TO:James L. App, City ManagerFROM:Doug Monn, Interim Public Works DirectorSUBJECT:Creston Road Corridor - Development of a Plan LineDATE:December 6, 2005		ug Monn, Interim Public Works Director eston Road Corridor - Development of a Plan Line	ie	
NEEDS:		r the City Council to consider expanding the adopted Scope of Work and asso S Corporation for the Creston Road Corridor Plan Line.	ociated c	ontract with
FACTS:	1.	On June 21, 2005, the City Council authorized staff to award the contract to for Creston Road from Capitol Hill to Rolling Hills Road to URS Corporati \$194,217.		
	2.	On September 9, 2005, staff conducted a pre-project meeting with URS C the scope of the plan line project.	orporati	on to define
	3.	At this meeting it was determined that consideration should be given to exp Work associated with the Creston Plan Line to include the entire corri Riverside to Niblick. If approved, the amended Scope of Work should result and relevant plan versus trying to interface multiple plans by different eng construction.	idor from It in a me	m 13th and ore cohesive
	4.	<ul> <li>The expanded Scope of Work includes:</li> <li>extending the analysis along the corridor to Niblick Road,</li> <li>performing a feasibility study for intersection improvements at Lana S Paso Robles Street/13th Street, and at Riverside Avenue/13th Street.</li> </ul>	street/Cr	reston Road,
	5.	This item was presented to the City Council on October 18, 2005. The City matter back to the ad hoc Committee to more specifically define the traffic r include a wide range of potential options. The Committee reviewed the rec and recommends approval of the expanded scope of work as presented here	mitigatio ommeno	n designs to
Analysis and Conclusion:		Based on staff direction, URS Corporation prepared the attached Scop proposal which is in addition to their original contract.	e of W	ork and fee
Policy Reference:		Adopted Capital Improvement Project		
Fiscal Impact:		The City's Budget, adopted June 7, 2005, includes the funding necessary to expansion of the Scope of Work (see Exhibit H). Intersection study at Riverside and Paso Robles Street Creston Road Preliminary Master Plan Intersection study at Creston and Lana	o cover ti	ne proposed \$ 100,000 \$ 250,000 \$ 50,000
<b>OPTIONS:</b>	a. b.	<ul> <li>Authorize staff to expand the current contract for the Creston Road F Corporation to:</li> <li>1) extend the study to Niblick</li> <li>2) include a feasibility study for improvements at Creston/Lana</li> <li>3) include a feasibility study for improvements at Paso Robles/13th</li> <li>4) include a feasibility study for improvements at Riverside/13th</li> <li>Amend, modify, or reject the above option.</li> </ul>	Plan Lind Fee: Fee: Fee: Fee:	e with URS \$ 18,000 \$ 35,000 \$ 30,000 \$ 35,000 \$ 35,000

