

OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE DISSOLVED APPLE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

The Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Dissolved Apple Valley Redevelopment Agency at 4:30 p.m. The meeting will occur in the Council Chambers located at 14955 Dale Evans Parkway in Apple Valley, California.

# **AGENDA**

REGULAR SESSION JULY 23, 2012 4:30 P.M.

PLEASE SILENCE CELL PHONES AND PAGERS UPON ENTERING THE CHAMBERS

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Roll Call Pledge of Allegiance

## **PRESENTATIONS**

Introduction and Oath of Office of New Board Members

- Dr. Christopher O'Hearn, Victor Valley College
- Chief Sid Hultquist, Apple Valley Fire Protection District

## A. Selection of Vice Chairperson

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

## **BUSINESS ITEMS**

- 1. Adoption of Minutes of the Oversight Board Meeting on May 7, 2012
- 2. Oral Presentation Update on RDA Dissolution Proceedings, Including Summary of Newly Enacted AB 1484
- 3. Yucca Loma Bridge Contract Amendment # 8 of the Yucca Loma Bridge Contract Agreement, in the Amount of \$422,400.00, for Additional Design, Right-of-Way Services and Construction Support Adjourn

Adjourn Meeting to August 13, 2012 at 4:00 p.m.



OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE DISSOLVED APPLE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

# **PUBLIC NOTICE**

This agenda contains a brief description of each item of business to be considered at today's meeting. The agenda, its supporting documents and all writings received by the Successor Agency related to these items are public records and available for review during regular business hours in the Town Clerk's Office at 14955 Dale Evans Parkway, Apple Valley, CA, during normal business hours.

The agenda and its supporting documents can be viewed online at <a href="http://www.applevalley.org">http://www.applevalley.org</a>. However, the online agenda may not include all available supporting documents or the most current version of documents. Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Oversight Board after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Town Clerk's Office.

In accordance with the Rules of Procedure members of the public may address the Oversight Board on any item on the agenda and on any matter that is within the Town Council's jurisdiction. To address the Town Council regarding an item, complete and submit the yellow card entitled Request to Speak. Please indicate on the card whether you are speaking under Public Comments or on an item that is listed on the agenda and please list the item number.

When called, approach the podium and please state your name before giving your presentation. Speakers may address the Oversight Board for up to three (3) minutes. Speakers are to address the Oversight Board as a whole through the Chairperson. Comments to individual Board Members and/or staff are not permitted.

Individuals, who demonstrate disruptive conduct during Town Council Meetings that prevent the Town Council from conducting its meeting in an orderly manner, are guilty of a misdemeanor as stated in Section 2.04.030 of the Town of Apple Valley Municipal Code and are subject to removal from the Chambers or arrest.

The Town of Apple Valley recognizes its obligation to provide equal access to those individuals with disabilities. Please contact the Town Clerk's Office at (760) 240-7000 two working days prior to the scheduled meeting for any requests for reasonable accommodations.



# OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE DISSOLVED APPLE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Date:

July 23, 2012

Item No:

Δ

To:

Oversight Board

From:

Orlando Acevedo, Economic Development Specialist

Subject:

Selection of Vice Chairperson

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Move to elect one member to serve as Vice Chairperson of the Oversight Board for the 2012 calendar year.

## SUMMARY

To help ensure the Oversight Board meetings proceed in an orderly manner, a Chairperson must be elected to preside over the Oversight Board meetings. A Vice Chairperson should also be elected to preside over the meeting when the Chairperson is absent. Staff recommends that one-year terms be adopted.

With the resignation of Vice-Chairperson Art Bishop, it would be appropriate at this time for the Oversight Board to select a Vice-Chairperson to serve for the remaining of the year.

## BACKGROUND

Pursuant to ABx1 26, Health and Safety Code Section 34179, each successor agency shall have an Oversight Board composed of seven members. The members shall elect one of their members as the Chairperson and shall report the name of the Chairperson and other members to the State Department of Finance on or before May 1, 2012.

Oversight Boards shall have fiduciary responsibilities to holders of enforceable obligations and the taxing entities that benefit from distribution of property tax and other revenues pursuant to state law. Oversight Boards are tasked with reviewing and approving the Successor Agency's Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule in order to be submitted to the County Auditor-Controller, State Controller and the Department of Finance.



OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE DISSOLVED APPLE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Date:

July 23, 2012

Item No:

1

To:

**Oversight Board** 

From:

La Vonda M-Pearson, Town Clerk

Subject:

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** 

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

That the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the dissolved Apple Valley Redevelopment Agency approve the minutes for the meeting of May 7, 2012.

## **SUMMARY**

Special Meeting - May 7, 2012

# TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY OVERSIGHT BOARD

# SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES – May 7, 2012

## **CALL TO ORDER:**

The Town of Apple Valley Oversight Board meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m.

## **ROLL CALL:**

Roll call was taken with the following members present:

Board Member: Kevin Mahany; Matt Schullenberg; Barb Stanton; David Wert; Vice-Chair Art Bishop; Chair Frank Robinson.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Board Member Barb Stanton

#### PRESENTATIONS:

La Vonda M-Pearson, Secretary, administered the Oath of Office to new member David Wert of the Oversight Board.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None.

## **BUSINESS ITEMS**

## 1. Adoption of Minutes of the Oversight Board Meeting – April 16, 2012

## MOTION

Motion by Board Member Stanton, seconded by Board Member Wert, and unanimously carried, to approve the minutes of the Oversight Board Meeting dated April 16, 2012

# 2. Adoption of Amendment to Second Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS)

Orlando Acevedo, Economic Development Manager, presented the staff report as filed with the Secretary. He explained the need to submit a revised resolution which would include an amendment to return three enforceable obligations to the second ROPS that were inadvertently removed.

Mr. Acevedo reviewed the corrections that were needed to the ROPS which included changes to the line item dealing with the Low Mod Income Housing Fund.

