRED FUNDS COME FROM?

SHOPP

11.) PRIOR PCRs – LIST OTHER PCRs PREVIOUSLY APPROVED.

None

PROJECT CONCURRENCE

12.) (A) (STIP-RIP) WHEN DID THE DISTRICT DISCUSS THIS WITH HEADQUARTERS STIP PROGRAM MANAGER AND THE RTPA OR COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSIONS STAFF? EXPLAIN THEIR REACTION.

(B) (STIP-IIP) WHEN DID THE DISTRICT DISCUSS THIS WITH HEADQUARTERS STIP PROGRAM MANAGER? EXPLAIN THEIR REACTION.

(C) (SHOPP) WHEN DID THE DISTRICT DISCUSS THIS WITH THE HEADQUARTERS PROGRAM MANAGER? EXPLAIN THEIR REACTION.

The district program adviser discussed this change with Tom Schriber in November 2014. Mr. Schriber concurred with the proposed changes.

13.) LESSONS LEARNED, NEW STRATEGIES (What new information pertaining to this project could be beneficial to others?)

This project was one of the first projects in District 2 to utilize the Small Capital Value Project (SCVP) format. The PID was approved without a Right of Way Data Sheet or environmental PEAR. This fact was noted on the project Risk Management Plan. Not having the cost data prior to PID approval is a flaw in the processing of the PID. There will be no more SCVP's approved without Right of Way Data sheet or PEAR to identify costs prior to programming.

14.) District Project Manager Signature

Chris Harvey
 CHRIS HARVEY
 District Project Manager

2/27/15
 Date

(530) 225-3101
 Phone Number

Ed Lamkin
 ED LAMKIN
 Deputy District Director
 Program/Project Management

2-27-15
 Date

APPROVAL - COMMENTS - CONCERNS

PD Concurrence

PD Objections (detail concerns):

15.) Comments - Concerns:

Jim Deluca
 JIM DELUCA
 HQ Project Delivery Coordinator

2/29/15
 Date

APPROVAL

John Bulinski
 JOHN BULINSKI
 DISTRICT DIRECTOR

3/3/15
 Date

	Approve	Deny	No HQ Action
Cost	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Split / Combine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Revise & Resubmit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Monika for
 JAMES E. DAVIS
 HQ DIVISION CHIEF
 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

3/17/15
 Date

Rachel Falsetti
 RACHEL FALSETTI
 HQ DIVISION CHIEF
 TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

3/18/15
 Date

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

- (a) Attach 1 page copy (screenprint) of project work plan status schedule.
- (b) Attach the current CTIPS project information.
- (c) PCR Data Worksheet, if applicable (for splits/combines).
- (d) For STIP Projects, please attach the latest Project Programming Request (PPR)
- (e) Summary Cost Estimates, if/when needed

PROJECT ID: _____
 DISTRICT/EA: _____

State Highway Operation and Protection Program
Shasta County
 Document Year 2012, Version Number 1
 PPNO: 3538
 (Dollars in Thousands)

DIST.	PPNO:	EA:	CTIPS ID:	ICRP No.	TITLE (DESCRIPTION):	ELEMENT:	SHOPP Major Const	MPO ID:	11
02	3538	46460	111-0000-0230		(Near Viola, from 1.5 miles to 1.1 miles west of North Battle Creek Reservoir Road, improve roadway geometrics.)	SPONSOR:	Caltrans		
CT PROJECT ID:						MPC:	Shasta County RTPA		
02-1400-0004						CORRIDOR:			
COUNTY:	ROUTE:	PM:							
Shasta County	44	45.1 / 45.4							
						PRJ MGR:	Chris Harvey		
						PHONE:	(530) 225-3101	LAW:	12
						EMAIL:	Chris.Harvey@dot.ca.gov		

