

PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST (amended)

PROJECT ID: 0200000161
 DISTRICT/EA: 02/2C090 PPNO: 3212 PGM Doc: SHOPP PGM Del FY: 15/16 PROG CODE: 20.XX.201.110

Cty Rte PM Description

PROJECT (SCOPE) DESCRIPTION: PLU 70 50.6/51.7 In Plumas County near Quincy from 0.6 mile west to 0.5 mile east of Spring Garden Bridge Overhead. Replace Bridge.

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	\$1,100	15/16	\$1,600	15/16	\$1,059	97%	80%	\$500	45%	_____	A B
PS&E	\$1,700	15/16	\$1,400	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$(300)	(18)%	_____	A
R/W SUP	\$300	15/16	\$230	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$(70)	(24)%	_____	A
CON SUP	\$2,100	15/16	\$2,800	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$700	34%	_____	A
R/W CAP	\$240	15/16	\$240	15/16	\$5	2%	0%	\$0	0%	_____	NA
CON CAP	\$15,400	15/16	\$11,900	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$(3,500)	(23)%	_____	A
Total	\$20,840		\$18,170		\$1,064			\$(2,670)	(13)%		

PA&ED exp > budget. See attached R/G

WHAT PHASE IS THE PROJECT IN?

PRE-PGM DELIVERY YR PGM DELIVERY YR & PRE VOTE POST VOTE

Cost Change Type	Description	Programmed Budget	Data Systems Changed
Cost Change Request Types			
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: PLU 70 50.6/51.7 In Plumas County near Quincy from 0.6 mile west to 0.5 mile east of Spring Garden Bridge Overhead. Rehabilitate Bridge

"010" Safety Project? Yes No (Only If Revised)

(SHOPP PRIMARY PERFORMANCE OUTPUT BY PROGRAM CODE)

Project Performance	EXISTING (PROGRAMMED)		PROPOSED		PERFORMANCE CHANGE		
	<u>1</u> Value	bridge Units	<u>1</u> Value	bridge Units	<u>NA</u> Value	<u>NA</u> Units	<u>NA%</u>

1.) **WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?**

To increase programmed PA&ED and construction support, and decrease programmed PS&E, R/W, and construction capital. Also, to change scope of work from bridge replacement to bridge rehabilitation + widening.

2.) **COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING REGARDING THE LATEST TWO COST ESTIMATES.**
(\$'s in 1,000's.)

1. *(rehab. + widen)* ESTIMATE DATE: 12/14, Con Capital \$11,900 RW Capital \$240.
(replacement) ESTIMATE DATE: 12/14, Con Capital \$17,000 RW Capital \$240.
2. *(replacement)* ESTIMATE DATE: 04/13, Con Capital \$11,400 RW Capital \$240.

3.) **WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE?**

The PA&ED costs are projected to overrun as a result of: 1). The District studied a realignment alternative not in the PSSR and 2). A change in scope from replacement to rehabilitation as directed by the HQ Program Manager, Mike Johnson and District 2 Director, John Bulinski.

It was determined that bridge rehabilitation and widening was the best alternative to the project's environmental, terrain, and delivery constraints. As such, much of the environment and early design were re-worked. Other PCR changes reflect a revalidation of support and capital costs with the scope change. Support costs have also been increased 15% in anticipation of the Department's new loaded rates.

4.) **WHEN WAS THE CHANGE DISCOVERED?**

The District and the HQ Bridge Program agreed to investigate the scope change in February 2014, with a PDT validation in September 2014. A decision is due in February from the Union Pacific Railroad regarding work within 18 ft of the railroad tracks. A negative response could force the replacement alternative.

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

The rehabilitation alternative has been chosen to minimize changes in capital funding.

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

No additional construction capital funds are requested.

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

This PCR represents a change in scope while still meeting the project's need and purpose.

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

Yes. A supplemental scoping change PSSR document has been written and approved.

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

A 1997 VA was performed on this bridge and concluded to realign the highway. The 1997 alternative was dropped when Plumas County removed STIP funding. The District is not pursuing the VA alternative because of cost and delivery constraints

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

From the SHOPP

11.) PRIOR PCRs – LIST OTHER PCRs PREVIOUSLY APPROVED. 7/2010 (schedule change - environmental constraints) and 5/2013 (schedule change - workload and railroad / CPUC issues, and support change - PA&ED under resourced.)

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.

NA

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

NA

(C) (SHOPP) WHEN DID THE DISTRICT DISCUSS THIS WITH THE HEADQUARTERS PROGRAM MANAGER? EXPLAIN THEIR REACTION. The scope change was agreed upon by the District 2 Director and the HQ Bridge Program Manager, Michael Johnson, in February 2014. During a January 2015 meeting in District 2, Michael Johnson reiterated his support for the rehabilitation alternative.