Vice-Chairman Bishop questioned whether or not the Down Payment Assistance Program would continue to be a program administered by the Town of Apple Valley.

Mr. Acevedo explained that the program would continue using a variety of other funds.

Board Member Stanton questioned the funding allocations listed within the ROPS.

Elizabeth Hull, Legal Counsel to the Successor Agency, stated that the total finance package was not presented to the board. She explained that only the loan portions were listed within the staff report.

Board Member Wert asked for an update on the history of the ROPS submitted to the Department of Finance.

Ms. Hull explained that the original ROPS submitted to the Department of Finance for review and approval was denied. She explained that this is primarily due to a discrepancy between dates. She stated that the Department of Finance is stating that June 27 is the operative date; however the Governor signed the authorizing document on June 28. She discussed other issues that have arisen that were used to deny the ROPS that she believes could be successfully challenged.

Chairman Robinson asked if there is a timeframe that the Department of Finance needs to adhere to in responding to the Town.

Ms. Hull indicated that the Department of Finance is not bound by a timeframe. She also stated that the denial letter submitted to the Town also states that no funding would be given to the Town of Apple Valley until the ROPS had been approved.

Board Member Stanton commented on the concern that SANBAG would not fund the Town's Yucca Loma Bridge project if we did not receive our money from the ROPS. She stated that she was thankful the Town was being proactive in trying to remedy these problems as soon as possible.

Ms. Hull agreed with the statement made by Board Member Stanton. She encouraged the Board to remain diligent in its efforts to convince the Department of Finance that the projects listed on the ROPS were qualified projects. She commented on successful actions taken by the March Joint Powers Authority to have one of its projects approved by the Department of Finance.

#### MOTION

Motion by Vice-Chair Bishop, seconded by Board Member Stanton, and unanimously carried, to adopt the attached Resolution No. 2012-07 approving an amendment to the second Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule ("ROPS") pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 34177(I).

| ADJOURNMENT   |
|---|
| <u>MOTION</u>   |
| Motion by Chairperson Robinson, seconded by Board Member Stanton, and unanimously carried, to adjourn the meeting of the Oversight Board at 4:50 p.m. |
| Mayor   |

Town Clerk



OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE DISSOLVED APPLE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Date:

July 23, 2012

Item No:

2

To:

Oversight Board

From:

La Vonda M-Pearson, Town Clerk

Subject:

ORAL PRESENTATION - UPDATE ON RDA DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS,

**INCLUDING SUMMARY OF NEWLY ENACTED AB 1484** 

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Oral presentation only. There is no action required.

## **SUMMARY**

Special Meeting - May 7, 2012



# OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE DISSOLVED APPLE VALLEY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Date:

July 23, 2012

Item No:

3

To:

Oversight Board

From:

Orlando Acevedo, Economic Development Manager

Subject:

YUCCA LOMA BRIDGE CONTRACT AMENDMENT # 8 OF THE YUCCA

LOMA BRIDGE CONTRACT AGREEMENT, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$422,400.00.

FOR ADDITIONAL DESIGN, RIGHT-OF-WAY SERVICES AND

CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

That the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the dissolved Apple Valley Redevelopment Agency approve Yucca Loma Bridge Project Contract Amendment #8 with Dokken Engineering, the project's design contractor, in the Not-to-Exceed amount of \$422,400.

## SUMMARY

Per the redevelopment dissolution proceedings set forth in ABx1 26, the Oversight Board is tasked with overseeing that the Successor Agency of the dissolved Redevelopment Agency pay only the debts and obligations provided on an approved Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS). Once a ROPS is approved, the Successor Agency may pay down the dissolved Redevelopment Agency's enforceable obligations using the appropriate funding source.

The Yucca Loma Road Bridge Construction project and the Dokken Engineering contract were both listed on the ROPS-1(January-June 2012) and ROPS-2 (July-December 2012) as "enforceable obligations" of the dissolved Redevelopment Agency. Each ROPS was respectively approved by this Oversight Board during the course of several meetings this spring, as well as by the State Department of Finance on May 24, 2012.

The proposed Contract Amendment #8 fulfills the wind-down purposes and procedures enacted by the state for a Successor Agency to carry-out and pay-down the approved enforceable obligations. Accordingly, new contracts and contract amendments related to the dissolution of enforceable obligations must be approved by the Oversight Board. Notably, the Town Council/Successor Agency is recommended to approve this contract amendment at its meeting of July 25, 2012.

The purpose of Contract Amendment #8 is to include tasks in association with additional design services related to combining the Yucca Loma Bridge and Yates Road construction document packages, additional efforts related to right-of-way acquisition and the park land conversion process. Also included is construction support related to Yates Road.

Dokken Engineering proposes to provide the additional services for a Not-to-Exceed amount of \$442,400, to be paid from available bond proceeds dedicated to the Yucca Loma Bridge construction

project, as described in each previous ROPS as well as any future ROPS, until such time as the contract amendment amount is fully expended.

This amendment will bring Dokken Engineering's total contract to \$5,270,400.00. This total contract amount represents 10% of the estimated \$52,000,000.00 construction cost of the associated improvements which span from Apple Valley Road to Park Road and includes all planning, environmental, design, right-of-way and construction support services for the improvements between Apple Valley Road and Park Road (and to Hesperia Road for environmental).

A summary of the estimated effort for each task and phase of work is included in the attached Contract Amendment Request Letter from Dokken Engineering, dated June 18, 2012. This letter also identifies which agency, the Town or the County, is responsible for the cost of each task.

Based upon the foregoing, staff recommends adoption of the form motion.

#### FISCAL IMPACT:

The Dokken Engineering contract identified as an enforceable obligation on each previous ROPS was associated with engineering services, per the previously executed contract amendments. This new Contract Amendment #8 is primarily construction services and will thus be funded from the bond proceeds dedicated to the Yucca Loma Bridge construction project, also an enforceable obligation, which were intended chiefly for construction activities as detailed in the Official Statement of the 2007 Tax Allocation Bonds.