ASSEMBLY:	2	IMPLEMENTING	PA&E	RW
SENATE:	4	AGENCIES:	PSE	CON
CONGRESS:	2			

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY (Printed Version is Shaded) (Last 9 versions displayed)

Version	Status	Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Vote	Cum Award	Programmed Dollars in Thousands - Total For Project					
								Prog Con	Prog RW	PA & ED	PS & E	RW Sup	Con Sup
1	Official	09/25/13	AGREGORI	Amendment - New Project	12H-349			1,580	50	374	226	94	286
0													

Fund Source	1 of 1	SHOPP - Collision Reduction	PRIOR	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	FUTURE	TOTAL
20.XX.201.010		- Safety Improvements					374				374
<u>Fund Type:</u>			PA&E				226				226
Surface Transportation Program			PS&E				94				94
			RW SUP				286				286
			CON SUP				50				50
			RW				1,550				1,550
			CON				2,580				2,580
			Total:								

HQ Comments:
 ***** Version 1 - 09/27/2013 *****
 Made Amendment 12H-349 official - ACG
 Entered new 2014 SHOPP project - RW

WYOMING REGULATORY: Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed
 E-A: 10-05347
 C-A-R: 2010-01
 P-R: 05-105-0

Level 2 Risk Register - Checksheet 9/13
 FY 0 Program: 153A Program: 910
 Total Costs (Capital & Support): \$7,100,000

Date:

Status	ID #	Type	Category	Title	Risk Identification				Risk Assessment				Risk Response		Risk Owner	Updated
					Risk Statement	Current status/assumptions	Probability	Cost Impact	Time Impact	Time Score	Rationale	Strategy	Response Actions			
Active	101	Threat	PM	Capital Support Cost	The PID was completed without formal input from RW and Environmental. No final PEAP or RW data sheets completed. Capital and support costs for air, RW purchase or Environmental and all support units have very rough estimates and may require additional design. This project may be delayed if a higher level of design is required. Disposal site clearance not included in original estimate.	The project has a high \$100M additional cost may require a PCR. These costs will be within the SI amount. Support cost changes will be modified by PCR once a bottom-up requests are complete.	3-Moderate	4-Moderate	2-Low	12	3	Accept	Continue to get all resource and capital requests complete. Modify programming by PCR once all cost information has been received.	Chris Harvey	8/16/2013	
Active	110	Threat	Environmental	Assumed CE-CF	Adjacent property owner has been identified as Sierra Pacific Industries. No estimate of tree value at this time not included in PID estimate.		3-Moderate	4-Moderate	4-Moderate	12	12	Accept		Anber Kelly	8/16/2013	
Active	120	Threat	RW	Delay of RW Acquisition	Nesting birds protected from harassment under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act may delay construction during the nesting season.	Will schedule project to the contractor can remove trees between September and February, typical removal window.	2-Low	2-Low	4-Moderate	8	8	Mitigate	Schedule contract work to avoid the nesting season or remove nesting habitat before starting work.	Chris Harvey	8/16/2013	
Active	140	Threat	ROW	Utility Relocation	Utility relocation not completed prior to the beginning of construction	Currently at the beginning of the environmental phase at this time. Should not be a problem if mapping is submitted by June 2014	2-Low	4-Moderate	4-Moderate	8	8	Accept	Monitor the submittal of RW utility verification mapping.	Lee Hernandez-Harvey	1/13/2014	
Active	160	Threat	Design	Dispose Site location	This project will require the disposal of approximately 100,000 cubic yards of material. The location of the final disposal site the unit cost of the excavation may be greatly increased.	Current estimated cost for excavation is \$100,000. The cost of excavation may increase the further the project. Hour in excess of 10 miles will increase estimated excavation cost.	3-Moderate	8-High	2-Low	20	8	Accept	Two possible sites have been identified. Looking into the possibility of using the site on Sierra Pacific land which is close and one 20 miles east of the project on USFS land.	Russ Iwin, Lita Hernandez-Harvey	1/13/2014	