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

As bridge replacement alternatives become more expensive, previously dropped alternatives such as rehabilitation could become more viable

14.) District Project Manager Signature

[Signature]
Eric Orr
District Project Manager

1/29/15 (530) 225-3439
Date Phone Number

[Signature]
Ed Lamkin
Deputy District Director
Program/Project Management

1-30-15
Date

APPROVAL - COMMENTS - CONCERNS

- PD Concurrence
- PD Objections (detail concerns):

15.) Comments - Concerns:

[Signature]
Jim Deluca
HQ Project Delivery Coordinator

1/30/15
Date

APPROVAL

[Signature]
John Bulinski
DISTRICT DIRECTOR

1/30/15
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

[Signature] for
JAMES E. DAVIS
HQ DIVISION CHIEF
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

2/18/15
Date

for

[Signature] 2/18/15
RACHEL FALSETTI Date
HQ DIVISION CHIEF
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Attach Letter to project workplan and include
- 2. Attach the current files on the information
- 3. Attach the current files on the information
- 4. Attach the current files on the information
- 5. Attach the current files on the information

PROJECT ID: 12-00151
DISTRICT FA: 22-001

SHOPP REPORT 2015 DISTRICT 02

PRSM date = 01/27/2015

CTIPS date = 01/12/2015

DRAFT-INTERNAL USE ONLY

Page 31
01/27/2015

02 PLU 070 2C090	DESCRIPTION: REPLACE BRIDGE DECK IRDAP #3212	2014 SHOPP	PS&E	RW	CON	RW CAP	CON CAP	TOTAL
CTips_id = 1300002087	Cd+Ppno = 02-3212	Title =	PAGEED					
PROGRAMMED	20.XX.201.110 - SHOPP Br Presrvn	1,100,000	1,700,000	300,000	2,100,000	240,000	15,400,000	20,840,000
PROGRAMMED SUM		1,100,000	1,700,000	300,000	2,100,000	240,000	15,400,000	20,840,000
CD+EA5 = 02-2C090	Note: * means includes distributed expenditures. Mgr: ERIC D. ORR, Phone: 530-225-3439							
EXPENDED	20.10.201.110 - Br Rehab	1,084,985	0	0	0	0	0	1,084,985
EXPENDED SUM		1,084,985	0	0	0	0	0	1,084,985
ESTIMATE TO COMPLETE		513,328	1,250,892	193,757	2,390,918	0	0	4,348,896
ESTIMATE AT COMPLETE		1,598,313	1,250,892	193,757	2,390,918	491,000	15,400,000	21,324,882
DIFFERENCE		-498,313	449,107	106,242	-290,918	-251,000	0	-484,882

02 PLU 070 2E000	DESCRIPTION: HOT MIX ASPHALT	2010 SHOPP	PS&E	RW	CON	RW CAP	CON CAP	TOTAL
CTips_id = 1300002081	Cd+Ppno = 02-3414	Title =	PAGEED					
PROGRAMMED	20.XX.201.010 - SHOPP Clsn Rdcn	228,000	212,000	96,000	372,000	101,000	2,099,000	3,108,000
PROGRAMMED SUM		228,000	212,000	96,000	372,000	101,000	2,099,000	3,108,000
CD+EA5 = 02-2E000	Note: * means includes distributed expenditures. Mgr: CHRIS S. HARVEY, Phone: 530-225-3101							
EXPENDED	20.XX.201.010 - Safety Imprsr	452,710	132,802	85,387	274,213	5,261	1,493,136	2,443,510
EXPENDED SUM		452,710	132,802	85,387	274,213	5,261	1,493,136	2,443,510
ESTIMATE TO COMPLETE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESTIMATE AT COMPLETE		452,710	132,802	85,387	274,213	0	1,567,000	2,512,112
DIFFERENCE		-224,710	79,197	10,612	97,786	96,000	532,000	590,887

PAED

Project	Dollars	Hours	<u>PECT</u>	<u>COE</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>Fund Source</u>	FY
02-2C0900	\$ 2,078	24	20.10.201.110	61000	42	T	10
02-2C0900	\$ 12,727	134	20.10.201.110	61000	892	F	10
02-2C0900	\$ 12,569	123	20.10.201.110	61000	42	T	11
02-2C0900	\$ 92,962	913	20.10.201.110	61000	890	F	11
02-2C0900	\$ 144,241	1,661	20.10.201.110	61000	890	F	12
02-2C0900	\$ 19,502	225	20.10.201.110	61000	42	T	12
02-2C0900	\$ 16,087	160	20.10.201.110	61000	42	T	13
02-2C0900	\$ 124,167	1,234	20.10.201.110	61000	890	F	13
02-2C0900	\$ 88,951	243	20.10.201.110	61000	42	T	14
02-2C0900	\$ 144,686	1,872	20.10.201.110	61000	890	F	14
02-2C0900	\$ 159	1	20.10.201.110	61000	42	T	15
02-2C0900	\$ 494,155	4,271	20.10.201.110	61000	890	F	15

\$ 1,152,284