

September 2, 2011

Stanislaus County Department of Public Works
Attn: Ms. Laurie Barton, PE
Deputy Director of Engineering and Operations
1716 Morgan Road
Modesto, Ca 95354

Subject: North County Corridor – Contract Amendment # 3

Dear Ms. Barton:

The North County Corridor Expressway Authority approval is requested for Contract Amendment # 3 as outlined below. This amendment incorporates additional project work as requested by the Project Development Team (PDT). These changes will require an increase to the project budget. This letter provides our scope for the amended contract work with the revised budget for each work task that will be incorporated into our original scope of services.

During the course of the execution of the project, the following items of work detailed below resulted in extra work and cost. All the extra work was anticipated with certain probability by the project team when developing the scope of the project, but were of such characteristics that it could not have been quantified. These issues were shown on the Project Risk Matrix and stated in the project assumptions when the scope of work was approved last year. The Consultant team and North County Corridor Transportation Expressway Authority staff worked diligently and minimized the magnitude of incurred costs wherever possible.

With the close of the selection process for the final set of alternatives to be studied in detail in the environmental document, the team is evaluating the changes that occurred to the originally assumed scope, and the team has evaluated the impacts of those changes to the budget and schedule. The following issues have been identified and are shown below with more detail with the mitigation efforts to avoid. Some of these activities have already occurred and others are anticipated.

1. Additional Costs Already Incurred

(a) Alternatives Screening (WBS 165.05.15):

Since the Scoping Meetings held in September 2010, the project team has been diligently working towards analyzing the suggestions provided by the public and developing a reasonable range of alternatives to be studied in the environmental document. The scoping process resulted in analyzing 18 different build-alternatives. The team narrowed it down to two main alternatives, with several design variations on the east end of the project. These alternatives are shown on the attached map.

The assumptions stated under WBS 165.05.15 “Alternatives for Further Study” of the scope approved by the Board last July (through Amendment #2) called for as many as 12 alternatives to be considered for screening. This assumption had to be made because we could not have predicted how many different alignment suggestions would be received from the public that would require screening analysis.

The additional alternatives that required screening involved engineering and environmental staff time, resulting in an increase of **\$23,760** to the budget.

(b) Permission to Enter Process (WBS 165.000):

The scope approved by NCCTEA last July, under WBS 165 “Property Access Rights for Environmental/Engineering Studies (PTE letters),” assumed Jacobs staff just compiling the addresses of the landowners to seek their permission to enter the property and doing one round of mailing. The team identified over 1100 parcels and sent letters requesting permission to enter the property to conduct various environmental surveys. The team received responses from owners of over two-thirds of the parcels.

Caltrans directed Jacobs’ team to conduct extensive outreach to the non-responsive owners in an effort to secure their consent for the team to enter their property for the environmental surveys. The efforts included a second mailing to the non-responsive owners, a third follow up via certified mail, door-to-door visits, and follow up via phone calls. In addition, per Caltrans direction, the team classified the parcels belonging to the non-responsive owners into three categories: Priority 1 was the “must have permission” to enter parcels, Priority 2 was the ones that we “prefer to have”, and Priority 3 was the ones that didn’t affect the analysis. The outreach efforts were targeted towards Priority 1 and 2, and towards Priority 3 as incidental to the first two. These efforts did pay off significantly. As of August 17, 2011, there were approximately 157 parcels of the 1,100 total that were outstanding – with only 68 classified as Priority 1 and 28 classified as Priority 2. Per Caltrans’s directions, we are not going to proceed with any additional effort to obtain permission to enter on the denied parcels from this point forward. Based on the qualitative analysis, the environmental document may identify “possible habitat presence” (with no mitigation) on these remaining parcels.

The additional efforts and the extra costs related to certified mailing, door-to-door efforts, phone outreach, database creation and update, etc. resulted in an increase of **\$73,870** to the budget. **\$7,500** of this work was performed by the sub-consultant ICF.

(c) Project Management

The Alternative Screening process involved extensive meetings with the Cities of Modesto, Oakdale, Riverbank, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and other stakeholders.

This resulted in a negotiated increase of **\$10,000**.

2. Cost Reductions

The consultant and NCCTEA staff worked diligently to identify ways to cut costs in the existing budget in an effort to mitigate the proposed increase. As a result, the following scope is identified for deletion.

The original contract contained the preparation of a Project Study Report/Project Development Support (PSR/PDS). It was anticipated that there would be funding for the project available in the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle. The PSR/PDS would be necessary to program these funds. However, current projections for the 2012 STIP do not reflect available funding.

Therefore, **\$83,480** for this work has been reallocated from the existing contract into added design related efforts. (Please see discussion below.)

3. Anticipated Additional Costs

(a) Design Changes (From WBS 165.05 and WBS 160.10.16 to WBS 160.10.15)

The original scope for Preliminary Engineering work was based on the assumption that the three Alternative alignments developed with local input during the Route Adoption study would be the Alternatives used for further study. This was a total of 56.7 centerline miles of roadway, or about 19 miles per Alternative. The new scope is now based on two Alternative alignments with six design option variations (1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, and 2C) proposed for study. The new scope has approximately the same centerline miles as in original scope, but there are now 21 miles on new alignments not previously developed during the Route Adoption study. In addition, approximately 14 miles of the 21 new miles are proposed on existing Kiernan (SR219) and Claribel roads which will require increased effort for design of local road realignments (Claribel Road, Claus Road) and to address issues with existing development. These costs are being offset by the reallocation from the preparation of PSR/PDS, as discussed earlier.