Attachments 1) Exhibit H of the adopted City Budget 2) Scope of Work

A         FY 2005-06         FY 2005-06         FY 2006-09         FY 2006-06         TOTAL           NP         183,000         100,000         100,000         1,000,000         400,000         5,2           NP         600,000         1,000,000         1,000,000         400,000         2         2           NP         55,000         1,000,000         400,000         400,000         5,2         2           NP         55,000         1,000,000         1,000,000         5,2         2         2           NP         55,000         5,140,000         1,50,000         5,282,000         5,9         2           NP         50,000         5,140,000         1,140,000         1,160,000         5,282,000         5,9         2           NP         50,000         5,140,000         1,140,000         1,160,000         5,282,000         5,9         2           NP         5,000         5,			FY 2005-2006 to 2008-2009	2008-2009					
Prisonant         Reformant         Reformant         Reformant         Reformant         Prisoned7         Prisoned7 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>EXHIBIT</th><th>r</th><th></th><th></th><th>·</th><th>·</th><th></th></t<>			EXHIBIT	r			·	·	
1         2         1         NP         130,000         4,000,000         5         4           101, 16ht St         NP         100,000         1,000,000         4,000,000         5           101, 16ht St         NP         100,000         1,000,000         4,000,000         5           101, 16ht St         950,000         856,100         856,100         856,100         400,000         4,000,000         5           101, 16ht St         950,000         856,100         856,100         856,100         10,000         4,00,000         5           101, 16ht St         950,000         856,100         856,100         856,100         10         200,000         1           101, 16ht St         950,000         856,100         NP         550,000         1150,000         5         200,000         1           101, 16ht St         100,000         10,000,000         150,000         1         200,000         5         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000         5         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000         1         200,000<		ORIGINAL APPROPRIATION	REMAINING APPROPRIATION	REQUEST TYPE	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08		S ES
1         1	TRAFFIC MITIGATION								
R01         183,000         183,000         100,000         1,000,000         4,000,000         5           R0         rounce-about         NP         600,000         1,000,000         4,000,000         1,000,000 <td>Left Turn Phase at 10th and Spring Note: with County Counthouse Project</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>dN</td> <td>•</td> <td>ľ</td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Left Turn Phase at 10th and Spring Note: with County Counthouse Project			dN	•	ľ	•		
No.1.161: 54.         NP         100,000         1,000,000         4,000,000         4,000,000         5           No.1.161: 54.         950,000         856,100         856,100         856,100         856,100         856,100         90,000         400,000         400,000         10           Party Design &         NP         250,000         10,000,000         400,000         400,000         1           Ref >950,000         856,100         856,100         NP         250,000         400,000         400,000         1           Ref >950,000         856,100         NP         250,000         1,000,000         582,000         1         1         200,000         1           Ref >0         NP         80,000         1,100,000         1,150,000         5,282,000         5         200,000         5         2           Ref >0         NP         50,000         1,140,000         1,150,000         5         2	New signal 24th and Vine			AP	183,000				183.0
(46W         550,000         856,100         NP         600,000         400,000         400,000         400,000         100,00	13th Street Bridge improvements over Hwy 101, 16th St southbound onramp, imp. at 101/46E including round-abo study @ Riverside & Paso Robles Street Study	lut		đ	100,000	100,000	1,000,000	4,000,000	5,200,0
ck         950,000         856,100         SUP         600,000         400,000         400,000         1           arty Design &         NP         250,000         1,000,000         400,000         400,000         1           arty Design &         NP         250,000         NP         35,000         400,000         400,000         1           eligin         NP         50,000         NP         35,000         1,000,000         400,000         1           eligin         NP         50,000         NP         50,000         5,130,000         5,232,000         5           a         (round-about         NP         50,000         5,140,000         5,523,000         5         200,000         5           ver Road         NP         50,000         5,130,000         5,130,000         5,130,000         5,523,000         5         200,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00,000         5         2,00	Project approvals and Env. Docs (PAED) 101/46W			NP	600,000				0.003
Inv         NP         250,000         400,000	Rehab and widen Union Rd - Riverglen to Kleck	950,000	856,100	SUP	600,000				0,000
arry Design &         int         250,000         int         662,000         int         62,000         int         200,000         int         200,00	Annual Street Program			dN		1,000,000	400,000	400,000	1.800.0
NP         NP         35,000         682,000         682,000         682,000         882,000         882,000         882,000         90,000         200,000         90,000 </td <td>Creston Road Imps - Phase III &amp; IV (Preliminary Design &amp; Master Plan)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>đN</td> <td>250,000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>250,0</td>	Creston Road Imps - Phase III & IV (Preliminary Design & Master Plan)			đN	250,000				250,0
ccc System         NP         35,000         S3,000         200,000           resign         NP         60,000         200,000         200,000           a         (round-bout         NP         50,000         150,000         200,000           a         (round-bout         NP         50,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           ver Road         NP         50,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,500,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           ver Road         Subtectals         \$ 950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           ver Road         Subtectals         \$ 950,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           ver Road         Subtectals         \$ 950,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,260,000         \$ 2,00,000	Rehab Vine St - First St to Hwy 46			dN				682,000	682 0