Accordingly, there are sufficient funds approved for this amendment in the current project budget.

- -

June 18, 2012

Mr. Brad Miller TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY Engineering Division 14955 Dale Evans Parkway Apple Valley, CA 92307

RE: Amendment Request #8 to the Yucca Loma Bridge Contract Agreement - Additional Design, Right of Way Services, and Construction Support

Dear Mr. Miller:

The purpose of this letter is to request Contract Amendment #8 to the July 2007 Agreement between the Town of Apple Valley and Dokken Engineering for services on the Yucca Loma Road/Yates Road/ Green Tree Boulevard Transportation Improvement Project. Amendment #8 includes additional design services related to combining the Yucca Loma Bridge and Yates Road construction document packages, additional efforts related to right of way acquisition and the park land conversion process. Also included is construction support related to Yates Road.

Dokken Engineering proposes to provide the additional services as outlined below for a Not-to-Exceed amount of \$422,400. This will bring Dokken Engineering's total contract to \$5,270,400. This total contract amount represents only 10% of the estimated \$52,000,000 construction cost of the associated improvements which span from Apple Valley Road to Park Road, and includes all planning, environmental, design, right-of-way and construction support services for the improvements between Apple Valley Road and Park Road (and to Hesperia Road for environmental). At 10% soft costs for the wide range of services provided, we believe Dokken Engineering remains a good value for this large, complex, multiagency project.

A summary showing the estimated effort for each task included in this addendum is included as Attachment A: Amendment #8 - Task and Cost Proposal Summary. An overall Contract Cost Summary has been included as Attachment B. Descriptions of the added services are provided below. In addition, Attachment B identifies which agency, the Town or County, is responsible for the cost of each task.

## Description of Additional Scope of Services - Amendment 8:

Following are descriptions of the added scope of services for each task affected by this amendment. The order listed below is consistent with the attached cost proposal and contract summaries.

## Phase 0: Project Management

Contract Task

Additional Budget

**Task Total:** \$18,700

## Task 0.2 Project Management - Phase 2: General Multi-Agency:

The original 2007 contract contained scope for project management for a time period of three years. Amendment 5 and 6 increased the budget in this item to cover additional coordination with the three jurisdictions involved, including material preparation and meetings through an estimated timeframe of January 2013. Given the current schedule for State Land Acquisition, it is anticipated that multi-agency project coordination will continue until July of 2013, at which time the joint project will have fully transitioned to construction. A budget augmentation is requested for this extended time frame.



## Phase II: Final Design, Engineering and Permitting

Task Total:

\$44,500

# Task 2.1 Final Geotechnical and Hydrology Report:

Yates Road Liquefaction Analysis (\$15,500)

Borings along the toe of Yates Road identified a sand layer that is predicted to liquefy under the design seismic event. As a result, an optional task to perform Cone Penetration Testing and a slope stability and settlement analyses were recommended as part of Amendment 6. At that time, the County was planning to grade for only two lanes and declined the optional task. Since that time, the project scope has changed to include grading for the 4-lane widening and the County has asked Dokken to proceed with the analysis as described in that Optional Task. The testing would occur along the toe of the slope between Fortuna Lane and approximately 300 feet west of Park Road. Dokken staff would work with County Regional Park staff to gain access to the park for the drilling. The price indicated above has been discounted from the \$36,000, as previously quoted, in light of other work proposed below because we are able to combine some tasks and reduce overall cost.

Yates Road Soundwall Extension and Foundation Borings (\$11,000)

The soundwall borings completed to date were completed assuming a spread footing. They are between 16 to 18 ft. deep. In addition, they do not extend west beyond Park Road. Pursuant to discussions with the County, with the recent change to pile foundations and the realignment of the wall along existing Yates Road/Ridgecrest Road (as describe in Task 2.4 D, below), additional deeper borings are needed to adequately design the walls. It is proposed to do one additional day of drilling to obtaining eight additional deeper borings to supplement the borings already obtained.

Update Yates Road Geotechnical Design Report (GDR) (\$14,000)

The February 2012 Draft Geotechnical Design Report will be updated by Dokken subconsultant Group Delta Consultants Inc. to include the analyses relating to the above items as well as responding to comments received from the constructability review of the 95% combined plans and specs. A Final GDR will be provided for inclusion in the construction bid package.

Yucca Loma Road Geotechnical Design Report (GDR) Update (\$4,000)

Currently there exists a Geotechnical Design Report to support the proposed improvements along Yucca Loma Road from the eastern terminus of the proposed Yucca Loma Bridge to Apple Valley Road. Since the time it was prepared, changes have been made to the design concept including shifting the centerline to allow for a Class I bike path and changing the drainage system design and profile from reinforced concrete pipe to a 10° x 6° box culvert. As a result, the GDR must be updated to support the new design. Group Delta will assist in performing the update and/or perform additional calculations to provide design recommendations to match the construction plans and design intent. A Supplement to the Final Geotechnical Design Report will be provided, suitable for inclusion with the Final GDR in the construction bid package.





## Task 2.3 C- Yucca Loma Road 65% Plans and Estimate:

Task Total:

\$24,800

## Project Management (\$8,400)

As the Bridge/Yates Road project moves to construction in the beginning of 2013, the design focus will return to the Yucca Loma Road Widening phase of the project. Budget for project management of this next project is needed. It was originally part of Task 0.1, but that budget has been expended more quickly than planned on current extended project management tasks related to the State parkland conversion process and combining the Yucca Loma and Yates contract documents into one set.

The budget requested for oversight of the Yucca Loma Road phase is proposed in this Task 2.3, and the following 90% and 100% PS&E tasks, instead of Task 0.1 so that it will be separately billed to the Town rather than as a multi-agency coordination cost that is shared with the County.