Design Scope Assumptions

- Assume two (2) alignment Alternatives from SR99 to just east of Yosemite Avenue, with three (3) alignment variations at east connection to SR120, so a total of six (6) Build Alternatives (1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, 2C) for study in DED.
- For Alternatives 1A, 1B, 1C: 4-lane freeway/expressway, with 50' local road easements for future frontage/access roads on both sides, with no frontage design or details. Use planned SR99/Hammett IC Layout Plans and ROW design by others, to be provided by Stanislaus County. No Freeway to Freeway connector design at SR99. Typical Sections presented to the PDT dated 5/18/2011 will be used. One set of engineering design will be prepared for the

portion between SR99 and McHenry Avenue that will be used to support both the State Route Alternative and the Local Road Alternative in the environmental document.

- For Alternatives 2A, 2B, 2C: 4-lane freeway/expressway, with 50' local road easements for future frontage/access roads on both sides, no frontage road design or details, use typical Sections dated 5/18/2011 for four design segments: SR99 to McHenry, McHenry to Claus, and Claus to Albers, and Albers to SR120. Use planned SR99/Kiernan IC Layout Plans and ROW design by others, to be provided by Stanislaus County, No freeway to Freeway connector design at SR99.
- IC locations planned as shown on IC Location Map dated May 13, 2011 and approved by JPA staff. Assume no changes to IC locations that would cause a change to study area ESL maps.
- Cross-over connection Alternative(s) or option(s) between Alt 1 and Alt 2 (i.e., using portion for Alt 1 and combination with a portion for Alt 2) may be needed, but will be determined at a later date with PDT concurrence. The additional work effort and cost (Design, Environmental, Traffic, etc) will be defined at that time for JPA review and approval.
- Delete PSR – PDS from work scope.
- No additional design work on the initial Design Options
- Assume no new Alignment Options to be considered during DED
- JPA staff will manage public requests for design changes during DED development. Assume no changes that would cause changes to study area ESL maps.

The anticipated additional cost for these efforts is anticipated to be **\$92,750**. This work has been offset by the elimination of the PSR/PDS. The remaining **\$9,270** difference between the Design Changes and the reallocation from the elimination of the PSR/PDS has been negotiated to **no net increase**.

(b) Land Net Survey Changes (WBS 160.200)

The new alternatives identified fall outside the aerial and topographic mapping limits that was originally flown and had been processed. Therefore, there will be additional cost associated with the collection of this mapping on approximately 2 miles on new alignments that is essential for engineering and environmental analysis. Photography will be acquired in color and scanned at a resolution of 12 microns. Photography will be taken at an altitude of 3600 feet above mean elevation with an average photo scale of 1:7200. From the photography a seamless digital color ortho photo will be produced at a pixel resolution of .5' (GSD). Digital mapping will be compiled to produce 2' contours and planimetry for the corridor mapping at a width of 1000' with wider mapping at selected major intersections and other areas of interest.

Aerial mapping, field design surveys, and GIS parcel information will be combined with existing project surveys to produce a project base map. Spot

elevation will be shown and contours will be generated at 2' intervals. The base map will show assessor's parcel lines, section corner monuments, right-of-way lines, roadways, drainage facilities, railroad tracks and facilities, levees, structures, fences, driveways, poles, streetlights, trees, and vegetation limits. A field review of the topographic survey will be performed to ensure adequate topographic features are tied and quality is assured. Plotted cross section exhibits are not included in this scope of services.

The exact boundary lines of Individual parcels will not be determined by field survey methods but the parcel lines as defined in the Stanislaus County GIS information will be incorporated into the base drawing.

This cost is estimated to be **\$75,000**.

(c) Traffic Changes (WBS 165.10.35 and 165.10.70)

As explained in the "Alternative Screening Section" above, and in the attached memorandum from Fehr & Peers dated March 28, 2011 describing the amendment to the traffic work scope, the original assumption was to analyze two build alternatives. The alternatives that are now moving forward for further study involves additional traffic analysis. The Consultant team and JPA Staff worked with the Project Development Team (PDT) and concurred with the level of analysis to be performed.

This cost is estimated to be **\$34,890** and the work was performed by the sub-consultant Fehr & Peers.

(d) Overhead and Indirect Costs Already Incurred PTE Related

In addition to the cost estimates presented above, there are costs for other reimbursable expenses such as printing, travel and other incidentals that have already occurred associated with the PTE process. This resulted in an increase of **\$1,692**.

(e) Overhead and Indirect Costs Anticipated

In addition to the cost estimates presented above, there are costs for other reimbursable expenses such as printing, travel, sub-consultant administration, and other incidentals that are anticipated to be associated with the remaining added work. This cost is estimated to be **\$2,170**.

Summary and Approval Request:

The NCCTEA approval is requested for Contract Amendment # 3 to incorporate the additional work as described in this request, bringing the total increase of the requested amendment #3 to **\$221,382**.

The following table provides a summary of the incurred and anticipated costs by task:

Item Description	Item #	Incurred Cost as of 7/1/11	Item #	Anticipated Cost	Total
ADDITIONS					
Design		\$ -	3a	\$ 83,480	\$ 83,480
Surveys		\$ -	3b	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000
Environmental - Alts	1a	\$ 23,760			\$ 23,760
Environmental - PTE	1b	\$ 73,870			\$ 73,870
Project Management	1c	\$ 10,000			\$ 10,000
Traffic		\$ -	3c	\$ 34,890	\$ 34,890
ODC (PTE Related)	3d	\$ 1,692			\$ 1,692
Other ODC's		\$ -	3e	\$ 2,170	\$ 2,170
REDUCTIONS					
Design		\$ -	2	\$ (83,480)	\$ (83,480)
Grand Total					\$ 221,382

Should you have any questions, please contact me at 916-799-6779 or at kris.balaji@jacobs.com

Sincerely,



Kris Balaji, P.E., PMP
 Project Manager