07- LA-101-PM 33.0 30710K - 0714000213- 4766 4050.400.000 Locally Funded Highway Project May 2015

Project Study Report To **Request Conceptual Approval Of** A Project Funded by Others

On Route **US-101**

 \pm 0.2 miles West of Liberty Canyon Road

I have reviewed the right of way information contained in this report and the R/W Data Sheet attached hereto, and found the data to be complete, current and accurate:

lon 5/1/15

Dan Murdoch, ACTING DEPUTY DISTRICT DIRECTOR, RIGHT OF WAY

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

At

Reza Fateh, PROJECT MANAGER

APPROVED:

Carrie Bowen, DISTRICT DIRECTOR

DATE

Vicinity Map





This project study report has been prepared under the direction of the following registered civil engineer. The registered civil engineer attests to the technical information contained herein and the engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based.

4/28/15 DATE REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER PROFESSION Siew Mei Tan C61389 Exp. 06/30/15 STATE CIVIL OF CAL

Table of Contents

| 1. | INTRODUCTION1 | |
|-----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 2. | BACKGROUND |) |
| 3. | PURPOSE AND NEED | , |
| 4. | DEFICIENCIES | , |
| 5. | CORRIDOR AND SYSTEM COORDINATION | , |
| 6. | ALTERNATIVES4 | ŀ |
| 7. | COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT | ; |
| 8. | ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION/DOCUMENT | , |
| 9. | FUNDING/PROGRAMMING | , |
| 10. | SCHEDULE |) |
| 11. | RISKS |) |
| 12. | FHWA COORDINATION |) |
| 13. | PROJECT REVIEWS |) |
| 14. | PROJECT PERSONNEL | |
| 15. | ATTACHMENTS | |

1. INTRODUCTION

Project Description:

This project proposes to construct a vegetated bridge across US-101 near Liberty Canyon Road in the City of Agoura Hills to function as a wildlife crossing. The project is sponsored by the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA), which is a local partnership between the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, the Conejo Recreation and Park District, and the Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District. A cooperative agreement between MRCA and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was executed on February 12, 2015. MRCA requested that Caltrans develop a Project Initiation Document (PID) for the project and agreed to fund the cost of the PID. MRCA and the Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains (RCDSMM), project architect, provided the location and design elements of the bridge. Caltrans subsequently prepared this Project Study Report (PSR) to evaluate the cost and structural feasibility of the bridge and associated improvements.

One "no build" and one "build" alternative were evaluated and documented in this report. The "build" alternative, Alternative 2, proposes to build a 165-foot wide by 200-foot long bridge across US-101 west of Liberty Canyon Road. The bridge will be vegetated to provide a passage that resembles the natural habitat of wildlife. The slope between end of the bridge and Agoura Road south of the freeway will be built up to grade to allow the crossing to extend over Agoura Road before descending to join existing ground. A tunnel and associated retaining wall systems would be constructed along Agoura Road to keep the road operational and to accommodate the fill material needed to construct the wildlife crossing. The costs for the recommended alternative are summarized in the table below. An escalation rate of 3% per year is used to estimate the escalated cost. The capital funding source for the project is to be determined (TBD), as the project sponsor is actively seeking funding opportunities.

| Project Limits | 07-LA-101-PM 33.0 | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Number of Alternatives | Two (2) | | |
| Programmable Project Alternative | Alternative 2 | | |
| | Current Cost Estimate: | Escalated Cost Estimate: | |
| Capital Outlay Support | \$10,152,500 \$10,152,500 | | |
| Capital Outlay Construction | \$33,410,000 \$37,603,000 | | |
| Capital Outlay Right-of-Way | \$6,140,000 \$9,085,000 | | |
| Funding Source | TBD | | |
| Funding Year | 2017/2018 | | |
| Type of Facility | 8 Lane Freeway | | |
| Number of Structures | Two (2) | | |
| Anticipated Environmental | Negative Declaration (ND)/ | | |
| Determination or Document | Finding of No Significa | ant Impact | |
| Project Development Category | 4 | | |

2. BACKGROUND

US-101 is a freeway that runs mostly north-south in the State of California. It is also known as the Hollywood/Ventura Freeway and is a heavily travelled commuter route serving the Greater Los Angeles area and connecting Los Angeles and Ventura Counties. It also acts as the primary access route to and from downtown Los Angeles, various residential communities, and tourist destinations in Los Angeles, as well as the central California coast.

Within the project limits, US-101 is a 8-lane freeway that runs east-west through the City of Agoura Hills separating the Santa Monica Mountains (to the south) from the Simi Hills and Santa Susana Mountains (to the north). US-101 is a formidable and virtually impenetrable barrier for many wildlife species including mountain lions, bobcats, gray foxes, coyotes, and mule deer that inhabit and travel between these two mountain ranges. In particular, mammals with large home ranges such as mountain lions and bobcats need large connected habitats in order to hunt, breed, and thrive. The construction of US-101 divided this previously continuous habitat range into isolated habitat fragments and resulted in severely restricted movement between the two mountain ranges. For mountain lions in particular, the consequences of this restriction results in increased inbreeding and territorial fighting, and very low genetic diversity, within the Santa Monica Mountains.

The wildlife crossing is critical in the linkage between the Santa Monica Mountains and the Sierra Madre Range, which is one of the few coastal to inland connections remaining in Southern California. Both the South Coast Missing Linkages Project and the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project identified the need to preserve and enhance this critical linkage in order to sustain ecological and evolutionary processes in California's South Coast Ecoregion. Additionally, the National Park Service has been collecting and publishing data on carnivore movement for over a decade, thereby validating the importance of a linkage for sustaining wildlife populations in the Santa Monica Mountains.

Analysis of genetics and tracking of ranges size conducted by the National Park Service has indicated that providing wildlife connectivity through intervening natural areas in the Simi Hills, Santa Susana Mountains, and ultimately to the larger ecosystem of the Sierra Madre Range is imperative for preserving a viable mountain lion population in the Santa Monica Mountains. The genetic diversity of mountain lions in the Santa Monica Mountains was determined to be lower than anywhere else in the state of California, or anywhere else throughout the species range in the Western United States. Moreover, connectivity is not just important for mountain lions, as National Park Service data has shown that bobcats and coyotes are also exhibiting significant genetic effects in the relatively short period since the freeway was built and research has shown that smaller species including lizards and birds are affected by the habitat fragmentation caused by roads and urban development. Without a safe and sustainable wildlife crossing, movement between these remaining areas of natural habitat is severely restricted and wildlife within the Santa Monica Mountains is essentially trapped.

The Liberty Canyon area was identified by scientists and experts working in the field of wildlife movement as the optimal location for a safe and sustainable wildlife crossing across US-101. Prime habitat has already been protected on both sides of the freeway at this

location that is contiguous with large swaths of protected habitat to the north and south of this connection. In addition, a tragic indicator that Liberty Canyon is the appropriate location for a wildlife crossing is the death of a male puma that was killed while attempting to migrate into the Santa Monica Mountains in October 2013.

3. PURPOSE AND NEED

Purpose:

The purpose of this project is to provide a safe and sustainable passage for wildlife across US-101 near Liberty Canyon Road in the City of Agoura Hills that reduces wildlife mortality and allows for the movement of animals and the exchange of genetic material.

Need:

The need for the proposed project is based on genetic and tracking data that shows US-101 is a barrier to wildlife that historically traveled between the Santa Monica Mountains and the Simi Hills, ultimately connecting the Santa Monica Mountains to the Sierra Madre mountain range north of Highway 126. In particular, large mammals such as mountain lions and bobcats need large connected habitats in order to hunt, breed, and thrive. US-101 divides this previously contiguous range into isolated habitat fragments; for mountain lions, this has resulted in inbreeding, territorial fighting, and a decrease in genetic diversity. Connectivity is critical for all kinds of wildlife, especially in an area such as Los Angeles with an extensive freeway system. The need will only increase as climate change effects species distribution.

4. DEFICIENCIES

Environmental impacts and mitigation measures were not considered nor required when US-101 and most of Southern California's freeways were built in the 1950s. As a result the construction of US-101 bisected the previously connected natural habitat ranges of many wildlife species. Presently, a safe and sustainable wildlife crossing across US-101 is not available. Without the addition of a wildlife crossing, the ecological and environmental impact on wildlife that resulted from the construction of US-101 will persist and the fate of many wildlife species within the Santa Monica Mountains will remain in jeopardy.

5. CORRIDOR AND SYSTEM COORDINATION

In District 7, US-101 extends 83.1 miles; 39.5 miles are in Los Angeles County and 43.6 miles are in Ventura County. US-101 is part of the Federal Aid Primary (FAP) system, which is a subset of the National Highway System (NHS). The project limits lie within the freeway segment from State Route 27 to the Los Angeles/Ventura County Line. This segment is classified as Rural Principal Arterial under FAP; and State Freeway under the State Highway System (SHS).

The latest Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for US-101 was completed in July 2013. The TCR identifies the existing and future route conditions as well as future needs for each route on the SHS. Currently, US-101 within the project limits has four mixed flow lanes (MFL) and an auxiliary lane in each direction. The existing Level of Service (LOS) for this segment of the freeway is F0. Due to financial, environmental, right of way, and other constraints, it is very difficult for Caltrans to continue to add more lanes to the highway systems. With these limitations, Caltrans District 7 has established LOS F0 as the minimum acceptable LOS on the freeway system. In accordance with the "CONCEPT – 2035 Facility" table in the TCR, eight (8) total MFLs (four [4] MFLs in each direction) are needed in the year of 2035 to maintain LOS of F0 within the project segment of the freeway. Thus, no widening of this segment of the freeway is planned at this time.

6. ALTERNATIVES

A. Viable Alternatives

The two viable alternatives for this project are Alternative 1: "No Build"; and Alternative 2: "Build".

Alternative 1: "No Build"

This alternative does not satisfy the purpose and need for this project and will result in the continued restriction of wildlife movement into and out of the Santa Monica Mountains and threaten the long-term viability of wildlife species within it.