Modifications to Storm Drain System (\$16,400)

As design of the Yucca Loma Road Storm Drain System has progressed, the initial drainage design included an 8' reinforced concrete pipe and was changed to a 10' x 6' box culvert at the direction of the Town per recommendations from the SBC Flood Control District. This change resulted in modifications to utility relocations and the overall profile of the system and additional budget is requested for this design work.

## Task 2.4 C- Yucca Loma Road 90% Plans, Specifications, and Estimate:

\$21,700

Project Management (\$18,700)

As described above, this item is for project management activities related to the Yucca Loma Road project.

Geotechnical Constructability Review (\$3,000)

Additionally, a geotechnical constructability review of the 90% PS&E package as it relates to the soundwall foundations and trenching of the large proposed drainage facility is also included in this task. This review will support preparation of the contract documents prior to bidding.

## Task 2.4 D- Yates Road 90% Plans, Specifications, and Estimate:

\$24,000

## Soundwall Footing Redesign (\$9,500)

In early discussions with the County, it was determined the new soundwall should be designed conservatively as a retaining wall. This was in response to a concern that some property owners had filled against the existing wall and there could be a transfer of load to the new wall. As part of an internal constructability and value engineering review, including site visits to verify back yard conditions at each lot, Dokken staff was able to determine, in conjunction with County staff, that the retaining concept was not necessary and that the costly spread footings associated with retaining could be replaced with CIDH pile foundations (in excess of \$500,000 in construction savings). This does, however, require some additional wall design and changes in the plan sheets and specifications.

## Soundwall Extension (\$6,000)

In addition, the original soundwall design scope from 2009 assumed the Green Tree Extension project would follow shortly after the Yates Road project. It was also assumed the Green Tree project would pick up the wall and extend it along the roadway at the point the alignment pulls away from the existing Yates Road/Ridgecrest Road. Constructing the full length of soundwall along the new roadway alignment



would have created a conflict between the new wall and the existing roadway, essentially cutting off Ridgecrest Road. Given the delay now expected for delivery of the Green Tree project, it was determined the wall needed to be extended along the existing alignment of Ridgecrest to a point of logical termini. Cross section and sound sight drawings were prepared to verify the wall could be extended along the existing roadway and tie into the existing wall north of Chinquapin and provide the same sound attenuation. The extended design must now also be added to the plan set. Budget requested for this item is for the analysis completed and the extra plan sheets added to the set.

Cross Section Redesign (\$8,500)

Lastly, the Yates Road plans are also being revised to accommodate changes in the cross section that was initially set over a year ago. The 65% plan set was developed using the originally approved cross section that consists of 2-lane improvements from Fortuna Lane to Park Road intersections. The County is choosing to move forward with a 4-lane option from Fortuna to just past the Park Road intersection. In addition to modifying the cross section sheets, modifications are needed to layout sheets, utility sheets, drainage design sheets, staging sheets, and pavement delineation sheets.

# Task 2.4 F - Combined Yucca Loma/Yates 95% Plans, Specifications, and Estimate:

Dokken's current scope called for providing PS&E for the Yucca Loma Bridge and Yates Road as separate construction packages. The Town and County have now directed Dokken Engineering to combine the Yates Road portion of this project with the Yucca Loma Bridge construction document set. The PS&E for the bridge project had already progressed to the 95% level, and the Yates Road project to the 65% level. Plan sets had already been layout out and much of the detailing completed. The merging of the plans, paired with Town and County requested changes, have required an additional 33 sheets to be added to the plan set over that which was originally estimated for each plan set added together. The new combined plan set will consist of 217 sheets with varying level of effort required to reformat or modify as needed for plan set consistency. For example, an additional seven utility sheets were added as a result of formatting all utility sheets to the same scale and covering the necessary information for all utility work from Park Road to Kasanka Trail. Construction staging concepts and corresponding plan sheets for the area west of the bridge must be totally redesigned. Grading and drainage sheets must be modified to remove some of the temporary measures that were planned to protect the site until the Yates Road project advanced. The quantities must be reviewed, adjusted and documented to reflect the combined work and another 95% estimate must be produced. The estimate must bifurcate Town and County items to facilitate preparing cost sharing information. Staging and utility coordination provisions in the specification must also be changed. Although overall the combining of the work will reduce cost (a 5% reduction in construction costs through economy of scale would be over \$2,000,000) additional design effort is needed to prepare a combined set of construction documents. An estimate of hours to complete this work is shown in Attachment A and corresponds to a requested budget of \$92,100.

Budget has also been included in the task to respond to comments from the constructability review planned by the Town to be performed by Parsons. This budget is not for the purpose of making plan corrections, but rather to allow flexibility in making changes of a nature that go beyond standard design that might, through alternative design or specifications restrictions/clarifications, save money in construction bids or reduce risk. Budget requested for this task is \$6,000.

\$98,100



## Task 2.5 C- Yucca Loma Road 100% Plans, Specifications, and Estimate:

\$12,500

As described above, this item is for project management activities related to the Yucca Loma Road project.

## Task 2.6 Right of Way Exhibits, Plats and Legals:

\$8,000

The original contract scope for right of way did include exhibits, plats, and legal descriptions for the State owned parcels. However, during the course of the 6(f) Parkland Conversion process, revisions and additional exhibits, plats, and legals have been requested by the Town and County. Deeds, plats, and legals for the State parcels located at or near the western approach to the Yucca Loma Bridge were modified at the request of the Town and County to accommodate a change in area, ownership, and type of take (easement to fee take) as a result of the Parkland Conversion. Budget is requested to cover the additional document work related to State owned parcels and the parkland conversion process. This task also includes additional budget for anticipated plat and legal changes due to NPS comments from the parkland conversion proposal.