Reign         NP         60,000         ×         200,000           a         (round-bout         NP         50,000         ×         150,000         ×         200,000         ×         9           (round-bout         NP         50,000         ×         1,928,000         ×         1,50,000         ×         2,85,100         ×         9         50,000         ×         1,000,000         ×         1,000,000         ×         1,000,000         ×         1,000,000         ×         ×         ×         1,000,000         ×	Strategic Plan for Pavement Mgmt Maintenance System			dN	35,000				35.0
a         (round- fround-about         NP         60,000         sources         accurate           (round-about         NP         50,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           ver Road         NP         50,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           ver Road         NP         50,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           Subtotals         950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 9           Subtotals         950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 2,200,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 2,350,000         \$ 2,350,000         \$ 2,350,000         \$ 2,350,000         \$ 2,350,000         \$ 2,350,000	Union Road Widening - Kleck to Prospect - Design			NP					
K for Creation and Lana         (round-about         NP         50,000         150,000         150,000         5           Goldenhill Road         (round-about         NP         50,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,950,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           K for Charolais and River Road         Subtoctals         \$ 950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,950,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           Sittaal)         Subtoctals         S 950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,900,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           Optact Fee Fund          S 0,000         \$ 1,900,000         \$ 1,900,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 9           In Fund          S 0,000         \$ 1,900,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 9           Total Uses          S 0,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 9           Total Uses          S 1,282,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 200,000         \$ 9           Total Uses           S 1,282,000         \$ 1,90,000 <td>Sidewalk Inventory &amp; Maintenance Program</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>NP</td> <td>60-000</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>000-007</td> <td>0.002</td>	Sidewalk Inventory & Maintenance Program			NP	60-000			000-007	0.002
Goldenhill Road         (round-about         NP         50,000         150,000         5,522,000         9 93           K for Charolais and River Road         stund-about         NP         50,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 93           R for Charolais and River Road         subbotals         \$ 956,100         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,490,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 93           pact Fee Fund         subbotals         subotals         \$ 950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,3000         \$ 1,400,000         \$ 1,3000         \$ 2,000,000         \$ 30           pact Fee Fund         subbotal         subbotal         subbotal         \$ 1,28,0,000         \$ 1,30,000         \$ 2,00,000         \$ 3,00         \$ 2,00,000 <t< td=""><td>k for Creston and Lana</td><td></td><td></td><td>đN</td><td>50,000</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>50,0</td></t<>	k for Creston and Lana			đN	50,000				50,0
btotals         \$ 5,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 95           btotals         \$ 950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 9,90           btotals         \$ 950,000         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 1,000,000         \$ 300,000         \$ 3,000         \$ 3,000         \$ 3,	Goldenhill Road	ut		ЧŅ			150,000		150,0
Subtotals         \$ 950,000         \$ 856,100         \$ 1,928,000         \$ 1,550,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 9           on Impact Fee Fund            \$ 713,000         \$ 1,140,000         \$ 7,30,000         \$ 5,282,000         \$ 5,00,000	Preliminary design work for Charolais and River Road (round-about in lieu of signal)			AN	50,000			-	50,000
on Impact Fee Fund         on Impact Fee Fund         s         15,000         s         15,000         s         s         10,00,000         s         s           If Plan Fund         in C         <		6 \$				\$ 1,140,000			
on Impact Fee Fund         on Impact Fee Fund         s         713,000         \$		-				:			
(1)         (2) <td>FUNDING USES:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	FUNDING USES:								
300,000         300,000         1,000,000         4,000,000         5,000,000         5,000,000         2,	Traffic Mitigation Impact Fee Fund								
(0)         (0) <td>SLUCCUG Grants</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>300,000</td> <td></td> <td>1,000,000</td> <td>4,000,000</td> <td>5,300,0</td>	SLUCCUG Grants				300,000		1,000,000	4,000,000	5,300,0
315,000         1,140,000         400,000         1,082,000           1         1,928,000         1,140,000         1,550,000         5,282,000           1         1,928,000         1,140,000         1,550,000         5,282,000         5           1         1         1,928,000         1,140,000         1,550,000         5,5282,000         5           1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1           1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1           1 <t< td=""><td>Union/46 Specific Plan Fund</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>600,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>200,000</td><td>800,0</td></t<>	Union/46 Specific Plan Fund				600,000			200,000	800,0
Image: Note of the image of the im					315,000	1,140,000	400,000	1,082,000	2,937.0
Original         Remaining           Budget         Budget as of           4/30/05         4/30/05           5         20,000,000         856,100           950,000         250,000         11,220           11,320,000         39,100         39,100	Total Uses						ΓÌ		5, 9,900,0
\$ 20,000,000         \$ 8,870,100           \$ 50,000,000         \$ 8,870,100           \$ 250,000         \$ 551,000           \$ 11,320,000         \$ 39,100           \$ 1,200,000         \$ 39,100				Original Budget	Remaining Budget as of 4/30/05				
Riverglen to Kleck         \$ 20,000,000         \$ 8,870,100           Riverglen to Kleck         950,000         856,100           11,320,000         11,320,000         100,000           39,100         39,100	*Carry-over Projects From Current CIP Budget:				-				
bad - Riverglen to Kleck     950,000     856,100       211,200     211,200       11,320,000     100,000       11,320,000     39,100	13st Street Bridge Widening			F	1	Various (see h	feasure D Food	helow)	
250,000 211,200 11,320,000 100,000 1,200,000 39,100	Rehab & Widen Union Road - Rivergien to Kleck			950,000		Union/46 Spe	cific Plan Fees		
11,320,000 100,000 100,000 39,100	Airport Rd/Hwy 46E PSR	-		250,000	211,200	Airport PSR Fe	es		
1,200,000 39,100	Niblick Bridge Mitigation			11,320,000	100,000	Bridge Impact	Fees		
	NIDIICK Koad Rehab				39,100	<b>I</b>			

