

PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST

PROJECT ID. 0300000458

DISTRICT/EA 03-3C380

PPNO 3258

PGM Doc. 2014 SHOPP

PGM Del FY 15/16

PROG CODE 335

PROJECT (SCOPE) DESCRIPTION: ED 50 75.4/77.3 In South Lake Tahoe from Route 89 North to Trout Creek Bridge #25-13. Stormwater Mitigation.

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	\$ <u>1,300</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>1,300</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>1,306</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>N/A</u>
PS&E	\$ <u>3,741</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>7,100</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>5,428</u>	<u>145%</u>	<u>80%</u>	\$ <u>3,359</u>	<u>90%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>C</u>
R/W SUP	\$ <u>2,650</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>5,000</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>3,284</u>	<u>124%</u>	<u>65%</u>	\$ <u>2,350</u>	<u>89%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>C</u>
CON SUP	\$ <u>3,778</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>9,800</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0%</u>	\$ <u>6,022</u>	<u>159%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>A</u>
R/W CAP	\$ <u>3,000</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>3,000</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>626</u>	<u>21%</u>	<u>19%</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>N/A</u>
CON CAP	\$ <u>24,000</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>30,500</u>	<u>15/16</u>	\$ <u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0%</u>	\$ <u>6,500</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>A</u>

Total \$38,469 \$56,700 \$10,644 \$18,231 47%

WHAT PHASE IS THE PROJECT IN? PRE-PGM DELIVERY YR PGM DELIVERY YR & PRE VOTE POST VOTE

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: _____
(Only If Revised)

"010" Safety Project? Yes No

Project Performance

EXISTING (PROGRAMMED)	PROPOSED	PERFORMANCE CHANGE
<u>58.8 acres</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>0%</u>
<u>Value Units</u>	<u>Value Units</u>	<u>Value Units</u>

(SHOPP PRIMARY PERFORMANCE OUTPUT BY PROGRAM CODE)

1.) WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?

Increase PS&E, R/W and Construction Support. Increase Construction Capital.

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

- | | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| 1. ESTIMATE DATE: <u>08/14 (MM/YY)</u> , Con Capital \$<u>30,500</u> | RW Capital \$<u>3,000</u> . |
| 2. ESTIMATE DATE: <u>02/14 (MM/YY)</u> , Con Capital \$<u>28,795</u> | RW Capital \$<u>2,351</u> . |

3.) WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE?

In general, total funding needs increased between February 2014 and today due to the following:

- More detailed information regarding the distressed condition of the existing pavement structural section.
- Changes to utility conflicts to avoid a 5-year schedule impact of relocating an existing telecommunications bank that runs the length of the project.
- Complex traffic staging, temporary paving, traffic handling work, and support for an additional 50 working days due to this traffic handling.
- The requirements in re-starting Right of Way work within the previously eliminated portion of the project.
- Scrutiny from external stakeholders to be consistent with statewide policy to provide and promote safe alternative transportation modes.
- Design and Right of Way rework associated with reducing project limits.

Cost increases for specific project components are due to:

PS&E Support Costs:

- Rework associated with reducing project limits then going back to the original limits.
- Structural section changes due to poor existing pavement conditions.
- Designing around utility conflicts.
- Extensive plan details needed due to the complexity of roadway, drainage, utilities, and construction staging plans.
- External stakeholder requests to provide options for safe alternative transportation mode.

Right-of-Way Costs:

- Rework associated with revalidating and updating appraisal reports in order to make new first written offers to replace rescinded offers.
- Amending Temporary Construction Easements (TCE) due to project schedule changes.
- Re-issue utility conflict requests to utility companies.
- Acquisition of utility easements to facilitate utility relocations.
- New appraisals for utility easements.
- Ongoing coordination with utility owners.

Construction Support:

- Current programmed amount is insufficient compared with actual expenditures on similar projects in the area.
- Tahoe basin water quality projects require work that is more detailed, complicated drainage, utility issues and staging with short construction windows.
- Environmental requirements and public outreach.
- Additional functional support during construction due to project complexities.

Construction Capital:

- Updated and increased quantities to structural section, drainage, utilities, and stage construction.
- New higher estimate for a Delaware Sand Filter (DSF) and adding and revising drainage items.
- Increasing the working days from 300 to 350 to account for complex traffic staging, temporary paving, and traffic handling work.

4.) WHEN WAS THE CHANGE DISCOVERED?