## Task 2.7 Other Agency Approvals:

\$9,700

Sub Task 2.7.07 SBCFCD Permitting - Additional Drainage Analysis

In May of 2011, San Bernardino County Flood Control District (FCD) issued conditional permits for the bridge and outfall construction. Since that time, the design of the outfall and its location in the Mojave River channel has changed at the request of the Town to address less restrictive right of way conditions. As a result, Dokken has performed additional coordination with the Town, County, and County FCD on revising the permit conditions based on the updated design work. Budget is requested to cover the efforts associated with addressing the FCD permit conditions regarding the proposed system change from a 10' x 6' arch culvert to a 10' x 6' box culvert. It is also anticipated that Dokken Engineering will meet with FCD in person twice.

# Task 3.0 Right of Way Acquisition Services

\$10,100

Sub Task 3.2 Acquisition/Negotiation

The right of way acquisition and negotiation efforts related to the private parcels for the Yucca Loma Bridge are now complete with the exception of closing escrow with Iverson. During the course of the Town's acquisition of portions of the Iverson property, additional coordination and efforts beyond the original scope were requested of Dokken by the Town, which exhausted task budget. In addition, his two lenders are now requiring excessive documentation in order to process reconveyance deeds. Dokken is requesting budget from the Town to cover the cost overrun to date and to provide some budget for continued support through close of escrow for Iverson as well as retain budget to obtain permits to enter for properties receiving a soundwall on Yucca Loma Road.

## Phase III: Bid and Construction Support

Amendment 6 to Dokken's contract included roadway and structural construction support related to the Yucca Loma Bridge, Yucca Loma Road, and the Restoration Area. At the County's request, construction support related to Yates Road was not included at that time. It was the County's intention they would contract directly with Dokken for construction support services for a separately bid Yates Road project, administered by the County. With the implementation of a combined bid package for the Bridge and Yates Road, the County has now requested that construction support services for Yates Road be included in Dokken's scope of services. Below is a description of the work contained within each subtask related to construction support



\$115,600

with environmental compliance for the work on Yates Road. In addition, geotechnical construction support (not previously included) for the Yucca Loma Bridge and Yates Road is described in tasks below.

## Task 5.2 Bidding and Construction Support:

Sub Task 5.2 B Yucca Loma Bridge-Geotechnical Support (\$48,000)

Geotechnical Construction Support related to the construction of the bridge piles was not originally included in Amendment 6 because it was thought these services would be provided by the Construction Management (CM) firm. Now that the CM firm has been identified and the various sub-consultants supporting both Dokken and Parson identified, it was determined the geotechnical related construction support should flow from the designer's contract since the geotechnical engineer was a key member of the design team. Items of work to be performed by Dokken's subconsultant, Group Delta, included in this task include:

- Geotechnical Engineer will review of contractor submittals regarding CIDH pile construction sequence, methods, materials, and construction equipment.
- Geotechnical Engineer will attend preconstruction and construction meetings regarding the pile construction activities.
- Provide on-site pile construction observations to verify the excavated soils are consistent with the design, document contractor operations and activities, and assist the CM in resolving issues and potential for claims.
- Review of the pile load test setup and pile load testing results.
   Recommendations for pile length revisions will be made after review of the pile load test results.
- Review of the pile integrity testing (gamma-gamma and cross-hole sonic logging) results and review of any required remedial measures, if required.
- Review of the shoring design and input soil parameters for the 6' x 10' box culvert trench excavation.
- Inspection of the 10' x 6' box culvert trench bottom to verify the soils present match those used in the design and provide recommendations where differences occur.

Geotechnical Construction Support services will be performed in close cooperation with the Town and the Parsons Construction Management Team on an "as-needed" basis. The budget requested is based on our estimate of what might typically be needed for a project of this size and scope.

Sub Task 5.2 D Yates Road Bidding and Construction Support (\$67,600)

The level of effort estimated for the Yates Road portion of the project, for design related construction support (roadway, structures, geotechnical) is based on planned number of working days for the work on Yates Road and the level of complexity for the project. Construction support services will be provided in close cooperation with the CM on a time and materials, as-needed basis. Services are anticipated to include:

- Working through the Town/County/CM, respond to bidder's questions and prepare draft addendums for the work related to Yates Road.
- Assist County and Town in reviewing bids.
- Attend pre-construction meeting.



- Provide construction support as needed for roadway and soundwall work related to Yates Road. This effort includes site visits, responding to Request for Information, reviewing shop drawings as requested by the RE, coordination with on-site biologist, and reviewing change orders that affect the design.
- Attend bi-weekly construction meetings as needed for the work on Yates Road.
   In addition, Geotechnical Construction Support Services for Yates Road to be performed by Group Delta include the following tasks:
  - Attend meetings regarding the pile and fill placement construction activities.
  - Review of contractor submittals regarding CIDH pile construction, methods, materials, and construction equipment.
  - Provide construction observation services during the sound wall CIDH pile excavations to verify the excavated soils are consistent with the design assumptions.
  - Provide construction observations services for the slope and toe key excavations.

# Task 5.3 Preconstruction Biology Surveys and Training:

Prior to construction of both Yucca Loma Bridge and Yates Road, the following biological related services will be provided as it pertains to the Yates Road portion of the project adjacent to the County Park and Mojave River:

- Conduct preconstruction survey for burrowing owl, desert tortoise, southwestern
  willow flycatcher, and other nesting birds as required by the California
  Department of Fish and Game. Summarize results of the surveys in a report and
  provide to the appropriate agencies.
- Facilitate a worker awareness training session for the contractor and staff, educating them on species and sensitive natural resources present on the project site prior to commencement of work, as required by the various project permits.

## Task 5.4 Stake ESA:

It is anticipated that various Environmentally Sensitive Areas will need to be staked and fenced as part of contractor's scope of work for the project. This will include, but is not limited to, wetlands, culturally sensitive areas, and any vegetation/habitat that is to be protected during construction. Staking will mostly occur adjacent to existing Yates Road where widening is to occur. This item has been incorporated into the project bid schedule for construction from Park Road to Kasanka Trail. Environmental oversight for ESA staking will be provided by Dokken under tasks 5.1.02 and 5.1.04.