SED

\*Final amount subject to final year end results

26 September 2005

1380 Lead Hill Boulevard, Suite 100 Roseville, California 95661-2997 Tel: (916) 784-3900 Fax: (916) 784-0211

Ms. Ditas Esperanza City of El Paso de Robles Public Works Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446

#### Subject: Creston Road Plan Line Update - Revised Scope and Fee Request

Dear Ditas:

Per your request, URS Corporation has prepared the attached additional scope and fee proposal to expand our original contract with the City for preparation of a Plan Line for Creston Road. In summary, the expanded scope and fees are as follows:

- We will extend our analysis of the corridor up to Niblick Road, estimated fee increase of \$18,000 ;
- We will include a feasibility study for a roundabout at 13<sup>th</sup> St and Riverside Ave., estimated fee increase of \$35,000;
- We will include a feasibility study for a roundabout at 13<sup>th</sup> St and Paso Robles St., estimated fee increase of \$30,000;
- We will include a feasibility study for a roundabout at Creston Rd. and Lana St., estimated fee increase of \$35,000;

We would like to confirm our commitment to successfully deliver this planning effort and to support the City in this important planning effort. We appreciate this opportunity and look forward to working with you and the City on this project. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

**URS** Corporation, Americas

Jorge Aguilar, PE Project Manager

c:File I-A



CITY OF EI PASO DE ROBLES Plan Update for Creston Road

# Work Program

The following task outline represents the basis of our proposed contract scope for the project. The "Scope at a Glance" is an outline listing of the tasks and the details of each activity are included in the following discussion. We would be pleased to discuss any aspect of this proposal with the City and expect that it will be further refined during subsequent steps. The scope of work presented is assumed to be integrated with the "Project Understanding" Section of this proposal and with the specific work scopes of our extended team members, as such these documents are hereby incorporated by reference.

