

PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST

PROJECT ID. 0900020090

DISTRICT/EA 09-35210 PPN0 0611 PGM Doc. SHOPP PGM Del FY 17/18 PROG CODE 20.10.378

Cty Rte PM Description

PROJECT (SCOPE) DESCRIPTION: INY 168

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

SCOPE, COST & SCHEDULE CHANGES

TYPE OF REQUEST: X PGM COST PGM YEAR SCOPE SPLIT / COMBINE X OTHER: Update mile limits

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	\$287	17/18	\$500	17/18	\$480	167%	95%	\$213	67%		C	Documentation
PS&E	\$733	17/18	\$936	17/18	\$	%	%	\$203	28%		A	YES
R/W SUP	\$1,306	17/18	\$1,730	17/18	\$	%	%	\$424	32%		A	YES
CON SUP	\$556	17/18	\$765	17/18	\$	%	%	\$209	38%		A	YES
R/W CAP	\$1,448	17/18	\$1,850	17/18	\$	%	%	\$402	28%		A	X NO
CON CAP	\$2,860	17/18	\$3,270	17/18	\$	%	%	\$410	14%		A	YES
Total	\$7,190		\$9,051		\$480			\$1,861	26%			

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

Cost Change Type	Description	Data Systems Changed	
		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: INY 168 17.5 / 18.3
(Only If Revised) INY 395 114.9 / 116.4

"010" Safety Project? Yes No X

Project Performance	EXISTING (PROGRAMMED)		PROPOSED		PERFORMANCE CHANGE		
	Value	ADA Units	Value	ADA Units	Value	ADA Units	0%
	255	ADA	255	ADA	0	ADA	0%

(SHOPP PRIMARY PERFORMANCE OUTPUT BY PROGRAM CODE)

1.) WHAT IS THE PROPOSED CHANGE?

The proposed change is to increase the programmed costs of PS&E, RW Support, Construction support, RW Capital, Construction Capital, and to document the cost overrun on PA&ED.

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

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

1. ESTIMATE DATE: <u>09/11</u>	Con Capital <u>\$2860.</u>	RW Capital <u>\$1448.</u>
2. ESTIMATE DATE: <u>01/15</u>	Con Capital <u>\$3270.</u>	RW Capital <u>\$1850.</u>

3.) WHAT WAS THE REASON FOR THE CHANGE?

Reasons for the changes are as follows: Estimates were not escalated to the program year prior to programming. The current capital and support estimates were programmed from a 2011 PID and were not escalated to 2017/18. The proposed support increases are based on work plan revisions and labor rate increases. Surveying work was under estimated and included consultants. PA&ED was delayed for unanticipated and non resourced historic surveys.

4.) WHEN WAS THE CHANGE DISCOVERED?

The historic surveys were known in August 2014. Not escalating resource costs were known at the time of programming. The under estimated survey work during PA&ED was known in July of 2014.

5.) WHAT HAS BEEN DONE TO MINIMIZE ANY CHANGE? Due to the historic nature of the City of Bishop and the importance of the Americans with Disabilities Act, there was nothing that could be done to minimize the changes.

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

We could construct a portion of the project with the programmed funds and put the remaining work on a transition list for construction at a later date.

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

Not applicable (not proposing to reduce scope or split.)

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

If this PCR is not approved, we would need a supplemental scoping document. If the PCR is approved than no supplemental document will be required

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

No, the overall cost of the project did not trigger a Value Analysis.

**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.

On January 30, 2015 The Project Manager, SFP, and Design Manager discussed the Project with the Program Advisor. They were not prepared to provide the requested increase in capital funding.

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

Additional reviews of project costs should be performed by the district prior programming.

14.) District Project Manager Signature

Brian McElwain

BRIAN MCELWAIN
District Project Manager

2/3/15

Date

(760) 937-5460

Phone Number

Craig Holste

CRAIG HOLSTE
Deputy District Director
Program/Project Management

2/3/15

Date

APPROVAL - COMMENTS - CONCERNS

PD Concurrence

PD Objections (detail concerns):

15.) Comments - Concerns:

Paul Gennaro

PAUL GENNARO
HQ Project Delivery Coordinator

2/3/15

Date

APPROVAL

Michael D. Beauchamp

MICHAEL D. BEAUCHAMP
DISTRICT DIRECTOR

2/3/2015

Date

	Approve	Deny	No HQ Action	
Cost	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>EXCEPT PAED!</u>
Scope	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>RW CAP</u>
Schedule	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Split / Combine	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>update mile limits</u>
Revise & Resubmit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

James E. Davis for

JAMES E. DAVIS
HQ DIVISION CHIEF
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

2/27/15

Date

Bruce DeTerra

BRUCE DETERRA
Acting HQ DIVISION CHIEF
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING

3-3-15

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

PROJECT ID. 0900020090
DISTRICT/EA 09-35210

Afhami, Reza@DOT

From: Davis, James E@DOT
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 11:30 AM
To: Holste, Craig A@DOT
Cc: Afhami, Reza@DOT; Kress, Monica L@DOT; Williams, Rich K@DOT; Heikens, Darold R@DOT; De Terra, Bruce W@DOT; Gennaro, Paul N@DOT
Subject: RE: Draft Outcomes of this Afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting

10-4 and I agree.