Alternative 2: "Build"

This alternative proposes to build a vegetated bridge across US-101 west of Liberty Canyon Road to provide a safe passage for wildlife to cross the freeway. The scope of work includes:

- Construct a two span 165-foot wide by 200-foot long bridge with columns on spread footings in the freeway median.
- Construct retaining walls at both the north and south end of the bridge.
- Construct soundwalls along the outer edges of the bridge to mitigate traffic noise and block light in order to make the crossing more conductive to wildlife crossing.
- Plant vegetation on the bridge to provide a passage that resembles the natural habitat for wildlife.
- Install irrigation and drainage system on the bridge.
- Fill and grade the slope and open area between the freeway and Agoura Road to provide a continuous grade thereby allowing the wildlife crossing to extend over Agoura Road before descending to join existing ground.
- Construct a tunnel and associated retaining wall systems along Agoura Road to keep the road operational and to support the fill materials required by the wildlife crossing.

The Structure Advance Planning Study (APS) for the proposed bridge, tunnel, and associated improvements are included in Attachment B.

This alternative can be constructed in two phases if funding is limited. The first phase would consist of the construction of the bridge over US-101. This would meet the immediate need to provide a wildlife crossing across the busy freeway. The capital and support cost for this phase is approximately \$30 million dollars.

The second phase would consist of the construction of the Agoura Road tunnel and grading of the open area between US-101 and Agoura Road to allow the wildlife crossing to extend over Agoura Road, which is currently a two-lane road that does not have high traffic volumes. If traffic volumes increase due to nearby residential and commercial development, Agoura Road would be widened per City of Agoura Hills's requirements and have higher traffic volumes that may result in undesirable conditions for wildlife seeking to cross Agoura Road. The second phase of the project would allow the wildlife crossing to extend over Agoura Road. The capital and support cost for this phase is approximately \$20 million dollars.

This is the recommended alternative for programming and it is recommended that the project proceed to the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase. The implementation of the two phases of this alternative will be furthered studied in the PA/ED phase.

Design Exceptions

Based on the scope of work proposed by this project, on April 7, 2015, the HQ Design Reviewer concurred that the preparation of a Fact Sheet Exceptions to Mandatory Design Standards for the features described below would be deferred to the PA/ED Phase.

The identified nonstandard features proposed by this project are as follows:

1. Nonstandard Shoulder Width, SB Mainline Shoulder

The existing left shoulder width for SB US-101 within the project limits is 10 feet. The widths of the proposed bridge columns (5 feet 6 inches in diameter) and associated concrete barrier (Type 60F) will reduce the left shoulder width from 10 feet to 6 feet 6 inches, for a distance of 155 feet along the freeway centerline.

The standard for which this exception would be requested from is Index 302.1 of the Highway Design Manual (HDM) (last updated 9/22/14). Index 302.1 states, **"The shoulder widths given in Table 302.1 shall be the minimum continuous usable width of paved shoulder on highway.**" Table 302.1 calls for a left paved shoulder width of 10 feet for freeways with 6 or more lanes.

2. Nonstandard Shoulder Width, NB Mainline Shoulder

The existing left shoulder width for NB US-101 within the project limits is 10 feet. The widths of the proposed bridge columns (5 feet 6 inches in diameter) and associated concrete barrier (Type 60F) will reduce the left shoulder width from 10 feet to 6 feet 6 inches, for a distance of 155 feet along the freeway centerline.

The standard for which this exception would be requested from is Index 302.1 of the HDM (last updated 9/22/14). Index 302.1 states, **"The shoulder widths given in Table 302.1 shall be the minimum continuous usable width of paved shoulder on highway."** Table 302.1 calls for a left paved shoulder width of 10 feet for freeways with 6 or more lanes.

3. Nonstandard Stopping Sight Distance on Horizontal Curve, SB Mainline

The bridge columns will be placed along the portion of the freeway with an 1800-foot radius horizontal curve along the centerline. The proposed columns and reduced shoulder width will result in a stopping sight distance of 427 feet for a design speed of 70 mph along the inside lane of SB mainline.

The standard for which this exception would be requested from is Index 201.1 of the HDM (last updated 9/22/14). Index 202.1 states, **"Table 202.1 shows the minimum standards for stopping sight distance related to design speed for motorists."** Table 201.1 calls for stopping sight distance of 750 feet for a design speed of 70 mph.

4. Nonstandard Stopping Sight Distance on Horizontal Curve, NB Mainline

The proposed bridge abutment wall will be located at a distance of 12 feet from the edge of shoulder. The wall will obstruct the view of motorists travelling on the outside lane of NB mainline. The abutment wall and proposed shoulder width of 10 feet will result in a stopping sight distance of 635 feet for a design speed of 70 mph along the outside lane of NB mainline.

The standard for which this exception would be requested from is Index 201.1 of the HDM (last updated 9/22/14). Index 202.1 states, **"Table 202.1 shows the minimum standards for stopping sight distance related to design speed for motorists."** Table 201.1 calls for stopping sight distance of 750 feet for a design speed of 70 mph.

Hazardous Waste

The Preliminary Hazardous Waste Assessment prepared for this project, finds that construction activities involving imported soil backfill will not have hazardous waste issues unless the existing freeway shoulder surfaces are disturbed before they are covered with imported fill material. If the exposed sites are disturbed, the exposed soils are likely to be lead-impacted and will require an Aerially Deposited Lead (ADL) site investigation. The elevation of groundwater in the project area needs to be determined if piles are proposed for supporting the bridge. If groundwater elevation is below the endpoints of piles, the site should not have any issues; otherwise it will need to be screened for potential contaminants for disposal purpose.

Landscaping

The bridge across US-101 and fill area between the freeway and Agoura Road will be landscaped to provide a continuous passage that resembles a natural habitat for the wildlife. The landscape designs will be provided by MRCA in the next phase of the project.

Stormwater

The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) has jurisdiction over the project area. The total disturbed area (TDA) for the project is 4.44 acres.

A long-form Storm Water Data Report (SWDR) was prepared in accordance with the July 2010 Edition of Storm Water Quality Handbook-Project Planning Design Guide (PPDG) and approved on April 23, 2015. The SWDR Cover Sheet is presented in Attachment E.

Right of Way

The recommended alternative would require right of way from MRCA, City of Agoura Hills, and private property owners. The Right of Way Data Sheet is presented in Attachment F.

Utilities

Existing utilities along Agoura Road will be impacted by this alternative. Overhead utility lines and poles on both the north and south side of Agoura Road will need to be modified and/or relocated. Water lines along Vendell Place will need to be relocated. Sewer lines along Agoura Road will also need to be relocated if they are in conflict with the proposed retaining wall systems and associated footings. Drainage facilities impacted by construction of the project will be modified and/or relocated.

Railroad

Railroad impacts are not anticipated for this project since no rail systems exist within the project limits.

Other Agencies Involved

- The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) will oversee 401 Certification and the project's compliance with storm water regulations.
- The City of Agoura Hills will be involved for the improvements within their city limits, in the vicinity of Agoura Road.
- Army Corps of Engineers will be involved with the Section 404 Permit.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) will be involved with the

Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement.

B. Other Alternatives

Two other alternatives exist for this project, but were not fully developed as part of this report due to recommendations from the Project Delivery Team; they could be studied further in subsequent project phases. Both alternatives propose to construct a tunnel to go under US-101 to serve as a wildlife crossing. Neither tunnel would convey wildlife across Agoura Road to the south, as occurs with the full implementation of Alternative 2, since they would both open to the south between Agoura Road and US-101.

The first tunnel is a 13 feet wide by 13 feet high jacked box culvert located west of Liberty Canyon Road. The study was originally done by the Federal Highway Administration Central Federal Lands Highway Division (FHWA-CFLHD) in August 2010. The cost estimate for the tunnel was updated by FHWA in 2015 and is presented in Attachment I of this report. This alternative will not accommodate the same wide range of wildlife species as the bridge proposed by Alternative 2.

The second tunnel is a 32 feet wide by 15 feet high cast-in-place rectangular culvert located west of Liberty Canyon Road. This alternative may not be feasible due to constructability considerations and high traffic impacts. Specifically, such a large tunnel would require using the cut and cover technique, which would require closing US-101, one of the busiest freeway in the region. Overall, such a large tunnel would be more costly than the overpass portion of Alternative 2.

7. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

This project is a result of collaborative effort between many government agencies and local communities. In addition to MRCA, RCDSMM, and Caltrans, National Wildlife Federation, National Park Service, City of Agoura Hills, City of Malibu, and local communities have contributed their support to the need of this project.

MRCA, RCDSMM, and Caltrans have been working with City of Agoura Hills on the design of the bridge and potential impact to the city road and related facilities.

There will be more public involvement when this project proceeds to the next phase, including general public and stakeholder meetings.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION/DOCUMENT

The April 2015 Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR) that was prepared for this project concludes that the project is expected to be classified as follows:

• California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA):

Initial Study with proposed Negative Declaration (ND).

• National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):

Routine Environmental Assessment with proposed Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

The PEAR is presented in Attachment D.

9. FUNDING/PROGRAMMING

It has been determined that this project may be eligible for federal-aid funding.

| Fund Source | Fiscal Year Estimate | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|--------|----------|
| TBD | Prior | 2015/16 | 2016/17 | 2017/18 | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | Future | Total |
| Component | In thousands of dollars (\$1,000) | | | | | | | |
| PA&ED Support | | 700.00 | 500.00 | | | | | 1200.00 |
| PS&E Support | | | 1169.35 | 2171.65 | | | | 3341.00 |
| Right-of-Way | | | 300.00 | 300.00 | | | | 600.00 |
| Support | | | 500.00 | 500.00 | | | | 000.00 |
| Construction | | | | | 1754 02 | 3006 90 | 250 58 | 5011 50 |
| Support | | | | | 175 1.02 | 5000.70 | 250.50 | 5011.50 |
| Right-of-Way | | | 2140.00 | 4000.00 | | | | 6140.00 |
| Construction | | | | | 20046.00 | 13364.00 | | 33410.00 |
| Total | | 700.00 | 4109.35 | 6471.65 | 21800.02 | 16370.90 | 250.58 | 49702.50 |

Capital Outlay Support and Project Estimates

The support cost ratio is 25.67%.