Developments have been on-going since the last PCR was approved in January 2013.

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

A meeting was held on February 27, 2014 with HQ Programming to request additional funds. Since additional funds were not available in the Stormwater program, it was decided that the only recourse was to reduce project scope. We were in the process of reducing project limits and eliminating about one-half of the project to live within the current total project budget when we learned in August 2014 that additional programming is available and we were instructed by HQ Project Management to build the entire project.

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

Half of the current project scope can be constructed.

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

Yes, the remaining work would need to be programmed as a separate project in order to complete the necessary water quality improvements.

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

A supplemental scoping document is not necessary unless the full funding is not identified and the scope is reduced.

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

A Value Analysis Study was not completed for this specific project. However, a Value Analysis Study was completed in 2007 and looked at strategies to reduce construction related impacts for all major projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin, including this one, originally planned for construction from 2008 to 2014.

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

Additional funds for support and capital will come from the SHOPP program.

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

There are three previous PCRs for this project to change the program year and to change the program cost.

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.

This PCR was discussed with Doug Coleman (District Program Advisor) and various people from HQ including, Jim Davis, Rick Guevel, Katrina Pierce, Greg Berry and Jagjiwan Grewal at various times from February 2014 to September 2014. In the end, HQ Project Management is instructing the District to build the entire project.

This PCR was discussed with Susan Massey, Pavement Program, to fund the cost change from the Pavement Program.

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

Early and proper analysis and investigation of the existing structural section, especially for projects in the Tahoe Basin.

Early involvement and buy-in from external stakeholders.

14.) District Project Manager Signature

Paulene Dixon
 for CLARK A. PERI
 District Project Manager

12-1-14
 Date

916-825-8168
 Phone Number

Thomas L. Brannon
 THOMAS L. BRANNON
 Deputy District Director
 Program/Project Management

12-7-14
 Date

APPROVAL - COMMENTS - CONCERNS

- PD Concurrence
- PD Objections (detail concerns):

15.) Comments - Concerns:

I have a number of concerns which have been shared with the District - suggest that go to PCR Exec Committee.

Jim DeLuca
 JIM DELUCA
 HQ Project Delivery Coordinator

12/2/14
 Date

APPROVAL

	<u>Approve</u>	<u>Deny</u>	<u>No HQ Action</u>
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"/>

Amarjeet S. Benipal 12/2/14
 AMARJEET BENIPAL
 DISTRICT DIRECTOR

James E. Davis for
 JAMES E. DAVIS
 HQ DIVISION CHIEF
 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

1/21/15
 Date

Rachel Falsetti for 1-22-15
 RACHEL FALSETTI
 HQ DIVISION CHIEF
 TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

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

PROJECT ID. 0300000458
 DISTRICT/EA 03-3C380

State Highway Operation and Protection Program

El Dorado County

Document Year 2014, Version Number 9

PPNO: 3258

(Dollars in Thousands)

DIST: 03	PPNO: 3258	EA: 3C380	CTIPS ID: 120-0000-0046	TCRP No.	TITLE (DESCRIPTION): (In South Lake Tahoe, north of Route 89 to Trout Creek Bridge. Water quality improvements.)	ELEMENT: SHOPP Major Const.	MPO ID: 20
CT PROJECT ID: 03-0000-0458						SPONSOR: Caltrans	
COUNTY: El Dorado County						MPO: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	
ROUTE: 50						CORRIDOR:	
PM: 75.4 / 77.3						PRJ MGR: Mike Bartlett	
						PHONE:	LAW: 06
						EMAIL:	

ASSEMBLY: 4	IMPLEMENTING	PAED	RW
SENATE: 1	AGENCIES:	PSE	CON
CONGRESS: 4			

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
9	Official	03/26/14	DBERRY	Approved - Carry Over			24,000	3,000	1,300	3,741	2,650	3,778
8	Official	01/04/13	LSTOCKTO	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	12H-178		24,000	3,000	1,300	3,741	2,650	3,778
7	Official	07/09/12	AGREGORI	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	12H-060		24,000	3,400	1,300	3,741	2,250	3,778
6	Official	04/12/12	DBERRY	Approved - Carry Over			24,000	3,400	1,300	3,741	2,250	3,778
5	Official	09/22/11	AGREGORI	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	10H-456		24,000	3,400	1,300	3,741	2,250	3,778
4	Official	05/03/10	DBERRY	Approved - Carry Over			25,317	3,704	1,300	2,941	2,250	3,778
3	Official	03/13/08	MCALLAHA	Approved - Carry Over			22,454	5,250	1,632	2,941	688	3,778
2	Official	03/11/08	MCALLAHA	Amendment - Cost/Scope/Sch. Change	06H-484		22,454	5,250	5,161			
1	Official	03/16/06	MCALLAHA	Approved - New Project			21,385	5,000	5,161			