# "Scope At A Glance"

TASKS	TASK DESCRIPTIONS
1	Project Management, QA/QC
2*	Team Meetings, Data Collection & Project Coordination
3*	ROW Delineation & Incorporation into Existing Mapping
4*	Traffic Analysis
5*	Preliminary Environmental Evaluation, Design & Drainage Study
5.1	Full-width Arterial Standard
5.2	Alternative Concepts
5.3	Drainage Study
5.4	Cost Estimating
5,3	Criteria Matrix
6	Public Presentations & Workshops
6.1	Initial Coordination and Input
6.2	Preliminary Concepts
6.3	Recommended Alternative
7	Preliminary Design Report
7.1	Draft PDR
7.2	Final PDR

Notes: \* Denotes task revisions as requested for additional roundabout studies. A summary discussion of each of the activities shown follows this table:





## Task 1 – Project Management, QA/QC

This task addresses the coordination of the various project delivery tasks, design disciplines and key client communication to meet deliverable and schedule commitments. Various project functions will be initiated independently and concurrently particularly at the beginning of the project (ie administrative functions, mapping, data collection/review, traffic scoping and existing conditions analysis, concept planning, team and agency coordination functions). These initial functions will reach a point where they become interdependent prior to finalization and then may again reach some level of independence.

The project schedule, task budgets, invoicing and production progress will be closely monitored to ensure timely action and interactive teaming with the City. Please note that the scope of services budget included with this submittal consists of estimated individual task budgets and that these may vary within the total estimated budget for this work.

## **Independent Quality Assurance Program**

This is an on-going task that is scheduled to be performed immediately prior to submittals. URS implements a review of the project documents by a senior level engineer that is not actively involved in the project planning or design. This review is in addition to the normal reviews by supervisory personnel. The URS Quality Assurance Manual outlines a systematic approach to the review of project documents prepared by company personnel. Each office has a Quality Assurance Officer who is responsible for the periodic audit of project files to ensure adherence to QA procedures and to assist in the documentation of QA processes. A corporate staff member additionally periodically spot audits project files to assure compliance with the mandated plan that is to be established as part of the project initiation.

## **Deliverables:**

- Project Schedule Updates
- General Project Coordination and Administration
- Invoicing and Budget Tracking
- Project Specific QA File Materials (either an "In-House" or client walk through review of the general procedures is available if requested).

## Task 2 - Team Meetings, Data Collection & Project Coordination

As our first order of work, URS will coordinate a Kick-Off meeting of the Project Development Team (PDT) that is to be comprised of the City, and URS Team members. We'll prepare for and meet at the City offices to review the scope of work, define the roles of the project participants, and confirm schedule and milestone requirements.

At that time, we'll gather relevant City/agency data and record documents. This data should include, but not be limited to; the Dec 12, 2003 updated City General Plan and EIR, City land planning and zoning information, City utility information, as-built plans for facilities adjacent to the project site, and additional data





as determined applicable. An initial Request For Information will be submitted to allow time for the information to be gathered prior to the Kick-Off meeting. A field review will follow the meeting with PDT members participating as appropriate.

<u>Eight (8)</u> additional project coordination staff meetings are included for this project. These meetings may be conducted "face to face" at the City offices or by teleconference as mutually scheduled by the City and URS staff.