10. SCHEDULE

| Project Milestones | Scheduled Delivery Date (Month/Day/Year) | |
|--------------------------------|---|------------|
| BEGIN ENVIRONMENTAL | M020 | 7/1/2015 |
| NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) | M030 | 7/30/2015 |
| NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI) | M035 | 7/30/2015 |
| CIRCULATE DPR & DED EXTERNALLY | M120 | 5/1/2016 |
| PA/ED | M200 | 12/30/2016 |
| DRAFT STRUCTURES PS&E | M378 | 9/30/2017 |
| PROJECT PS&E | M380 | 3/30/2018 |
| RIGHT OF WAY CERTIFICATION | M410 | 3/30/2018 |
| READY TO LIST | M460 | 6/30/2018 |

| Project Milestones | Scheduled Delivery Date (Month/Day/Year) | |
|---------------------|---|------------|
| AWARD | M495 | 10/1/2018 |
| APPROVE CONTRACT | M500 | 11/1/2018 |
| CONTRACT ACCEPTANCE | M600 | 6/30/2020 |
| END PROJECT | M800 | 12/30/2020 |

11. RISKS

Pursuant to District Directive 35 (DD-35), risk management activities were conducted. The resulting Risk Register is presented in Attachment H.

12. FHWA COORDINATION

This project is considered to be an Assigned Project in accordance with the current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Joint Stewardship and Oversight Agreement.

13. PROJECT REVIEWS

| Caltrans | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Project Manager | Reza Fateh | Date <u>April 14, 2015</u> | | | | | |
| Structure Construction | Darwin Vargas | Date <u>April 16, 2015</u> | | | | | |
| Environmental Planning | Barbara Marquez | Date <u>April 16, 2015</u> | | | | | |
| Headquarter Design Review | Brian Frazer | Date <u>April 16, 2015</u> | | | | | |
| Design | Derek Higa | Date <u>April 17, 2015</u> | | | | | |
| Constructability Review | Quality Review Meeting | Date <u>April 16, 2015</u> | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Project Sponsor | | | | | | | |
| Santa Monica Mountain Conservancy Paul Edelman Date April 16 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Project Architect

| Resource Conservation District of Santa | | |
|---|---------------|--------------------|
| | Clark Stevens | Date April 9, 2015 |

14. PROJECT PERSONNEL

| Name | Title | Phone Number |
|-----------------|--|--------------|
| Reza Fateh | Project Manager | 213-897-8316 |
| Marco Ruano | Chief, Office of Project and Special Studies (OPSS) | 213-897-9863 |
| Rafael Molina | Senior Transportation Engineer, OPSS | 213-897-7945 |
| Siew Mei Tan | Project Engineer, OPSS | 213-897-5995 |
| Barbara Marquez | Senior Environmental Planner | 213-897-0791 |

15. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Project Location Map
- B. Structure Advance Planning Study (APS)
- C. Planning Cost Estimate
- D. Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR)
- E. Storm Water Data Report (Cover Sheet)
- F. Right of Way Data Sheet
- G. Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Data Sheet
- H. Risk Register
- I. Jacked Box Culvert Estimate by FHWA-CFLHD

Project Location Map

Attachment – A



Structure Advance Planning Study (APS)

Attachment – B



1

Т

| | | 1001 MILL | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| LA | 101 | 34.3 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 3) Contiuous concrete Trench Drain | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Vertico | al Cleara | nce | | | | |
| ed dirt | fill | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| as brid | dges. | | | | | |
| y exter tructur | ior load e. | | | | | |
| 3. Traffic will pass through construction site; therefore, falsework openings are required. Based on information available at the time of this study, there is sufficient vertical clearance to provide a minimum of 15'-0" under falsework. | | | | | | |
| by other | s. | | | | | |
| conflict ers. | †0 | | | | | |
| e handl | ed | | | | | |
| emain u | nchangec | | | | | |
| oura Roa | d to | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | LA n Vertico ed dirt as brid y exter tructur uction s requisit the t nt vert of 15'-d by other conflict res. we handl remain u bura Roa | LA 101 n Vertical Clearan ed dirt fill as bridges. y exterior load tructure. uction site; re required. it the time nt vertical of 15'-0" by others. conflict to rs. be handled remain unchanged bura Road to | | | | |



CONTRACT No.: X



STRUCTURES

ЦО

DIVISION

Т

TRANSPORTATION

ЦO

DEPARTMENT

1

CALIFORNIA

щ

| | | DIST | COUNTY | ROUTE | POST MILE |
|--|-----------------|----------|--|--|-------------|
| | | 07 | LA | 101 | 34.3 |
| / \ | | LEGEND: | Indicat grade (Indicat grade (| es exist contour es final contour | ing |
| | | | Indicat importe | es exten ed soil f | t of ill |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 3.5:1 | | | | | |
| 3.5:1 | | | | | |
| (SHOWN BELOW) | | | | | |
|) <i>]] </i> | 1 | | | | |
| | 1. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| TRUCTURE | PLA | | IG S | STUD | Y |
| DESIGN BRANCH | | BERTY | | YON | |
| 15 | UNIT: 3604 | | No. 307 | 1 0K | , |
| IV | SCALE: AS NOTED |) PROJEC | CT No. & PH | ASE: 0714 | 000213 |
| | CONTRACT No.: X | | | | |





ш TURI Ö RU ⊢ S L Ο DIVISION 1 **TRANSPORTATION** L ō DEPARTMENT 1 ALIFORNIA C LL_ 0 Ц ◄

STRUCTURES DESIGN ADVANCE PLANNING STUDY SHEET (ENGLISH) (REV. 08-09-10)

Planning Cost Estimate

Attachment – C

<u>Planning</u> Cost Estimate

Project ID: 0714000213

| Type of Estimate : | PSR |
|--------------------|--|
| Program Code : | 4050.400.000 |
| Project Limits : | LA-101-PM 33.0 |
| Description: | Route 101 Liberty Canyon Wildlife Crossing |
| Scope : | Construction of a bridge across US-101; a tunnel over Agoura Road; fill and grading in between US-101 and Agoura Road. |
| Alternative : | 2 |

| | C | Current Cost | | Escalated Cost | |
|------------------------------------|----|--------------|----|----------------|--|
| ROADWAY ITEMS | \$ | 12,174,500 | \$ | 13,702,507 | |
| STRUCTURE ITEMS | \$ | 21,235,000 | \$ | 23,900,180 | |
| SUBTOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 33,409,500 | \$ | 37,602,687 | |
| RIGHT OF WAY | \$ | 6,139,848 | \$ | 9,084,821 | |
| TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY COST | \$ | 39,550,000 | \$ | 46,688,000 | |
| PA/ED SUPPORT | \$ | 1,200,000 | \$ | 1,200,000 | |
| PS&E SUPPORT | \$ | 3,341,000 | \$ | 3,341,000 | |
| RIGHT OF WAY SUPPORT | \$ | 600,000 | \$ | 600,000 | |
| CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT | \$ | 5,011,500 | \$ | 5,011,500 | |
| TOTAL CAPITAL OUTLAY SUPPORT COST* | \$ | 10,152,500 | \$ | 10,152,500 | |
| | | | | | |

| TOTAL PROJECT COST | \$ 49,702,500 | \$ 56,900,000 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | |

| | Project Manager Date | e Phone |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Approved by Project Manager | Reza Fateh | (213) 897-8316 |
| | Begin Construction | Nov-2018 |
| | RTL | Jun-2018 |
| | PS&E | Mar-2018 |
| | PA/ED Approval | Dec-2016 |
| | Estimated Project Schedule PID Approval | May-2015 |
| | Number of Plant Establishment Days | Days |
| | Estimated Mid-Point of Construction (Month/Year) | Sep 2019 |
| | Number of Working Days | 440 Working Days Month / Year |
| | Estimated Date of Construction Start (Month/Year) | Nov / 2018 |
| | Date of Estimate (Month/Year) | Month / Year April / 2015 |
| | If Project has been programmed enter Programmed Amount | \$- |

I. ROADWAY ITEMS SUMMARY

Estimate

Estimate

| | | Section | | | Cost |
|---------|-----------|------------------------|-----------|------|-------------|
| 1 | Earthw | ork | | \$ | 1 693 500 |
| 2 | Paveme | ent Structural Section | | ¢\$ | 161 900 |
| - | Drainad | ie | | \$ | 735.000 |
| 4 | Special | tv Items | | \$ | 224.400 |
| 5 | Environ | mental | | \$ | 2,797,000 |
| 6 | Traffic I | tems | | \$ | 185,000 |
| 7 | Detours | i | | \$ | - |
| 8 | Minor It | ems | | \$ | - |
| 9 | Roadwa | ay Mobilization | | \$ | 579,700 |
| 10 | Supplei | mental Work | | \$ | 359,900 |
| 11 | State Fi | urnished | | \$ | 300,000 |
| 12 | Conting | jencies | | \$ | 2,434,900 |
| 13 | Overhe | ad | | \$ | 2,703,200 |
| | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL ROADWAY IT | EMS | \$ | 12,174,500 |
| | | | | | |
| e Prepa | red By | Siew Mei Tan, PE | 4/24/2015 | (213 | 8) 897-5995 |
| | | Name and Title | Date | | Phone |
| e Revie | wed Bv | Reza Fateh, PM | 4/24/2015 | (213 |) 897-8316 |

By signing this estimate you are attesting that you have discussed your project with all functional units and have incorporated all their comments or have discussed with them why they will not be incorporated.