Fund Source 1 of 1	SHOPP - Mandates	PRIOR	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	FUTURE	TOTAL
20.XX.201.335 - Storm Water Mitigation				1,300						1,300
Fund Type:				3,741						3,741
National Hwy System				2,650						2,650
				3,778						3,778
				3,000						3,000
				24,000						24,000
				Total:						38,469

HQ Comments:

***** Version 9 - 03/26/2014 *****
 Carryover project from 2012 to 2014 SHOPP
 Made Amendment 12H-178 official - LS
 ***** Version 8 - 01/04/2013 *****
 Entered amendment #12H-178 - RW
 ***** Version 7 - 07/10/2012 *****
 Made Amendment 12H-060 official - ACG
 Entered amendment #12H-060 - DB
 ***** Version 6 - 04/12/2012 *****
 Carryover project from 2010 to 2012 SHOPP
 ***** Version 5 - 09/26/2011 *****
 Made Amendment 10H-456 official - ACG
 Entered Amendment #10H-456 - DB
 ***** Version 4 - 05/03/2010 *****
 Carryover project from 2008 to 2010 SHOPP
 ***** Version 3 - 04/10/2008 *****
 ***** Version 2 - 04/10/2008 *****
 Entered Amendment 06H-484
 *** 6/14/07 Loc/Desc updated to vote box format
 ***** Version 1 - 03/24/2006 *****

Afhami, Reza@DOT

From: Guevel, Rick L@DOT
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 9:56 AM
To: Afhami, Reza@DOT
Cc: De Terra, Bruce W@DOT; Massey, Susan C@DOT; Scherzinger, Kurt V@DOT; Berry, Donna M@DOT
Subject: FW: What is the District 3 target \$ for programming in the 2016 SHOPP?

Greetings Reza,

Please print and attach a copy of this e-mail to the proposed PCR on 03-3C380 and kindly route the PCR to Department executives for approval. This isn't something I can sign since it was a significant discussion item at several executive level meetings and we must provide this item back to Department leadership as the solution for this cost overrun.

Thank you.

Rick.

From: Massey, Susan C@DOT
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 9:08 AM
To: Guevel, Rick L@DOT
Cc: Caputo, Joe C@DOT; Weber, Brian A@DOT; Mahserelli, Leo P@DOT; Jones, Ron D@DOT
Subject: RE: What is the District 3 target \$ for programming in the 2016 SHOPP?

Hi Rick,

I am in agreement to reduce the pavement programming target for 2016 SHOPP by the \$18 mil as requested in the PCR to fund 03-3C380.

Susan

From: Guevel, Rick L@DOT
Sent: Thursday, January 15, 2015 3:49 PM
To: Massey, Susan C@DOT
Cc: Weber, Brian A@DOT; Berry, Donna M@DOT
Subject: RE: What is the District 3 target \$ for programming in the 2016 SHOPP?

Hello Susan,

The PCR for that south lake Tahoe storm water project (03_3C380) says you agreed to fund the increase. If that is the case, please confirm your agreement to reduce the pavement programming target for 2016 SHOPP by the 18 mil requested in the PCR so we can move on this proposal.

Thanks.

Rick.

----- Original message -----

From: "Massey, Susan C@DOT"

Date: 01/09/2015 1:57 PM (GMT-08:00)

To: "Guevel, Rick L@DOT"

Cc: "Weber, Brian A@DOT"

Subject: RE: What is the District 3 target \$ for programming in the 2016 SHOPP?

Hi Rick,

D3 allocation for 2016 SHOPP is \$29.5 million per year or \$59 million for 2 years.

Thanks,

Susan

From: Guevel, Rick L@DOT

Sent: Friday, January 09, 2015 11:00 AM

To: Massey, Susan C@DOT

Cc: Berry, Donna M@DOT

Subject: What is the District 3 target \$ for programming in the 2016 SHOPP?

Hello Susan –

What is the District 3 target \$ for programming new projects in the 2016 SHOPP?

Thanks.

Rick.