# Task 5.5 Biological Construction Monitor:

For Yates Road, the following biological monitoring services will be provided:

- Provide a biologist to monitor all work performed within the nesting season as needed. Reporting of such monitoring will be provided to the various permitting agencies.
- The biologist will notify the Resident Engineer of biological resources found that would affect contractor operations and advise of necessary buffer zones.

\$3,200

\$0

\$9,400



## Task 6.0 State Land Conversion and Revalidation of the Environmental Document:

\$22,100

Sub Task 6.1 State Parcel Acquisition Coordination (\$5,200)

The 6(f) Parkland Conversion Process has exceeded the timeframe originally anticipated due to additional coordination and review with the various State Agencies and National Park Service. Budget is requested to continue the current level of effort related to conversion proposal approval and acquisition coordination until the currently anticipated completion estimated at November, 2012.

At the request of the Town and County, Dokken prepared a Scope of Appraisals to provide supplemental information to the County Appraiser, including providing additional coordination as needed, pertaining to the 6(f) parkland conversion and State land acquisitions. This work was not originally included in Dokken's scope of services for this task. Budget is requested and included above to cover this additional work.

Sub Task 6.2 Conversion Mapping & Preliminary Engineering (\$16,900) At the request of the Town and County, Dokken has prepared additional exhibits related to the proposed replacement land for the 6(f) conversion as options related to the conversion proposal submitted to OGALS and NPS. In addition, Dokken prepared exhibits for County discussions with the property owner of the parcels intended to be purchased for parkland replacement. Dokken is requesting additional budget to carry the current level of effort related to mapping and preliminary engineering to anticipated completion of the conversion process.

## **Summary**

A detailed estimated cost breakdown of all services associated with this amendment is provided in Attachment A: Amendment #8 – Task and Cost Proposal Summary. These services would be provided on a time and material, not-to-exceed, basis in accordance with the current Agreement.

The current and proposed contract amounts are summarized as follows:

| Original Contract Amount   | \$2,850,982 |
|--|-------------|
| Amendment 1: Green Tree Extension ED   | \$283,000   |
| Amendment 2: Supplemental Traffic Analysis   | \$19,700    |
| Amendment 3, Part I: Apple Valley Road to Park Road (Two Bid Packages; added   | \$336,900   |
| Right-of-Way Services)   |             |
| Amendment 4: Clearing and Tree Removal PS&E and Construction Support   | \$97,815    |
| Amendment 5: Additional Scope and Extended Services - Yucca Loma Bridge  | \$256,078   |
| Amendment 6: Additional Right of Way Services and Construction Support for   | \$847,400   |
| Town Facilities  |             |
| Amendment 7: State Land Conversion and Revalidation of the ED  | \$149,650   |
| TIGER II Grant Application Assistance  | \$6,475     |
| A A A B A F C F I TICED II   |             |
| Total Current Contract with Amendments 1, 2, 3-P1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and TIGER II Grant Application Assistance               | \$4,848,000 |
| Amendment 8 Request: Additional Design, Right of Way Services, and Construction Support for Town and County Facilities | \$422,400   |
| Total Proposed Contract Amount   | \$5,270,400 |

We continue to appreciate the opportunity to provide continued services for this major transportation project and look forward to hearing from you regarding this work. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (916) 858-0642.

Sincerely,

DOKKEN ENGINEERING

Elizabeth B. Diamond, PE

Director of Engineering/Project Manager

Attachments:

Attachment A: Task and Cost Proposal Summary

Attachment B: Contract Cost Summary

cc: Carrie Schindler, Transportation Planning Chief, San Bernardino County

Town of Apple Valley -Yucca Loma Bridge Contract Services Agreement ATTACHMENT A: AMENDMENT 8 - TASK AND COST PROPOSAL SUMMARY Additional Design, Right of Way Services, and Construction Support