Name and Title

Phone

Date

SECTION 1: EARTHWORK

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|---|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|-----------------|
| 160101 | Clearing & Grubbing | LS | 1 | х | 50,000.00 | = | \$ 50,000 |
| 170101 | Develop Water Supply | LS | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 190101 | Roadway Excavation | CY | 235 | х | 100.00 | = | \$ 23,500 |
| 190103 | Roadway Excavation (Type Y) ADL | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 190105 | Roadway Excavation (Type Z-2) ADL | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 192037 | Structure Excavation (Retaining Wall) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 193013 | Structure Backfill (Retaining Wall) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 193031 | Pervious Backfill Material (Retaining Wall) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 194001 | Ditch Excavation | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 198001 | Imported Borrow | CY | 216,000 | х | 7.50 | = | \$ 1,620,000 |
| 198007 | Imported Material (Shoulder Backing) | TON | | х | | = | \$ - |
| XXXXXX | Some Item | | | х | | = | \$ - |

TOTAL EARTHWORK SECTION ITEMS \$ 1,693,500

SECTION 2: PAVEMENT STRUCTURAL SECTION

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|---|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|--------------|
| 150771 | Remove Asphalt Concrete Dike | LF | 200 | х | 15.00 | = | \$ 3,000 |
| 150860 | Remove Base and Surfacing | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 153103 | Cold Plane Asphalt Concrete Pavement | SQYD | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 1532XX | Remove Concrete (type) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 250401 | Aggregate Subbase | CY | 115 | х | 150.00 | = | \$ 17,250 |
| 260203 | Class 2 Aggregate Base | CY | 125 | х | 100.00 | = | \$ 12,500 |
| 280000 | Lean Concrete Base | CY | 145 | х | 250.00 | = | \$ 36,250 |
| 365001 | Sand Cover | TON | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 374002 | Asphaltic Emulsion (Fog Seal Coat) | TON | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 374492 | Asphaltic Emulsion (Polymer Modified) | TON | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 3750XX | Screenings (Type XX) | TON | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 377501 | Slurry Seal | TON | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 390095 | Replace Asphalt Concrete Surfacing | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 390132 | Hot Mix Asphalt (Type A) | TON | 120 | х | 180.00 | = | \$ 21,600 |
| 390136 | Minor Hot Mix Asphalt | TON | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 390137 | Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt (Gap Graded) | TON | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 393003 | Geosynthetic Pavement Interlayer | SQYD | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 39405X | Shoulder Rumber Strip (HMA, Type XX Inden | STA | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 394071 | Place Hot Mix Asphalt Dike | LF | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 394090 | Place Hot Mix Asphalt (Misc. Area) | SQYD | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 397005 | Tack Coat | TON | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 401050 | Jointed Plane Concrete Pavement | CY | 175 | х | 300.00 | = | \$ 52,500 |
| 401108 | Replace Concrete Pavement (Rapid Strength | CY | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 404092 | Seal Pavement Joint | LF | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 404094 | Seal Longitudinal Isolation Joint | LF | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 413112A | Repair Spalled Joints (Polyester Grout) | SQYD | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 413115 | Seal Existing Concrete Pavement Joint | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 420102 | Groove Existing Concrete Pavement | SQYD | | Х | | = | \$ - |
| 420201 | Grind Existing Concrete Pavement | SQYD | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 731521 | Minor Concrete (Sidewalk) | CY | 25 | х | 750.00 | = | \$ 18,750 |
| 731530 | Minor Concrete (Textured Paving) | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| XXXXXX | Some Item | | | х | | = | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | |

TOTAL STRUCTURAL SECTION ITEMS \$ 161,900

SECTION 3: DRAINAGE

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|---|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 150206 | Abandon Culvert | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 150805 | Remove Culvert | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 150820 | Modify Inlet | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 152430 | Adjust Inlet | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 155003 | Cap Inlet | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 193114 | Sand Backfill | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 510502 | Minor Concrete (Minor Structure) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 510512 | Minor Concrete (Box Culvert) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 62XXXX | XXX" APC Pipe | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 64XXXX | XXX" Plastic Pipe | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 65XXXX | XXX" RCP Pipe | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 66XXXX | XXX" CSP Pipe | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 68XXXX | Edge Drain | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 69XXXX | XXX" Pipe Downdrain | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 70XXXX | XXX" Pipe Inlet | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 70XXXX | XXX" Pipe Riser | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 70XXXX | XXX" Flared End Section | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 703233 | Grated Line Drain | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 72XXXX | Rock Slope Protection (Type and Method) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 721420 | Concrete (Ditch Lining) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 721430 | Concrete (Channel Lining) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 729010 | Rock Slope Protection Fabric | SQYD | 1 | х | | = | \$ - |
| 750001 | Miscellaneous Iron and Steel | LB | | х | | = | \$ - |
| XXXXXX | Drainage | LS | 1 | х | 735,000.00 | = | \$ 735,000 |
| XXXXXX | Some Item | | | х | | = | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | |

TOTAL DRAINAGE ITEMS \$ 735,000

SECTION 4: SPECIALTY ITEMS

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|---|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 070012 | Progress Schedule (Critical Path Method) | LS | 1 | х | 5,000.00 | = | \$ 5,000 |
| 150662 | Remove Metal Beam Guard Railing | LF | 200 | х | 20.00 | = | \$ 4,000 |
| 150668 | Remove Terminal Systems | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 153221 | Remove Concrete Barrier | LF | 195 | х | 50.00 | = | \$ 9,750 |
| 153250 | Remove Sound Wall | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 190110 | Lead Compliance Plan | LS | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 49XXXX | CIDH Concrete Piling (Insert Diameter) | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 510060 | Structural Concrete (Retaining Wall) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 510133 | Class 2 Concrete (Retaining Wall) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 510524 | Minor Concrete (Sound Wall) | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 5110XX | Architectural Treatment (Insert Type) | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 511048 | Apply Anti-Graffiti Coating | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 5136XX | Reinforced Concrete Crib Wall (Insert Type) | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 518002 | Sound Wall (Masonry Block) | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 520103 | Bar Reinf. Steel (Retaining Wall) | LB | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 800360 | Chain Link Fence | LF | 3,000 | х | 65.00 | = | \$ 195,000 |
| 832001 | Metal Beam Guard Railing | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839310 | Double Thrie Beam Barrier | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839521 | Cable Railing | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839541 | Transition Railing (Type WB) | EA | 2 | х | 4,500.00 | = | \$ 9,000 |
| 8395XX | Terminal System (Type CAT) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 8395XX | Alternative Flared Terminal System | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 8395XX | End Anchor Assembly (Insert Type) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839561 | Rail Tensioning Assembly | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839XXX | Crash Cushion (Insert Type) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 83XXXX | Concrete Barrier (Insert Type) | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839576 | End CAP (Type A) | LF | 2 | х | 350.00 | = | \$ 700 |
| 839578 | End CAP (Type TC) | EA | 2 | х | 450.00 | = | \$ 900 |

TOTAL SPECIALTY ITEMS \$ 224,400

SECTION 5: ENVIRONMENTAL

5A - ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

| Item code | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | | Cost | |
|--|------|----------|---|-----------------|------|-----|------------|-----------------|
| XXXXXX Biological Mitigation | LS | 1 | х | 250,000.00 | = | \$ | 250,000 | |
| 071325 TEMPORARY REINFORCED SILT FENCE | LF | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 071325 Temporary Fence (Type ESA) | LF | | х | | | \$ | - | |
| XXXXXX Long Term Biological Monitoring | LS | 1 | х | 1,050,000.00 | | \$ | 1,050,000 | |
| XXXXXX Permits and Agreements | LS | 1 | х | 6,912.00 | | \$ | 6,912 | |
| XXXXXX Wildlife Fencing, Ramps | EA | 6 | х | 5,000.00 | | \$ | 30,000 | |
| | | | | Subto | otal | Env | ironmental | \$ 1,336,912 |

5B - LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 200001 | Highway Planting | LS | 1 | х | 270,000.00 | = | \$ 270,000 |
| 20XXXX | XXX" (Insert Type) Conduit (Use for | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 20XXXX | Extend XXX" (Insert Type) Conduit | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 201700 | Imported Topsoil | CY | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 2030XX | Erosion Control (Type) | SQYD | 1 | х | | = | \$ - |
| 203021 | Fiber Rolls | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 203026 | Move In/ Move Out (Erosion Control) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 204099 | Plant Establishment Work | LS | 1 | х | 305,000.00 | = | \$ 305,000 |
| 204101 | Extend Plant Establishment (X Years) | LS | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 208000 | Irrigation System | LS | 1 | х | 385,000.00 | = | \$ 385,000 |
| 208304 | Water Meter | EA | | х | | = | |
| 209801 | Maintenance Vehicle Pullout | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| XXXXXX | Landscape | LS | | х | | = | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | |

Subtotal Landscape and Irrigation \$

960,000

5C - NPDES

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | | Cost | |
|-----------|--|---------|------------|------|------------------|-----|------|-------------|------|
| 074016 | Construction Site Management | LS | 1 | х | 5,000.00 | = | \$ | 5,000 | |
| 074017 | Prepare WPCP | LS | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074019 | Prepare SWPPP | LS | 1 | х | 5,000.00 | = | \$ | 5,000 | |
| 074023 | Temporary Erosion Control | SQYD | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074027 | Temporary Erosion Control Blanket | SQYD | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074028 | Temporary Fiber Roll | LF | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074032 | Temporary Concrete Washout Facility | EA | 1 | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074033 | Temporary Construction Entrance | EA | 1 | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074035 | Temporary Check Dam | LF | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074037 | Move In/ Move Out (Temporary Erosion Cont | EA | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074038 | Temp. Drainage Inlet Protection | EA | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074041 | Street Sweeping | LS | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 074042 | Temporary Concrete Washout (Portable) | LS | | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| XXXXXX | Construction Site BMPs | LS | 1 | х | 490,000.00 | = | \$ | 490,000 | |
| Supplem | ental Work for NPDES | | | | | | | | |
| (These co | osts are not accounted in total here but under S | Supplen | nental Wor | 'k o | n sheet 7 of 11) | | | | |
| 066595 | Water Pollution Control Maintenance Sharing* | LS | 1 | х | 5,000.00 | = | \$ | 5,000 | |
| 066596 | Additional Water Pollution Control** | LS | 1 | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| 066597 | Storm Water Sampling and Analysis*** | LS | 1 | х | | = | \$ | - | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Subtotal | NP | DES (Without S | upp | leme | ental Work) | \$ 5 |

*Applies to all SWPPPs and those WPCPs with sediment control or soil stabilization BMPs.