James E. Davis
Chief
Division of Project Management
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
(916) 654-2494

Caltrans Mission: Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability.

Caltrans Vision: A performance-driven, transparent, and accountable organization that values its people, resources and partners, and meets new challenges through leadership, innovation, and teamwork.

From: Holste, Craig A@DOT
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 11:20 AM
To: Davis, James E@DOT
Subject: FW: Draft Outcomes of this Afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting

Hi Jim,

Regarding the District 9 ADA project discussed Friday at the PCR Executive Teleconference, I should have made more clear the need for the support cost changes to be approved as well as the construction capital. I did not discuss them more because I thought they would be approved. I understand that we are going to wait with the R/W capital but I don't see how we cannot approve the changes in various support costs with the increases in the labor rates we have experienced.

Craig Holste
Deputy District Director
Program/Project Management
District 9
760 872-0670

From: Heikens, Darold R@DOT
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 10:18 AM
To: Afhami, Reza@DOT; Holste, Craig A@DOT; Wiebke, Marcella J@DOT
Subject: RE: Draft Outcomes of this Afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting

I would second Reza's statement that the approval was for construction capital only at this time.

Darold Heikens, Chief
Caltrans ADA Infrastructure Program
(916) 531-5329

From: Afhami, Reza@DOT
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 10:09 AM
To: Holste, Craig A@DOT; Wiebke, Marcella J@DOT; Heikens, Darold R@DOT
Subject: RE: Draft Outcomes of this Afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting

Hello, Craig.

Regarding your inquire below, the idea was to **ensure the project is more defined by working on it for a year or so** before proposing for major cost changes.

Although I was not running this meeting, at this time, I understand the compromise was to **only approve the proposed Con Cap**.

Darold Heikens / Marcella, would you please confirm.

Thanks.

Reza Afhami, P.E.
HQs Division of Project Management
(916) 654-4038

From: Holste, Craig A@DOT
Sent: Monday, March 02, 2015 8:16 AM
To: Afhami, Reza@DOT
Subject: RE: Draft Outcomes of this Afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting

Hi Reza,

Regarding the District 9 Project, it was also my understanding that the Support Cost changes would also be approved leaving only the R/W Capital remaining unchanged. I should have clarified this before we adjourned the meeting.

Craig Holste
Deputy District Director
Program/Project Management
District 9
760 872-0670

From: Afhami, Reza@DOT
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2015 2:26 PM
To: Davis, James E@DOT; Craggs, Timothy L@DOT; Pierce, Katrina C@DOT; De Terra, Bruce W@DOT; Kress, Monica L@DOT; Williams, Rich K@DOT; Moore, Larry T@DOT; Gennaro, Paul N@DOT; Guevel, Rick L@DOT; Mcelwain, Brian J@DOT; Holste, Craig A@DOT; Nguyen, Michael Thanh@DOT; Nguyen, Doanh@DOT; Woo, Harlan@DOT; Donatello, Amy L@DOT; Luchetta, John@DOT; Heikens, Darold R@DOT; Wiebke, Marcella J@DOT; Johnson, Michael B@DOT; Cooley, Paul N@DOT; Green, Brent L@DOT; Wright, Deidre E@DOT; Brown, Jody L@DOT

Cc: Benton, Janice I@DOT; Pulliam, Kristen M@DOT; Chew, Ken@DOT; Von Schwind, Sara@DOT; Wilkins, Linda@DOT; Falsetti, Rachel A@DOT; Taber, Cynthia@DOT; Simeroth, Cindy J@DOT; Vierra, Rochelle@DOT; Leichtfuss, Lindsay A@DOT; Rajendra, Shira@DOT; Lee, Steve J@DOT; Toan, Vong D@DOT; amydntl@gmail.com
Subject: Draft Outcomes of this Afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting

Hello.

Enclosed is the summary draft of the outcomes of this afternoon's Executive Teleconference Meeting.

Should you have any questions regarding this e-mail, please feel free to contact me.

Reza Afhami, P.E.
HQs Division of Project Management
(916) 654-4038