## **Deliverables:**

- Attendance at a Kickoff meeting at the City offices
- URS participation at up to eight (8) additional meetings

## Task 3 - Right of Way Delineation and Incorporation Into Existing Mapping

For this task URS and Vaughan surveys propose to start the project immediately by using the mapping from the <u>City wide aerial recently obtained by the City</u> and incorporating right of way delineation from <u>Riverside</u> <u>Avenue to Niblick Road</u> calculated from record data maps and input into the AutoCadd drawing. Boundaries will be based on record information only and not be based on actual field surveys, additionally, it is assumed that sufficient boundary information will be found in the field to reasonably align the record information. Boundary establishment for purposes of right of way acquisition, determination of area quantities or preparation of legal descriptions would require additional analysis on a parcel by parcel basis using Citysupplied preliminary title reports and is not included in this estimate. Record data establishment will be primarily based on the Creston Road Plan Line Record of Survey prepared by EDA recorded in Book 72 of Surveys, Page 32 together with the survey of the Orchard Bungalow Tract prepared by Vaughan Surveys for the City of Paso Robles.

## **Deliverables:**

• Existing Right of Way Delineation for the project (Riverside Ave. to Niblick Rd.) in AutoCadd format

## Task 4 – Traffic Analysis

The existing plan line shows a four-lane arterial cross section with a 72-foot curb-to-curb width within a 96-foot right-of-way. The abutting land uses are residential, commercial, and institutional, where constructing the fourlane cross section could affect several existing building and/or property access. The ATE/URS team will jointly develop several alternative designs that would reduce/minimize impacts to the abutting uses with a focus on achieving the City's desired level of service. Alternative designs would include, but not necessarily be limited to: a three-lane section (one lane each direction with center left-turn lane); a modified two-lane section with property access consolidated at selected locations; potential street closures; or turn prohibitions (right turn only locations); use of roundabouts at key intersections such as at: 13<sup>th</sup> St/Riverside Ave, 13<sup>th</sup> St/Paso Robles St, Creston Rd/Lana Lane, and at up to two other locations.

Analyses of the alternative designs will be based on traffic volume forecasts generated by the City's traffic model that was developed for the Circulation Element. Additionally, ATE will conduct 24-hour machine traffic count at 2 locations on Creston Road and up to 4 locations on key side streets to independently verify existing and forecast information. Forecast future traffic volumes for buildout (horizon year to be determined): The volume forecasts





but would have the benefit of the past input to reduce potential controversy and confirm the publics input and ownership. The final phase is to present the recommended alternative, allow for City Council action if appropriate and distribute information to the public on the next steps and timelines.

Public meetings or workshops are to be scheduled by the City as appropriate for other considerations.

#### **Deliverables:**

- Attendance at up to 4 Public Presentations
- Up to two coordination meetings with City staff and School District representatives
- Electronic and Board Mounted Exhibits to support the presentations

#### Task 7 - Preliminary Design Report

After review of the preliminary concepts and input by City staff and public stakeholders, URS will prepare the delineation for a recommended alternative and summarize the technical memorandums prepared to date and the project process in a Draft Preliminary Design Report. This report will include the text discussion on existing conditions, background, public process and criteria matrix, preliminary design alternatives and costs, drainage considerations and preliminary and anticipated environmental studies, final recommended alternative, proposed schedule and costs for: construction, right of way, design, right of way support and construction management. At this stage we expect a more refined look at cost estimating, particularly for right of way and have assumed up to 25 parcel impacts and the following conditions for **right of way assessment**:

The various land uses throughout the project limits include: high and medium density residential, church and commercial. Impacts can be mitigated to the point that relocation of any businesses or residences will not be required or sales of property will be amicable and "in whole" without controversy.

- Review of current and projected land use patterns from a right of way cost prospective for each study alternative,
- A comparable analysis of each property, including potential damages to those properties which have improvement affected by the project.
- Right of Way estimates, by parcel, for each alternative for inclusion in the Right of Way Data Sheets.
- Analysis of up to 25 parcels for right of way estimate assume 4 different land use types.

Utility relocation analysis is not included in the ROW data sheet and ROW data sheets will be produced by the URS team for up to 25 parcels.

We expect one iteration of comments to the draft report and will provide a final report based on the receipt and resolution of those written comments.

## **Deliverables:**

- Draft Preliminary Design Report (10 copies)
- Final PDR (5 Copies)