**Applies to both SWPPPs and WPCP projects.

*** Applies only to project with SWPPPs.

TOTAL ENVIRONMENTAL \$ 2,797,000

SECTION 6: TRAFFIC ITEMS

6A - Traffic Electrical

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost | |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|-----------------|---|------|---|
| 150760 | Remove Sign Structure | EA |) | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 151581 | Reconstruct Sign Structure | EA |) | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 152641 | Modify Sign Structure | EA |) | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 5602XX | Furnish Sign Structure | LB | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 5602XX | Install Sign Structure | LB | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 56XXXX | XXX" CIDHC Pile (Sign Foundation) | LF | > | K | = | \$ | - |
| 860090 | Maintain Existing Traffic Management | LS | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 860810 | Inductive Loop Detectors | EA | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 86055X | Lighting & Sign Illumination | LS | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 8607XX | Interconnection Facilities | LS | > | K | = | \$ | - |
| 8609XX | Traffic Monitoring Stations | LS | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 860XXX | Signals & Lighting | LS | > | K | = | \$ | - |
| 8611XX | Ramp Metering System (Location X) | LS | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 8611XX | Ramp Metering System (Location X) | LS | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 86XXXX | Fiber Optic Conduit System | LS | > | K | = | \$ | - |
| XXXXX | Some Item | | | | | | |

Subtotal Traffic Electrical

\$-

6B - Traffic Signing and Striping

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|-------------|
| 120090 | Construction Area Signs | LS | 1 | х | 5,000.00 | = | \$ 5,000 |
| 150701 | Remove Yellow Painted Traffic Stripe | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 150710 | Remove Traffic Stripe | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 150713 | Remove Pavement Marking | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 150742 | Remove Roadside Sign | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 152320 | Reset Roadside Sign | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 152390 | Relocate Roadside Sign | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 566011 | Roadside Sign (One Post) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 566012 | Roadside Sign (Two Post) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 560XXX | Furnish Sign Panels | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 560XXX | Install Sign Panels | SQFT | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 82010X | Delineator (Class X) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 84XXXX | Permanent Pavement Delineation | LS | | х | | = | \$ - |
| | | | | | | | |

6C - Stage Construction and Traffic Handling

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|------|----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------|
| 120100 | Traffic Control System | LS | 1 | х | 125,000.00 | = | \$ 125,000 |
| 120120 | Type III Barricade | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 120143 | Temporary Pavement Delineation | LF | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 12016X | Channelizer | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 128650 | Portable Changeable Message Signs | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 129000 | Temporary Railing (Type K) | LF | 2,200 | х | 25.00 | = | \$ 55,000 |
| 129100 | Temp. Crash Cushion Module | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 129099A | Traffic Plastic Drum | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| 839603A | Temporary Crash Cushion (ADIEM) | EA | | х | | = | \$ - |
| XXXXXX | Some Item | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Subtotal Stage Construction and Traffic Handling \$

Subtotal Traffic Signing and Striping

180,000

5,000

TOTAL TRAFFIC ITEMS \$ 185,000

\$

SECTION 7: DETOURS

| Include co | nstructing, maintaining, and removal | | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|------|----------|-----------------|---|------|---|
| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price (\$) | | Cost | |
| 0713XX | Temporary Fence (Type X) | LF |) | < | = | \$ | - |
| 07XXXX | Temporary Drainage | LS | > | K | = | \$ | - |
| 120143 | Temporary Pavement Delineation | LF | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 1286XX | Temporary Signals | EA | > | K | = | \$ | - |
| 129000 | Temporary Railing (Type K) | LF | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 190101 | Roadway Excavation | CY | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 198001 | Imported Borrow | CY | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |
| 198050 | Embankment | CY |) | < | = | \$ | - |
| 250401 | Class 4 Aggregate Subbase | CY |) | < | = | \$ | - |
| 260201 | Class 2 Aggregate Base | CY | > | < | = | \$ | - |
| 390132 | Hot Mix Asphalt (Type A) | TON | > | < . | = | \$ | - |
| XXXXXX | Some Item | LS | > | ĸ | = | \$ | - |

| | | | | TOTAL D | ETOURS | \$ | - |
|--|----|-----------|---|-----------|--------------|-----|-----------|
| | | | | SUBTOTAL | SECTIONS 1-7 | ′\$ | 5,796,800 |
| SECTION 8: MINOR ITEMS | _ | | | | | | |
| 8A - Americans with Disabilities Act Items | | | | | | | |
| ADA Items | | | | 0.0% | \$ | - | |
| 8B - Bike Path Items | | | | 0.00/ | ^ | | |
| Bike Path Items | | | | 0.0% | \$ | - | |
| Other Minor Items | | | _ | 0.0% | \$ | | |
| Total of Section 1-7 | \$ | 5,796,800 | x | 0.0% | = \$ | - | |
| | | | | TOTAL MIN | NOR ITEMS | \$ | - |

SECTIONS 9: MOBILIZATION

| ltem | | | | | | |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------|---|-----|------|---------------|
| 999990 | Total Section 1-8 | \$ 5,796,800 | x | 10% | = \$ | \$ 579,680 |

SECTION 10: SUPPLEMENTAL WORK

| Item code | | Unit | Quantity | ι | Init Price (\$) | | Cost | |
|-----------|---|---------|----------------|---------|-----------------|---|---------------|---|
| 066015 | Federal Trainee Program | LS | - | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066063 | Traffic Management Plan - Public Informatic | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066090 | Maintain Traffic | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066094 | Value Analysis | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066204 | Remove Rock & Debris | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066222 | Locate Existing Cross-Over | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066670 | Payment Adjustments For Price Index Fluct | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066700 | Partnering | LS | 1 | х | 50,000.00 | = | \$ 50,000 | |
| 066866 | Operation of Existing Traffic Management S | LS | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| 066920 | Dispute Review Board | LS | 1 | х | 15,000.00 | = | \$ 15,000 | |
| XXXXXX | Some Item | | | х | | = | \$ - | |
| | Cost of NPDES Supp | lementa | al Work specit | fied ir | n Section 5C | Ξ | \$ 5,000 | |
| | Total Section 1-8 | \$ | 5,796,800 | | 5% | = | \$ 289,840 | |
| | | | | TO | | | | * |

TOTAL SUPPLEMENTAL WORK \$ 359,900

TOTAL MOBILIZATION \$ 579,700

SECTION 11: STATE FURNISHED MATERIALS AND EXPENSES

| Item code | Unit | Quantity | | Unit Price (\$) |) | Cost | |
|---|------|-----------|---|-----------------|------|-----------|---------|
| 066063 Public Information | LS | 1 | х | 50,000.00 | = | \$50,000 | |
| 066105 RE Office | LS | 1 | х | 160,000.00 | = | \$160,000 | |
| 066803 Padlocks | LS | | х | | = | \$0 | |
| 066838 Reflective Numbers and Edge Sealer | LS | | х | | = | \$0 | |
| 066901 Water Expenses | LS | | х | | = | \$0 | |
| 066062A COZEEP Expenses | LS | 1 | х | 90,000.00 | = | \$90,000 | |
| 06684X Ramp Meter Controller Assembly | LS | | х | | = | \$0 | |
| 06684X TMS Controller Assembly | LS | | х | | = | \$0 | |
| 06684X Traffic Signal Controller Assembly | LS | | х | | = | \$0 | |
| XXXXXX Some Item | | | | | | | |
| Total Section 1-8 | \$ | 5,796,800 | | 0% | = | \$- | |
| | | | | TOTAL S | TATE | FURNISHED | \$300,0 |

SECTION 12: TIME-RELATED OVERHEAD

Estiamted Time-Releated Overhead (TRO) Percentage (0% to 10%) = 10%

| Item code | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price (\$) | Cost |
|------------------------------|------|----------|-----------------|-------------|
| 070018 Time-Related Overhead | WD | 440 | X 6143.63636 = | \$2,703,200 |

TOTAL TIME-RELATED OVERHEAD \$2,703,200

SECTION 13: CONTINGENCY

(Pre-PSR 30%-50%, PSR 25%, Draft PR 20%, PR 15%, after PR approval 10%, Final PS&E 5%)

Total Section 1-11 \$ 9,739,600 x 25% = \$2,434,900

TOTAL CONTINGENCY \$2,434,900

II. STRUCTURE ITEMS

| | Bridge 1 | Bridge 2 | |
|--|---|--|--|
| DATE OF ESTIMATE Bridge Name Bridge Number Structure Type Width (Feet) [out to out] Total Bridge Length (Feet) Total Area (Square Feet) Structure Depth (Feet) Footing Type (pile or spread) Cost Per Square Foot | 03/27/15 Liberty Canyon Wildlife Crossing TBD CIP/PS Box Girder 165.00 LF 200.00 LF 33000 SQFT 5.50 LF Spread \$460.82 | 03/27/15 Agoura Road Tunnel TBD PC PS Panel w/ CIP Slab Lintel 224.00 LF 0 SQFT 2.00 LF N/A \$0.00 | 00/00/00 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX 57-XXX XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX |

| COST OF EACH STRUCTURE | \$15,207,000.00 | | \$6,028,000.00 | | \$0.00 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|----------------|--|--------|
|---------------------------|-----------------|--|----------------|--|--------|

| DATE OF ESTIMATE | 00/00/00 | 00/00/00 | 00/00/00 |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Name | ***** | ***** | ***** |
| Bridge Number | 57-XXX | 57-XXX | 57-XXX |
| Structure Type | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | **** | ***** |
| Width (Feet) [out to out] | 0.00 LF | 0.00 LF | 0.00 LF |
| Total Length (Feet) | 0.00 LF | 0.00 LF | 0.00 LF |
| Total Area (Square Feet) | 0 SQFT | 0.00 SQFT | 0.0 SQFT |
| Structure Depth (Feet) | 0.00 LF | 0.00 LF | 0.00 LF |
| Footing Type (pile or spread) | XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX | ***** | ***** |
| Cost Per Square Foot | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| | | | |

| COST OF EACH STRUCTURE\$0.00\$0.00 |
|---------------------------------------|
|---------------------------------------|

\$21,235,000.00 TOTAL COST OF BRIDGES

TOTAL COST OF BUILDINGS

\$21,235,000.00

\$0.00

TOTAL COST OF STRUCTURES¹

Estimate Prepared By: Ulysses Smpardos

Structure Design, Division of Engineering Services ¹Structure's Estimate includes Overhead and Mobilization.

Add more sheets if needed. Call them 9a, 9b, 9c, ..., etc

April 22, 2015

Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR)

Attachment – D



PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS REPORT

1. Project Information

| District | County | Route | PM | EA | | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| 07 | LA | 101 | 33.0 | 30710K | | | | |
| Project Title: | | | | | | | | |
| Liberty Canyon W | ildlife Crossing Proj | ect | | | | | | |
| Project Manager | | | Phone # | | | | | |
| Reza Fateh | | | 213-897-8316 | | | | | |
| Project Engineer | | | Phone # | | | | | |
| Siew Mei Tan | | | 213-897-5995 | | | | | |
| Environmental Off | fice Chief/Manager | | Phone # | | | | | |
| Garrett Damrath | | | 213-897-9016 | | | | | |
| PEAR Preparer | | | Phone # | | | | | |
| Fiona Nagle | | | 213-897-2956 | | | | | |

2. Project Description

Purpose and Need

The purpose of the project is to provide a safe and sustainable passage for wildlife across US-101 near Liberty Canyon Road in the City of Agoura Hills that reduces wildlife mortality and allows for the exchange of genetic material. The need for the proposed project is based on genetic and tracking data that show US-101 is a barrier to wildlife that historically traveled between the Santa Monica Mountains and the Sierra Madre mountain range in this area. In particular, large mammals such as mountain lions and bobcats need large connected habitats in order to hunt, breed, and thrive. US-101 divides this previously contiguous range into isolated habitat fragments, resulting in inbreeding, territorial fighting, and a decrease in genetic diversity.

