

PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST

PROJECT ID: 0612000110

DISTRICT/EA 06-0K800 PPNO 6596 PGM Doc. SHOPP PGM Del FY 15/16 PROG CODE 201.113

Cty Rte PM Description

PROJECT (SCOPE) DESCRIPTION: FRE 33 0.0 In Fresno, Kings and Madera Counties at Structures Nos. 42-0134, 42-0216F, 45-0007, and 41-0059E. Bridge Seismic Restoration.

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: TYPE C - PA&ED

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	\$ 456	15/16	\$ 727	15/16	\$695	152%	100%	\$ 271	59%	_____	C
PS&E	\$1,589	15/16	\$2,460	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$ 871	55%	_____	A
R/W SUP	\$ 18	15/16	\$ 65	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$ 47	261%	_____	A
CON SUP	\$2,132	15/16	\$2,460	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$ 328	15%	_____	A
R/W CAP	\$ 0	15/16	\$ 873	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$ 873	_____%	_____	A
CON CAP	\$4,825	15/16	\$ 8,220	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$ 3,395	70%	_____	A
Total	\$9,020		\$14,805		\$695			\$5,785	64%		

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	
	Value	Units	Value	Units	Value	Units
	<u>5</u>	<u>Bridge</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Bridge</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Bridge</u> <u>0%</u>

(SHOPP PRIMARY PERFORMANCE OUTPUT BY PROGRAM CODE)

1.) WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE? This PCR proposes to:

- a. Document PA&ED increase – Type C.
- b. Increase PS&E from \$1,589,000 to \$2,460,000 – Type A.
- c. Increase R/W Support from \$18,000 to \$65,000 – Type A.
- d. Increase in Construction Support from \$2,132,000 to \$2,460,000 – Type A.
- e. Increase R/W Capital from \$0 to \$873,000.
- f. Increase Construction Capital from \$4,825,000 to \$8,220,000.

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

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

1. ESTIMATE DATE: 01/15

Con Capital \$8,220,

RW Capital \$873.

2. ESTIMATE DATE: 10/11

Con Capital \$4,825,

RW Capital \$ 0.

3.) WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE?

- a. PA&ED SUPPORT: Additional resources were used due to additional detailed structural work and the complexity of the environmental clearance process.
- b. PS&E SUPPORT: Additional resources are needed due to the additional structural work.
- c. R/W SUPPORT: The original workplan was updated and, in addition with the new rate matrix, increased the support cost.
- d. CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT: Construction Support was reviewed and the only necessary change is to reflect the new rate matrix increase.
- e. R/W CAPITAL: The original scope of work did not include Right of Way capital needed for mitigation/bank credits, permit fees and in-lieu fees for environmental clearance of the project.
- f. CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL: The original non-escalated construction cost for the project was \$4,218,560 with \$3,800,000 estimated for Structural items. The new current construction cost is \$8,220,000 with \$5,715,000 estimated for Structural items. The increase is due to an updated APS and additional work being identified at the two Kings River Bridges. A field review was conducted in May 2014 and upon further investigation it was determined that there was more work needed than previously identified. The additional work has been identified at the two Kings River Bridges (Br. No. 42-0007 & 42-0064) where carbon fiber wrapping around the columns is needed. The carbon fiber wrapping increased the cost at Bridge No. 42-0007 from \$804,000 to \$1,291,800 and at Bridge No. 42-0064 from \$1,037,000 to \$2,400,300 for a total cost increase of \$1,851,100.

4.) WHEN WAS THE CHANGE DISCOVERED?

December 2014

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

Scope change was unavoidable due to complex environmental issues and detailed seismic corrective measures needed were more than anticipated.

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

The scope of the project would have to be significantly reduced by eliminating bridge locations.

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

N/A

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

A Supplemental PSSR was approved dated February 11, 2015.

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

No, a VA study was not conducted, however, principles of value engineering have been applied by the project team to ensure cost effectiveness of the project.

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

2014 SHOPP, 201.113 Seismic Restoration

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

N/A

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 Program Manager's, Diana Campbell, response to the draft PCR sent via email dated February 20, 2015, expressed concern about where the additional funding will be obtained.

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

Field reviews should include attendance of the environmental specialists and the HQ Structures design staff.

14.) District Project Manager Signature

Suzie Holdridge
 for SUZIE HOLDRIDGE
 District 6 Project Manager

2/20/15
 Date

(559) 243-3432
 Phone Number

Samer Shaath
 SAMER SHAATH
 Deputy District Director
 Program/Project Management

3/2/15
 Date

APPROVAL - COMMENTS - CONCERNS

- PD Concurrence
- PD Objections (detail concerns):

15.) Comments - Concerns:

Paul Gennaro
 PAUL GENNARO
 HQ Project Delivery Coordinator

2/25/15
 Date

APPROVAL

	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"/>

Sharri Bender Elhert
 SHARRI BENDER ELHERT
 DISTRICT DIRECTOR

3/3/2015
 Date

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

3/17/15
 Date

Bruce De Terra
 BRUCE DE TERRA
 ACTING HQ DIVISION CHIEF
 TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

3/18/15
 Date

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/combines).
- (d) For STIP Projects, please attach the latest Project Programming Request (PPR).
- (e) Summary Cost Estimates, if/when needed.

PROJECT ID. 0612000110
 DISTRICT/EA 06-0K800

2014 State Highway Operation & Protection Program
Fresno County
(Dollars in Thousands)

DIST. PPNO. EA. CTIPS ID:	TITLE (DESCRIPTION):	ELEMENT:
DB 6596 0K800 103-0000-0323	(In Fresno, Kings and Madera Counties at structures Nos. 42-0134, 42-0216F, 45-0007, 45-0064, and 41-0050E. Bridge seismic restoration.)	SHOPP Major Const.
CT PROJECT ID: 0612000110		SPONSOR: Caltrans
COUNTY:		#PO: Council of Fresno County Governments
Fresno County		CORRIDOR:
	ROUTE: PM:	PRJ MGR:
	VAR 1	PHONE: (0) 0-
	Performance Measure:	CALNET:
	Quantity: 5.00	MPO ID: 3
		LAW: 12

ASSEMBLY: 25, 30, 31	Implementing Agency: PAED -	RW -
SENATE: 14, 16	PSE -	CON -
CONGRESS: 18, 20		

PROJECT VERSION HISTORY				(Printed Version is Shaded) (Last 9 versions displayed)		Programmed Dollars in Thousands - Total For Project							
Version	Status	Date	Updated By	Change Reason	Amend No.	Vote	Cum Award	Prog Con	Prog RW	PA & ED	PS & E	RW Sup	Con Sup
2	Official	03/28/14	DBERRY	Approved - Carry Over				4,825		456	1,589	18	2,132
1	Official	04/12/12	DBERRY	Approved - New Project				4,825		456	1,589	18	2,132

Fund Source 1 of 1		SHOPP - Bridge Preservation	SMC - SHOPP Major Const.		PRIOR	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	FUTURE	TOTAL
Fund Type:	Bridge - State (HBRR)			PA&ED			456						456
				PS&E			1,589						1,589
				RW/SUP			18						18
				CON SUP			2,132						2,132
				RW									
				CON			4,825						4,825
				Others									
				Total:			9,020						9,020

***** Version 2 - 03/28/2014 *****
Carryover project from 2012 to 2014 SHOPP
***** Version 1 - 04/12/2012 *****
New 2012 SHOPP project