|                         | TOTAL   | 10.736             |   |                                       |  |                                     | s 243,261  | \$ 44,502                               | \$ 44,502                                   | \$ 24,798 | 24,798    | \$ 143,780      | \$ 23,981  | \$ 58,073  | \$ 12,484  | \$ 12,484                            | 7,982                                   | 2.112  | \$ 9,716               | 9776                              |                           | 10,104   |   |                                       | \$ 115,629                       | 48,000                         |                                      | \$ 3,169                 |  | 3,169                         |                                    | 6 9.387                           | The Street of th | 6 987           | 3,000        | \$ 22,119   | \$ 5,235                              | \$ 16,884                                       |             | \$ 422,395                        |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|-----------|-----------|-----------------|------------|--|------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|                         | Subconsultant<br>Group Delta                    |                    |   |                                       |  |                                     | \$51,000   |   | 440,000                                     |           |           | \$11,000        | \$2.000    | \$6,000  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       | \$63,000                         | segion s                       | 3                                    |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 | \$           | -   |                                       |   |             | \$114,000                         |
|                         | TOTAL<br>HOURS                                  | 120                |   | 130                                   |  |                                     | 1867   | 30                                      | 30  | 204       | 707       | 1,223           | 204        | 899  | 80         | 00                                   | 65                                      | 50 42  | 68                     | 65                                |                           | 89   |   |                                       | 442                              | 1                              |                                      | Q.                       |  | 40                            |                                    | 130                               |  | 180             | No.4         | 176   | 38                                    | 138   | 2,643       |                                   |
|                         | resonign3 fractalesA lastractits                |                    |   |                                       |  |                                     | 90   |   |   |           |           | 00              | 69         |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 | İ            |   |                                       |   | 9           | 185,381                           |
|                         | reenign3 essicous lavacutat                     |                    |   |                                       |  |                                     | 40   |   |   |           | ,         |                 | 40         |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       | 08                               | vii.                           |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   | 130         | \$15,066                          |
|                         | seenign3 voine2 lasutout22                      |                    |   |                                       |  |                                     | 34   |   | 89  | 14        | * :       | 77              | 12         |  |            |                                      | 100000000000000000000000000000000000000 |  |                        |                                   |                           |  | :   |                                       | 10                               | e                              |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  | Ī               |              |   |                                       |   | 1           |                                   |
|                         | Structural Project Engineer                     |                    |   |                                       |  |                                     |  |   | SOME CONTRACT                               |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 | Section 1999 |   |                                       |   |             |                                   |
| sk                      | relgolosa erelocera                             |                    |   |                                       | 5  |                                     | L  |   | Sec. 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10 |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   | A CONTRACTOR   |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       |                                  |                                |                                      |                          | The state of the s |                               |                                    |                                   | No. of Philosophical Philosoph |                 |              |   |                                       |   |             |                                   |
| Estimated Hours By Task | Frigolost voins                                 |                    |   |                                       | No Change Related to Public Outrasch/Coordination - Phase 2: Soundwalls and Final Design | ArD                                 | L  |   |   |           |           |                 |            | NECESSARY OF THE PERSONS ASSESSMENT OF THE P |            |                                      |   | Manual Ma |                        |                                   |                           | sistance                                       |   | Hanagement RFP                        |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               | SA                                 |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   |             |                                   |
| Hour:                   | Geotechnical Designer                           |                    | No Change Related to Project Management of Phase I: PARED | L                                     | Soundwalls a   | No Change Related to Phase 1: PARED |  |   |   |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           | No Change Related to Tiper II Grant Assistance |   |                                       |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               | No Change Related to 5,4 Stake ESA |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   |             |                                   |
| timate                  | istnemnonivn3 thetalesA                         |                    | gement of Ph  |                                       | n - Phase 2:   | ge Related to                       |  |   |   |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           | eleted to To                                   | 92  | No Change Related to 5.1 Construction |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               | nge Related 1                      | 70                                |  | 20              |              |   |                                       |   | 07          | \$4,290                           |
| Est                     | Istnemoriate Environmental in Planter Biologist | L                  | Project Mana  | L                                     | /Coordinatio   | No Chan                             |  |   |   |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           | No Change R                                    | 00  | Change Relate                         |                                  |                                | A sommerce                           | 9                        |  | 40                            | No Cha                             | 80                                |  | 20              |              |   |                                       |   | 96          | \$7,130                           |
|                         | Terry Platcher - Project Land                   | -                  | e Related to  | L                                     | iblic Outreach   |                                     | 20   |   |   |           |           |                 |            |  |            | ,                                    | 67                                      | 20   |                        |                                   |                           |  | L   | No                                    |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   | 20          | \$2,870                           |
|                         | Roadway Traffic Engineer                        | L                  | No Chang  | L                                     | Related to Pu  |                                     |  |   | District Control                            |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   |             |                                   |
|                         | Roadway Assistant Engineer                      | -                  |   | L                                     | No Change  |                                     | 008  |   |   | 2         | 780       |                 | 40         | 099  |            | 1                                    | 97                                      |  | 10                     | 10                                |                           |  | 120                                       |                                       | 120                              | 120                            | Special Section 1                    |                          |  | 200                           |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              | 70  | 10                                    | 09  | 880         | \$87,308                          |
|                         | Roadway Associate Engineer                      | -                  |   |                                       |  |                                     | 40   |   |   | 9         |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  | 9   |                                       | 9                                | 40                             | The second                           |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   | 80          | \$8,371                           |
|                         | Rebecce Neves - Roadway Project                 | Н                  |   | 2                                     |  |                                     | 121  | 12                                      | 12  | 2         | 237       | 44              | 77         | 165  | g s        | 1                                    | 2 12                                    |  | 01                     | 40                                | 46                        |  | 130                                       |                                       | 120                              | 120                            |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    | 10                                |  | 10              |              | =   | 13                                    | 36  | 617         | 160,051                           |
|                         | Mamager<br>Manager<br>Manager                   | -                  |   | L                                     |  |                                     |  |   |   |           |           |                 |            |  |            |                                      |   |  |                        |                                   |                           |  |   |                                       |                                  |                                |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              |   |                                       |   |             |                                   |
|                         | seenign3 voines - snaW mit.                     | -                  |   | \$                                    |  |                                     | 237  | 10                                      | 10  | 2         | 126       | 48              | 20         | 55   | 2 2        |                                      |   | 0.00   | 40                     | 12 40                             |                           |  | 40  |                                       | 64                               | 2                              |                                      |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              | 43  | 10                                    | 32  | 403         | \$66,261                          |
|                         | segeneH 52e(or4 - bnomeiG zill 6                | 24                 |   | 1 24                                  |  |                                     | SII 5u   |   |   | 16        | 4         | 24              | 8          | 92   | 91         |                                      |   |  | in                     | 91                                | 4.                        |  | -   |                                       |                                  |                                | ,                                    |                          |  |                               |                                    |                                   |  |                 |              | 16  | 0                                     | 10  | 149         | \$33,406                          |
|                         | TASK DESCRIPTION                                | Project Management | Project Hanagament - Phase I: PARED                       | Project Management - Phase Z: General | Public Outreach/Coordination - Phase 2:<br>Soundwalts and Final Design                   | PHASE 1: PARED                      | PHASE 2: Final Design, Engineering & Permitting<br>Teebs | Final Geotechnical and Hydrology Report | Yates Apad                                  | 65% PS&E* | 90% PS&E* | Yucca Dema Road | Yakes Road | Combined 85%, Set - YLV  | 100% PSEE* | Dinte of the Exhibite Man and Inches | Aught of Way Exhibits                   | Legal Descriptions   | Other Agency Approvals | Right of Way Acquisition Services | Aroulefelon (Hennel otton | Tiger II Grant                                 | PHASE 3: Bidding and Construction Support | Construction Management RFP           | Bidding and Construction Support | Yude Lone Bridge<br>Yates Road | Precontraction Stotem Survey Asserts | Coordination & Training* | Yung Loma Road   | Yates Road<br>Resheation Acea | Stake ESA*                         | Blokgical Construction Honkor/ECR | Yugga Laine Bridge   | Yucra Loma Road | П            | State Land Conversion and Revalidation of the<br>Environmental Document | State Parcel Acquisition Coordination | Conversion Mapping & Preliminary<br>Engineering | TOTAL HOURS | TOTAL NOT TO EXCEED COST \$33,406 |
|                         | TASK#   | Task 0.1           | Task 0,1  | Task 0,2                              | Task 0.3   | Tank 1                              | Took 3   | Task 2.1                                | 210   | 7ak 2.3   | Task 2.4  | 240             | 24D        | 246  | 24.0       | Tank 2.6                             | 2.6.01                                  | 26.02  | Tank 2.7               | Tesk 3                            | Tank 3.2                  | Task 4   | Tank S                                    | Task 5.1                              | Task 5.2                         | \$28<br>\$20                   | 5.2E                                 | 14 N S S                 | 530  | 530                           | Task S.4                           | Tank S.S                          | 955  | 5.50            | 955          | Task 6  | Tank 6.1                              | Task 6.2  |             |                                   |