Description of work

This project proposes to construct a vegetated bridge across US-101 near Liberty Canyon Road in the City of Agoura Hills for the purpose of a wildlife crossing. The project is sponsored by Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA). A cooperative agreement between MRCA and California Transportation Department (Caltrans) was executed on February 12, 2015. MRCA requested Caltrans to develop a Project Initiation Document (PID) for the project and agreed to fund the cost of the PID. MRCA provided Caltrans the location and design elements of the overcrossing. Caltrans prepared a Project Study Report (PSR) to evaluate the cost and structural feasibility of the bridge and associated improvements.

The bridge will be approximately 165 feet wide and 200 feet long. It will be vegetated to provide a passage that resembles the natural habitat of wildlife. The slope between the end of the bridge and Agoura Road south of the freeway will be filled up to grade to allow the crossing to extend over Agoura Road before descending to join existing ground. A culvert and associated

Revised April 2011

retaining wall systems will be constructed along Agoura Road to keep it operational and to accommodate the fill materials.

Alternatives

Two alternatives are being considered for the project:

Alternative 1: "No Build"

This alternative will result in continued deterioration of wildlife habitats in the area and continued isolation of native animal species.

Alternative 2: "Build"

This alternative proposes to build a bridge across US-101 west of Liberty Canyon Road to provide a safe passage for wildlife to cross the freeway. The scope of work includes:

- Construct a 165-foot wide and 210-foot long bridge with two spans and columns on spread footings in the freeway median.
- Construct retaining walls at both the north and south end of the bridge.
- Construct soundwalls along the outer edges of the bridge to prevent traffic noise and light from disturbing the animals.
- Plant vegetation on the bridge to provide a passage that resembles the natural habitat for wildlife.
- Install irrigation and drainage systems on the bridge.
- Fill and grade the slope and open area between the freeway and Agoura Road to allow the wildlife crossing to go over Agoura Road before descending to join existing ground.
- Construct culvert and associated retaining wall systems along Agoura Road to keep it operational and to support the fill materials.

Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative and it is recommended that the project proceed to the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase.

3. Anticipated Environmental Approval

| CEQA | | | NEPA | |
|--|------|--|---|---|
| Environmental Determination | 10.0 | | | |
| Statutory Exemption | | | | 1 |
| Categorical Exemption | | Categorical F | Exclusion | |
| Environmental Document | | | | |
| Initial Study or Focused Initial Study with proposed Negative Declaration (ND) or Mitigated ND | | Routine Environmental Assessment with proposed Finding of No Significant Impact Complex Environmental Assessment with proposed Finding of No Significant Impact | | |
| Environmental Impact Report | | Environment | Environmental Impact Statement | |
| CEQA Lead Agency (if determined): | | | CA Dept of Transportation District 7 | |
| Estimated length of time (months) to obtain environmental approval: | | | 18 months | |
| Estimated person hours to complete identified tasks: | | | 9423 | |

Check the anticipated environmental determination or document for the proposed project in the table below.

4. Special Environmental Considerations

A number of additional studies are needed for this project. These include:

Archaeological Survey Report Community Impact Assessment Report Geotechnical Design Report Location Hydraulic Study for impacts on a local stream Natural Environmental Study Report with special attention on endangered species (Biology) Storm Water Data Report Visual Impact Assessment Report Wildlife Corridor Assessment

This project will require extensive wildlife monitoring before, during, and after construction. This will be done in coordination with the National Park Service. Pre-construction monitoring will last approximately two years and post-construction approximately five years. During construction, a full-time monitor will be needed for any work near the valley oaks and streambed for approximately 12-16 months.

The visual quality of the project requires special attention in order to blend with the existing topography and natural landscape. In particular, detailed analysis is needed of structure color and
materials as they relate to the project's natural environment, and the use of native vegetation and removal of non-native plants in the project area are recommended. These studies will require significant lead time because of the complexities involved, and so should be done as early as possible.

5. Anticipated Environmental Commitments

- Re-vegetate any temporarily impacted areas and plant native vegetation on the structure. Any impacts to native vegetation including valley oaks will be mitigated through the planting and restoration occurring on site.
- Restoration of approximately 1.5 acres of riparian habitat as part of landscaping.
- Wildlife fencing improvements for an estimated 3,000 feet: 8 feet tall with an additional 2 feet buried below grade.
- Jump ramps within the fencing to provide escapes for any wildlife that are trapped between the fencing and the freeway.
- Pre-construction and post-construction monitoring of the wildlife crossing's effectiveness will be performed in coordination with NPS. Monitoring will be done 2 years prior to construction and 5 years after construction.
- A full-time biological monitor present during construction to monitor any work near the valley oaks and streambed for approximately 12 to 16 months.

6. Permits and Approvals

- Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 permit: 6-12 months, \$0
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement: 6-12 months, \$4912
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Section 401 Water Quality Certification: 6-12 months, \$1000-2000

7. Level of Effort: Risks and Assumptions

There are three areas that contain levels of uncertainty at the time of this PEAR. Further studies and/or mitigations may be required:

- 1) Technical issues
 - The final hazardous waste assessment is pending the geotechnical investigation. This information will indicate whether the existing slope shoulders of the project area will be disturbed. If they are, then the exposed soils are likely to be lead impacted and will require an ADL site investigation. If an ADL site investigation becomes necessary, the results can be available during the design phase before the PS&E. The

assessment will also provide the depth of the groundwater to help determine length of the piles.

- Further hydraulics studies may be needed in the following two conditions: a) grading alters existing topography to where local patterns of erosion and storm water drainage are changed; b) the streambed is altered or water is diverted.
- If this project disturbs greater than 1 acre during construction, then the following Storm Water compliance measures must apply:
 - NPDES Construction General Permit No. CAS000002
 - o NPDES Caltrans Statewide Permit No. CAS000003

In addition, all nine Caltrans approved treatment BMPs considered IF <u>net new</u> <u>impervious</u> area is greater than 1 acre.

- If a paleontological consultation is performed with the Los Angeles County of Natural History Museum, and paleontological resources are identified, then a Paleontological Evaluation Report (PER) will be needed during PA/ED. This consultation is recommended if possible, takes 1-4 weeks, and has an associated cost.
- 2) Biological issues
 - There may be endangered or threatened species in the project area. The potential also exists for temporary impacts to extend into the adjacent riparian vegetation, including the drip line of the valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) that are located within the project limits. Coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and CDFW will be needed during the life of the project to avoid or minimize impacts.
 - If any clearing and grubbing is to be performed during the bird nesting season (February 15 to September 1), a district biologist will need to perform necessary surveys to minimize the risk of violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
 - A bioacoustic study on noise levels appropriate for wildlife may be performed during PA/ED. This may affect soundwalls and other noise barriers.
- 3) Community issues
 - The adjacent open space and recreational hiking trails may qualify as Section 4(f) properties. If project construction requires use of these lands, they may qualify for 4(f) exemption under CFR §774.13 (g) "Exception regarding transportation enhancement projects". However, during the PA/ED Phase, more detailed documentation about whether the above exception applies will be needed, and written agreement/concurrence from the officials with jurisdiction over the conservation and recreation properties will need to be obtained.
 - Adjacent subdivisions and commercial properties to the east and west of the project will require further investigation to determine possible impacts on land use. In particular, the project intersects Agoura Road and Vendell Place. Agoura Road is the primary emergency access route for some of the subdivisions, and Vendell Place may be coming under ownership of a commercial developer for the purpose of constructing two new office buildings (APB Properties LLC).
 - A preliminary list of stakeholders and community groups is being compiled, but full knowledge of affected parties is not yet known. A more comprehensive assessment will be needed to ensure the project meets Caltrans' standards for context sensitive solutions.

8. PEAR Technical Summaries

8.1 Land Use:

The area surrounding the proposed project consists primarily of residential subdivisions to the east and west and open space to the north and south. The subdivisions are single family homes and condominiums that fall under the purview of Rondell Condo Owners Association and others. There may also be one or two commercial properties currently adjacent to the project footprint, and two office buildings (9600 sq ft and 20,000 sq ft respectively) are planned for east of the site at the northwest corner of Liberty Canyon Road and Agoura Road. South of the freeway, the project intersects Agoura Road – a frontage road and primary access for some of the subdivisions – and Vendell Place, a small unimproved public road currently owned by the City of Agoura Hills but which is under review for vacation in favor of APB Properties LLC for the two planned office buildings. It is anticipated that Vendell Place may be affected by construction of the wildlife crossing. All these properties will require further investigation to determine possible impacts from the proposed overpass.

The open space properties north and south of the project are owned by the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy and possibly other public agencies. A recreational hiking trail lies immediately south of Agoura Road and within the project area. The open space and hiking trail may qualify as Section 4(f) properties. The construction of the project would likely involve a use of land from these properties. However, the use, if required, is anticipated to fall under CFR §774.13 (g) "Exception regarding transportation enhancement projects, where:

- The use of the Section 4(f) property is solely for the purpose of preserving or enhancing an activity, feature, or attribute that qualifies the property for Section 4(f) protection; and
- The official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) resource agrees in writing to paragraph (g)(1) of this section."

It is anticipated that the requirement for Section 4(f) approval would not apply.

The City of Agoura Hills' General Plan 2035 states that protection and enhancement of open space resources, other natural areas, and significant wildlife and vegetation in the City is an integral component of a sustainable environment. Policy NR-4.12 states "Protect and maintain wildlife corridors, particularly the Liberty Canyon wildlife corridor, to help the continued survival of wildlife." The City also supports a comprehensive trail and pathway system that makes pedestrian and equestrian travel healthy, feasible, safe, and enjoyable. Policy CS-5.1 states "Link the local trail and pathway system to existing and proposed regional trails." The proposed project is consistent with these policies and the General Plan because it provides a wildlife corridor at Liberty Canyon and connects two hiking trail systems north and south of the US-101.

