

PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST

PROJECT ID. 0612000090
 DISTRICT/EA 06/0P270 PPNO 6645 PGM Doc. 2012 SHOPP PGM Del FY 2016 PROG CODE 201.361

PROJECT (SCOPE) DESCRIPTION: Ker 43 16.1/25.1 Construct pedestrian curb ramps.

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	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____	\$ _____	_____ %	_____ %	\$ _____	_____ %	_____	_____
PS&E	\$571	15/16	\$750	15/16	\$342	58%	41%	\$179	31%	_____	A
R/W SUP	\$80	15/16	\$410	15/16	\$72	90%	20%	\$330	413%	_____	A
CON SUP	\$271	15/16	\$318	15/16	\$0	0%	0%	\$47	17%	_____	A
R/W CAP	\$255	15/16	\$255	15/16	\$0	_____ %	_____ %	\$ _____	_____ %	_____	NA
CON CAP	\$1,206	15/16	\$1,206	15/16	\$0	_____ %	_____ %	\$ _____	_____ %	_____	NA

Total \$2,383 \$2,939 \$414 \$616 26%

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%

New Project Description: _____
 (Only If Revised)

"010" Safety Project? Yes No

Project Performance	EXISTING (PROGRAMMED)	PROPOSED	PERFORMANCE CHANGE
		<u>61</u> Curb Ramps Value Units	<u>61</u> Curb Ramps Value Units

(SHOPP PRIMARY PERFORMANCE OUTPUT BY PROGRAM CODE)

1.) WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?

- 1) During PS&E, it was determined that additional R/W was required to accommodate the required curb ramp improvements at 6 locations. R/W acquisition was not scoped in the PSR-PR. The addition of 6 R/W parcels will require environmental reevaluation, R/W engineering work and R/W appraisal and acquisition work. This requires a significant increase in resource hours to complete the work for the PS&E and R/W support components. Note: no R/W Capital programming changes are proposed. The R/W estimate prepared in 6/2012 assumed that the share of utility relocations would be mostly the states responsibility. A recent analysis determined that the state's share of utility relocations would be less but now the savings is offset by additional R/W acquisition.
- 2) All of the support components estimates have increased including construction due to the labor cost increases above the assumed escalation rate

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

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. ESTIMATE DATE: <u>06/12 (MM/YY),</u> | Con Capital <u>\$1,206,</u> | RW Capital <u>\$255.</u> |
| 2. ESTIMATE DATE: <u>12/14 (MM/YY),</u> | Con Capital <u>\$1,350,</u> | RW Capital <u>\$255.</u> |

3.) WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE?

Adequate survey and R/W information was not available at the PID phase when the project was programmed. Subsequent field survey and engineering determined that the proposed curb ramp improvements could not be contained in the existing R/W. R/W requirements have now been established that will allow the improvements to be constructed.

4.) WHEN WAS THE CHANGE DISCOVERED?

The need for additional R/W was conceptually discovered after field surveys were completed. Then after further engineering evaluation the R/W requirements were determined on 11/7/14.

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

The Design team has been working with various functions and ADA subject matter experts in an effort to minimize the R/W requirements. At one time, the Design team identified the potential need for 30 parcels. Through the process of engineering evaluation and team discussions the need for additional R/W was reduced to 6 parcels.

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

The R/W support component does not contain an amount that would allow R/W Engineering work and subsequent appraisal and acquisition work. It only contained an amount for utility relocation work, which is ongoing. Therefore given this constraint, any ADA curb ramp improvement requiring R/W acquisition would have to be excluded from this project. Currently there are six locations. At least two locations requiring R/W have been involved in lawsuits against the State. Additional curb ramp locations may need to be removed such that the PS&E and construction support estimate could then also be reduced. However, at this time no locations are proposed to be removed.

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

Any ADA curb ramp location removed from this project would then be placed on the District 6 ADA transition plan. Another project would be triggered in the future to address bundled ADA curb ramp locations. The project would then compete for available funds based on priorities.

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

A Supplemental Project Report would be prepared at the time the environmental re evaluation was complete to document the additional R/W acquisition needed for the original proposed improvements. No new scope is proposed.

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

No VA study was conducted, because this project does not meet the warrants.

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

The additional funds would come from the SHOPP 201.361 program.

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 potential for an increase in cost was first discussed with ADA program advisor in August 2014. At that time, they stressed the need to keep the project delivery year the same and to contain the cost or balance out the increases from other component for a no net gain PCR. The final resolution was then communicated to the advisor in December 2014.

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

ADA curb ramps improvements have a potential to require R/W acquisition. This should be accessed prior to programming.

14.) District Project Manager Signature

Chris Gardner
 CHRIS GARDNER
 District Project Manager

1/5/15
 Date

(559)243-3444
 Phone Number

for Sam Shaath
 SAMER SHAATH
 Deputy District Director
 Program/Project Management

1/5/15
 Date

APPROVAL - COMMENTS - CONCERNS

- PD Concurrence
- PD Objections (detail concerns):

15.) Comments - Concerns:

Paul M Gennaro
 PAUL GENNARO
 HQ Project Delivery Coordinator

1/5/15
 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"/>

Shari Bender Ehlert
 SHARRI BENDER EHLERT
 DISTRICT DIRECTOR

1/6/2015
 Date

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

1/20/15
 Date

for

Rachel Falsetti
 RACHEL FALSETTI
 HQ DIVISION CHIEF
 TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

1/22/15
 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/combiners).
- (d) For STIP Projects, please attach the latest Project Programming Request (PPR)
- (e) Summary Cost Estimates, if when needed.

PROJECT ID. _____
 DISTRICT/EA 06/0P270

State Highway Operation and Protection Program

Kern County
Document Year 2014, Version Number 2
PPNO: 6545
(Dollars in Thousands)

DIST: 06	PFNO: 6845	EA: 0P270	CTIPS ID: 104-0000-0361	TCRP NO.:	TITLE (DESCRIPTION): (In the cities of Shafter and Wasco, at various intersections. Construct pedestrian curb ramps.)	ELEMENT: SHOPP Major Const.	MPO ID: 4
CT PROJECT ID: 06-1200-0090						SPONSOR: Caltrans	
COUNTY: ROUTE: PM: Kern County 43 16.1 / 25.2						MPO: Kern Council of Governments	
						CORRIDOR:	
						PRJ MGR:	
						PHONE:	LAW: 12
						EMAIL:	

ASSEMBLY: 30	IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES:	PAED	RW
SENATE: 18			
CONGRESS: 20		PSE	CON

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
2	Official		DBERRY	Approved - Carry Over				1,206	255		571	80	271
1	Official		ZBARAZI	Amendment - New Project	12H-107			1,206	255		571	80	271

Fund Source 1 of 1 SHOPP - Mandates 20.XX.201.361 - ADA - New Curb Ramps															
							PRIOR	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	FUTURE	TOTAL
Fund Type	Extension						PA&ED			571					571
National Hwy System							PS&E		80						80
							R/W SUP								271
							CON SUP			271					271
							R/W		255						255
Funding Agency							CON		1,206						1,206
							Total:		2,383						2,383

HQ Comments:
***** Version 2 - 03/26/2014 ***** Carryover project from 2012 to 2014 SHOPP ***** Version 1 - 08/20/2012 *****
Entered new 2012 SHOPP project - RW