# TOWN OF APPLE VALLEY Yucca Loma Road/Yates Road/Green Tree Boulevard Transportation Improvement Project ATTACHMENT B: CONTRACT COST SUMMARY June 18, 2012

S 80,000,000 80,000,000 Proposed Total
Control County Cost Share of Town Cost Share of "S' Value of Construction
Amendment's Amendment & Amendment & Construction Value of Work 52,200,000 52,200,000 52,200,000 s 0.65% 4.38% 9,350 \$204,551 9,350 10,100 48,000 11,271 2,652 8,619 \$217,849 40,500 67,800 3,200 3,200 . . 9,400 8,400 10,829 2,548 8,281 9,350 73,050 24.000 3,920 80,200 \$5,270,400 18,700 \$422,400 18,700 21,700 24,000 98,100 12,500 10,100 143,800 Amendment 8 Remaining Contract Expended through Balance as of May 31, May 31, 2012 \$705,543 \$3.2.72 20.881 13.462 (42,289) (2.565) (14,084) 1017.57 16.853 300 (7.369) 140,685 3.481 78,037 (2,680) (3,580 1,562,280 653,413 908,867 \$4,142,457 1,111 122,876 48,122 7,568 69,901 121,863 6,475 4,613 792 5,899 121,671 44,773 24,100 22,150 9,917 20,731 200,000 c. Current Contract Amount + Amend 1, 2, 3-P1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and Tiger Grant 499,869 311,868 145,001 43,000 \$1,564,117 627,742 936,376 \$4,848,000 465,193 31,300 29,779 31,500.00 81,500.00 23,221 113,794 44,800 18,650 44,800 18,650 22,200 22,700 41,300 Original Contract Amount
Amendment 1 - Green Free Extension ED
Amendment 2 - Supplemental Traffic Amalysis:
Amendment 3 - Part 1:
Amendment 4 - Clearing and Tree Removat
Tree Removat
Removat
Free Free Free Free Springer Contractions and Tree Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Removat
Remo Project Total: Amendment 6 - Fores Design & Project Todan
Amendment 6 - Sourwahas, Yate Road, and Right of Way Services
Amendment 7 - Stels Land Connession and El Providision
Amendment 8 - Leegin Right of Way, and Controloin Suppore
Proposed Total Contract Amount Through Amendment 8 5.0 BIDDING AND CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT
5.1 Construction Management RPP
5.2 Bidding and Construction Support
6.2 Bidding and Construction Support
6.3 Prices Lone Bridge
6.3 The Assistance Support
6.4 State Res.
6. Biological Countruction Biology Survey, Agency Coord., & Training
6.3 Prices Res.
6. Biological Countruction Monitor/ECIS Compliance/SWPPP
6.0 STATE LAND CONVERSION AND ED REVALIDATION\*
6.1 Strie Preceded and Biology Survey, Agency Convention Managine, & Presidentian
6.2 Convention Managine, & Presidentian
6.3 Section of Compliance
6.4 NEPA/ACIO Amenidation
6.5 Technical Survey Regimeeting
6.5 Technical Survey
6.7 Residue of Compliance
6.8 Technical Survey
6.9 Residue of Compliance
6.9 6.9 Residue of Complianc Project Management - Phase I: PA&ED
 Project Management - Phase 2: General Multi-Agency\*
 Project Management - Phase 2: General Multi-Agency\*
 Public Outreach/Coordination - Soundwalls and Final Dealgr 2.0 PHASE 2 - FINAL DESIGN & RW ENGR TASKS E Restoration Jose
2.8 NOW Exhibit, Paris, and Legals
2.7 Other Agency Approvals
2.8 Final Design Approval
3.9 Yollow Amphysis
3.0 RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION SERVICES
4.0 TIGER II GRANT Final Geotechnical and Hydrology Reports
 Environmental Permitting
 S% Plans and Estimate 1.0 PHASE 1 - PE & ENV COMPLIANCE Env Documentation & Compliance 6 Years Loren Bridge
7 Years Loren Red
8 Years Loren Red
9 Years Loren Red
10 Years Loren Red
10 Years Loren Red
10 Years Loren Red
10 Years Red
10 Years Loren Red
10 Years Red
10 Years Loren Red
10 Years Lo Task PROJECT MANAGEMENT

These are addressed costs an incheduct costs and in a great man and County. The cost share for Project Management and POSE is absented 50/50 between Town and County since both agencies will beneaf it on cost savings through budding and construction of the contributor groups. When the state is the state is the state is the state request of the Town to private partial state is the budget. When trained to Tasks 2.1 and 5 are the sold responsibility of the County for Yales Road. The cost state for Task 6 is based on the folial area to be vested in each jurisdiction as it relates to the State correct parcels, while 45% vesting in the County and 55% vestings are considered to the C