8.2 Growth:

The proposed project is an environmental enhancement that does not involve new road construction or motoring facilities. Growth impacts are not anticipated.

8.3 Farmlands/Timberlands:

There are no agricultural or timber lands in the area. No impacts are anticipated.

8.4 Community Impacts:

This project is anticipated to add to or have little negative impact on the local community because it is an environmental enhancement rather than a growth-inducing construction. Connection of the hiking trail south and north of the freeway will likely have a positive impact on the community. However, several utilities and emergency services will be affected during construction, and there may be other negative impacts to be determined. Therefore, a Community Impact Assessment will need to be undertaken during PA/ED.

8.5 Visual/Aesthetics:

Review of the project site and proposed project overpass profile indicates that the project would not result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual environment. Rather, visual resources viewed by motorists would benefit from improved integration of the proposed overcrossing with the natural environment. For example, the color and materials of the structure and the use of native vegetation will enable this structure to blend with existing topography. Additionally, while re-grading the cut slopes may not be practical to restore a more natural appearance, the use of native plants can screen some of the hard lines of the cut slopes.

A comprehensive Visual Impact Assessment of the overcrossing should be done at the environmental document phase. This analysis should include: the general shape of the structure and retaining walls; the use of color, materials, and other design site features as they relate to the project's natural environment; the removal of non-native plant species where encountered; the planting of abundant native plants around disturbed areas to make the project consistent with the indigenous aesthetic; and the use of native vegetation on the structure itself. The design of this type of special structure requires significant lead time because of the complexities involved, and so should be done as early as possible.

8.6 Cultural Resources:

Aboriginally, the overall area was abundant in natural resources such as oak trees, large and small mammals, birds, and water. Chiefly due to these factors, the valley and surrounding mountains were intensely utilized by Native American people. Today, the subject property lies in a partially urbanized area. This evaluation is based on a records search conducted at the South Central Coastal Information Center and from the files housed at District 7.

Since the project possesses moderate to high archaeological sensitivity, mitigation of affected resources may involve project redesign and/or archaeological data recovery. The uninvestigated areas within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) should be surveyed by a qualified archaeologist prior to project approval. Once surveyed, results should be documented in an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR). If sites are found, further investigation and/or mitigation may be necessary. However, because the APE has been previously disturbed by highway construction, overall effects may be negligible (i.e. many sites may have been previously damaged and/or destroyed).

8.7 Hydrology and Floodplain:

Local, state and federal water resources and floodplain management agencies must be consulted if a proposed action encroaches on a 100-year base floodplain. Coordination also may occur in order to obtain current information on development and proposed actions in the affected watersheds. Caltrans is responsible for initiating early coordination meetings to discuss potential floodplain encroachments.

It is anticipated that the project will not present any drainage impacts on the floodplain. However, there is a riparian zone/stream adjacent to the project that will need further assessment to determine impacts of the overpass.

8.8 Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff:

The disturbed soil area is 4.4 acres. Storm Water compliance requires that, for any project disturbing greater than 1 acre, the following must apply:

- NPDES Construction General Permit No. CAS000002
- NPDES Caltrans Statewide Permit No. CAS000003
- All nine Caltrans approved treatment BMPs considered IF net new <u>impervious</u> area is greater than 1 acre.

Storm water quality must be considered during project planning (specifically the Project Study Report [PSR], Project Report [PR], Project Scope Summary Report [PSSR], and other scoping documents) in order to:

- Identify potential storm water quality requirements and pollutants of concern for specific water bodies;
- Ensure that the programmed project includes sufficient right-of-way and budget for required storm water controls;
- Identify project-specific permanent and temporary BMPs that may be required to
 mitigate impacts. Be advised that permanent BMPs (Design Pollution Prevention
 BMPs and Treatment BMPs) are to be implemented at the project site to the
 maximum extent practicable and to the extent that implementation is consistent with
 existing Caltrans policies. In practice, this means maximizing the use of vegetation in

the right-of-way.

In addition, these items need to be addressed in the PA/ED phase:

- Refer to Appendix C (Selection of Construction Site BMPs) and Appendix F (Cost Estimate of the Construction Site BMPs) of the PPDG (See Storm Water Unit website); Obtain concurrence from Jimmy Chan, Acting District 7 Construction Storm Water Coordinator.
- Contact TMDL Unit, Maria Agustin, for latest TMDL development and requirements in the project area.
- Continue to comply with the District 7 Directive Nos. DD31, DD81, DD32, DD91, DD92 and DD95 in the project. See Storm Water Unit website for more information.
- The PE must prepare and furnish the Storm Water Data Report document for each phase for review by the Storm Water Unit. This can be found on Storm Water unit website.
- Provide a cost estimate for the Storm Water consideration on Construction Site BMP, Design Pollution Prevention BMPs and Treatment BMPs if applicable.

The Storm Water unit website is found at http://110.56.12.51/stormwater/DocLink.asp.

8.9 Geology, Soils, Seismic and Topography:

There are no geological or geotechnical conditions that would preclude the development of this site as a wildlife crossing. Specifically:

- The site of the proposed wildlife crossing does not fall within an Earthquake Fault Zone map as established by the California Geological Survey (CGS).
- The potential for liquefaction is considered low for the proposed wildlife crossing site.
- There are no mapped landslides in the boundaries of the proposed wildlife crossing and the slope at this site is considered grossly stable.

However, please note the following two conditions to be considered during and post construction:

- Some surficial instabilities along hill slopes may exist within 500 feet to 1000 feet to the site.
- The proposed project requires significant grading to alter the existing topography which may change patterns of erosion and storm water drainage in the area.

SITE GEOLOGY

The proposed location of the wildlife crossing is located in the Transverse Ranges geomorphic province of California. A north-south convergent movement between the Pacific tectonic plate and the North American tectonic plate result in an almost east-west trend of mountain ranges, valleys, and tectonic structural features such as folds and faults (Harden, 1998). The Transverse Ranges geomorphic province includes several mountain ranges such as the Santa Monica Mountains, the Santa Ynez Mountains, the San Gabriel Mountains, and the San Bernardino Mountains (Harden, 1998). According to the Geologic Map of the Calabasas Quadrangle, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California, by Thomas W. Dibblee, Jr, (Dibblee 1992), Liberty Canyon and the surrounding area are underlain by several Miocene age sedimentary formations.

The surficial deposits found along the canyon floor are Quaternary alluvium (Qa) which are composed of gravel, sand and clay in depositional environments, characterized as valley areas, stream channels, alluvial fans, and slope wash.

The Dibblee map represents the area of the proposed wildlife crossing as being underlain by bedded, gray claystone of the Upper Topanga formation (Ttuc). Ttuc forms the hill slopes of the east side of Liberty canyon. Along the west side of Liberty canyon, where the wildlife crossing is proposed, Ttuc is shown at the base of the slopes and overlain by Qa. Ttuc is described by Dibblee as crumbly with ellipsoidal fracture.

North and south of SR-101, the Ttuc is overlain by the Monterey formation, which is described by Dibblee as a gray-brown, white weathering siliceous shale that is thinly bedded and moderately hard with platy fracture. The Monterey formation includes soft, fissile, diatomaceous shale, hard, brittle cherty shale, and layers of hard, yellow-weathering calcareous concretions or lenses. The Monterey formation also includes a light gray to light brown, semi-friable bedded sandstone and a gray coble conglomerate of mostly granitic detritus in sandstone matrix.

Dibble presents Conejo Volcanics in contact with the Monterey formation west of Liberty canyon and south of SR-101. Conejo Volcanics consist of dark gray to dark brown, crudely bedded to massive, andesitic to basaltic volcanic rock types. The Conejo Volcanics in this area present a variety of depositional environments including: flows, flow-breccia, reworked breccia, autoclastic flow breccia, and mud-flow (laharic) breccia.

SEISMICITY

The proposed wildlife crossing is located in southern California which is a seismically active zone. The geologic processes, which have caused earthquakes in the past, can be expected to continue. Seismic events, which are likely to produce the greatest bedrock accelerations, could be a moderate event on the Malibu Coast fault (approximately 6 miles south of the site), the Santa Monica fault (approximately 8 miles south of the site), and the Anacapa-Dume fault (approximately 10 miles south of the site).

An earthquake fault is considered by the State of California to be active if geologic evidence indicates that movement on the fault has occurred in the last 11,000 years, and potentially active if movement is demonstrated to have occurred in the last 2 million years.

Ground Shaking

Ground shaking is the primary cause of structural damage during an earthquake; the magnitude, duration and vibration frequency characteristics will vary greatly, depending upon the particular causative fault and its distance from the project.

Seismic design parameters can be obtained from Caltrans' ARS Online Tool. We reviewed available SPT data from the As-Built LOTB of Liberty Canyon Road Undercrossing (Bridge 53-1731), dated July 27, 1964. SPT blow counts greater than 40 are represented in shale and sandstone. Based on this information, the peak ground acceleration for deterministic and probabilistic range from 1.0g to 1.4g, with a Vs30 of 400 m/s.

Ground Rupture

An analysis of fault rupture hazard for a particular fault requires that the fault be located exactly, and its potential for rupture to be known, if only approximately.

The site of the proposed wildlife crossing does not fall within an Earthquake Fault Zone map as established by the California Geological Survey (CGS).

Liquefaction

Liquefaction exists when fine silts and sands are located below the water table. The water can also be perched ground water. Liquefaction has been documented to affect soils to 50 feet depth, during prolonged periods of ground shaking.

The Seismic Hazard Report for the Calabasas Quadrangle does not present a liquefaction zone or a location of historical liquefaction. Based on this information the potential for liquefaction is considered low for the proposed wildlife crossing site.

SLOPE STABILITY (LANDSLIDES)

The potential for land-sliding will depend on the degree (inclination) of the slope, strength of the rock/soil and the intensity of ground shaking. According to Plate 2.1 (Landslide Inventory, Shear Test Sample Locations, and Areas of Significant Grading, Calabasas Quadrangle) in the Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Calabasas 7.5-minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California (CGS 1997), there are no mapped landslides in the boundaries of the proposed wildlife crossing. A significant component of slope stability in sedimentary rock is based on bedding orientation. Based on Dibblee, the slope at this site is characterized by bedding that is dipping northeastward, into the slope, with a strike approximately northwest-southeast (perpendicular to the slope gradient). Considering the general orientation of bedding as represented by Dibblee, the slope at this site is considered grossly stable.

According to the Map Showing Landslides of the Central and Western Santa Monica Mountains, Los Angeles and Ventura Counties, California, by Weber and Wills (1983) some surficial instabilities along hill slopes may exist within 500 feet to 1000 feet to the site.

GROUNDWATER

Data from the State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker website were reviewed to obtain the most recent and nearest groundwater information. A well called P11 related to the Calabasas Landfill is located in Liberty canyon north of SR-101, 0.45 miles northeast of the proposed wildlife crossing. The groundwater in P11 was measured at a depth

of 33.59 feet below ground surface on August 13, 2014. The groundwater level at the time of measurement was 836.10 feet amsl. The well is located in a narrow valley and groundwater in that location is likely to vary due to seasonal rain events.

EROSION

The proposed project requires significant grading to alter the existing topography which may change patterns of erosion and storm water drainage in the area.

8.10 Paleontology:

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) has been previously disturbed by highway construction and adjacent residential land uses. Therefore, paleontology may not be of concern. However, if possible, consultation with the Los Angeles County of Natural History Museum (LACNHM) to verify whether paleontological resources would be of concern in this area is recommended. If the potential for such resources exists within the APE, then appropriate technical studies would need to be prepared by a qualified Paleontologist. Consultation with LACNHM could take 1-4 weeks and has an associated cost which is unknown at the time of this review.

8.11 Hazardous Waste/Materials:

The two sides of the freeway will need to be elevated to the height of the planned overpass with clean imported soil backfill. This part of the construction activity will not have hazardous waste issues unless the existing exposed shoulder surfaces are disturbed before they are covered by imported soil. If the exposed sides are disturbed, the exposed soils are likely to be lead impacted and will require an ADL site investigation.

The elevation of the groundwater in the project area needs to be known for the installation of the piles that may be required to support the overpass. If the groundwater elevation is below the endpoint of the piles, the site will not have any issues; otherwise, it will need to be screened for potential contaminants for disposal purpose.

The final hazardous waste assessment is pending the geotechnical investigation. This information will provide the depth of the groundwater (crudely estimated at 2-29 feet below ground level), help determine length of the piles, and whether the shoulders of the project area will be disturbed. If a hazardous waste investigation becomes necessary, the results can be available during the design phase before the PS&E.

8.12 Air Quality:

Per 40 CFR 93.126 published in the Federal Register (volume 69, page 40004) on July 1, 2004, Table 2 allows certain projects to be exempt from all emissions analyses. Based on the above- described scope of work provided in the March 2, 2015 memo request, proposed project is deemed listed in Table 2 under the subtitle "Other" and classifications "Plantings, landscaping, etc." Therefore, pursuant to 40 CFR 93.126, this project is deemed classified and is exempt from the requirement to determine conformity.

However, please note that the proposed project is located in Los Angeles County and is within the boundary of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD); therefore, this project must comply with the SCAQMD Fugitive Dust Implementation Rule 403 to minimize temporary emissions during construction of the project as applicable and appropriate.

8.13 Noise and Vibration:

The overpass structure will be vegetated and have sound abatement measures to provide a passage that resembles the natural habitat of wildlife. Based on the scope of this project, this is not a Type I project as defined in the 2011 Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. Hence, a detailed noise study is not required for this project.

If needed, a bioacoustic study can be performed during PA/ED if established noise guidelines/policies on wildlife from operation and construction noise are provided.

8.14 Energy and Climate Change:

This project is not expected to require an EIR or EIS; therefore, an energy technical report is not required.

The project is also not expected to have any negative effects on greenhouse gas emissions. Rather, it adds native, healthy vegetative cover to the landscape where before there was only concrete and airspace over the freeway. This additional vegetation means that greenhouse gasses will likely be reduced and thus have a positive effect on climate change.

8.15 Biological Environment:

The proposed project has the potential to impact biological resources including native vegetation, waters of the U.S. and/or State, threatened and endangered species, and wildlife conductivity. All of these resources will need to be further evaluated and coordination with the respective Resource Agencies may be necessary. It is anticipated that the proposed project may require a U.S. Army Corps (USACE) Section 404 Permit, Regional Water Quality Control (RWQCB) Board 401 Certification, and a CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement. During a field visit conducted on March 13, 2015, the project architect explained that the proposed limits of fill do not extend into the adjacent streambed. The design aims to avoid impacts, but it is uncertain at this time whether any permanent or temporary impacts will result from construction of the proposed project. There is the potential for temporary impacts to extend into the adjacent riparian vegetation, including the drip line of the valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) that are located within the project limits.

There is also potential for endangered or threatened species. It is anticipated that impacts

to listed species can be avoided or minimized but further evaluation of the habitat present and coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and CDFW is needed.

In order to construct the proposed project, native vegetation removal may be necessary. This vegetation includes riparian habitat and several large valley oaks (approximately six). In addition, if any clearing and grubbing is to be performed during the bird nesting season (February 15 to September 1), a district biologist will need to perform necessary surveys to minimize the risk of violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The proposed project is anticipated to have a positive impact on wildlife connectivity across U.S. 101. During the development of the Natural Environmental Study (NES), a Wildlife Corridor Assessment (WCA) will be prepared using baseline data gathered by the National Parks Service (NPS). This assessment will evaluate the anticipated increase in wildlife conductivity and outline a plan for monitoring the effectiveness of the crossing.

8.16 Cumulative Impacts:

Because this project does not add substantial construction or growth-inducing facilities to the area, a Cumulative Impact Analysis is not required.

8.17 Context Sensitive Solutions:

Caltrans uses Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) as its approach to plan, design, construct, maintain, and operate its transportation system. CSS uses innovative and inclusive approaches that integrate and balance community, aesthetic, historic, and environmental values with transportation safety, maintenance, and performance goals and is reached through a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach involving all stakeholders. In order to ensure that CSS is fully integrated into the project development process, careful, imaginative, and early planning is required along with continuous community involvement. Early agency coordination for each resource area as well as early outreach to the community will help to ensure a successful CSS outcome. CSS is an integral component of the PID stage and is coordinated by the PDT.

The proposed project offers a unique opportunity to simultaneously undertake highway planning and land use planning. As part of the project development, Caltrans has been actively partnering with various agencies and nonprofit stakeholder groups to acquire funding and other resources to support this project. These include:

Federal Highway Administration City of Agoura Hills Counties of Los Angeles and Ventura National Park Service Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority US Fish and Wildlife Service California Department of Fish and Wildlife California State Parks

Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains

This project has been garnering certain amount of media attention and a public rally has been held. Although it appears that public support is positive, there are several residential subdivisions and hiking trails in the area. Therefore, it will be important to assess during PA/ED whether the interests of any additional user or stakeholder groups, other than the partners listed above, need to be heard or represented as the project moves forward.

9. Summary Statement for PSR or PSR-PDS

Alternative 1: No Build

This alternative would require the least permits and studies, as no construction would occur. The existing conditions would remain as-is.

Alternative 2: Build

This alternative would require several technical studies and permits. One overpass would be constructed and designed to mimic a natural habitat in order to encourage wildlife usage. This would require possibly 3 permits plus coordination and partnership with multiple agencies and government jurisdictions.

10. Disclaimer

This Preliminary Environmental Analysis Report (PEAR) provides information to support programming of the proposed project. It is not an environmental determination or document. Preliminary analysis, determinations, and estimates of mitigation costs are based on the project description provided in the Project Study Report (PSR). The estimates and conclusions in the PEAR are approximate and are based on cursory analyses of probable effects. A reevaluation of the PEAR will be needed for changes in project scope or alternatives, or in environmental laws, regulations, or guidelines.

11. List of Preparers

| Cultural Resources specialist | Date: 3/9/15 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Alex Kirkish, PhD | |
| Biologist | Date: 4/1/15 |
| Erika Reppun | |
| Community Impacts specialist | Date: 3/26/15 |
| Fiona Nagle (Thoa Le, 4(f) permits) | |
| Noise and Vibration specialist | Date: 3/12/15 |
| Jin S Lee | |
| Air Quality specialist | Date: 3/23/15 |
| Andrew Yoon | |

Revised April 2011

| Geology specialist | Date: 3/11/15 |
|---|---------------|
| Michael Salisbury | |
| Paleontology Specialist | Date: 4/3/15 |
| Dawn Kukla | |
| Water Quality specialist | Date: 3/16/15 |
| Jay Arceo | |
| Hydrology and Floodplain specialist | Date: 3/13/15 |
| Ara Jitechian | |
| Hazardous Waste/Materials specialist | Date: 3/16/15 |
| Ali Nili | |
| Visual/Aesthetics specialist | Date: 3/19/15 |
| George Olguin | |
| Energy and Climate Change specialist | Date: 3/26/15 |
| Fiona Nagle | |
| PEAR Preparer (Name and Title) | Date: 4/3/15 |
| Fiona Nagle, PhD, Associate Environmental Planner | |

12. Review and Approval

I confirm that environmental cost, scope, and schedule have been satisfactorily completed and that the PEAR meets all Caltrans requirements. Also, if the project is scoped as a routine EA, complex EA, or EIS, I verify that the HQ DEA Coordinator has concurred in the Class of Action.

monan Barbara Marquez, Environmental Branch Chief

Date: 4|3|15Date: 4|3|15

Reza Fateh, Project Manager

REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS: Attachment A: PEAR Environmental Studies Checklist Attachment B: Estimated Resources by WBS Code Attachment C: PEAR Environmental Commitments Cost Estimate (Standard PSR)

| | | | | | Rev. 11/08 |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------|---------------------------------------|
| Environmenta | al Studies | for PA | &ED C | hecklis | st |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Not anticipated | Memo to file | Report required | Risk* | Comments |
| Land Use | | | | L | Part of CIA |
| Growth | | | | Ĺ | Part of CIA |
| Farmlands/Timberlands | | | | L | |
| Community Impacts | | | | L | CIA |
| Community Character and Cohesion | | | | L | · · · · · · |
| Relocations | | | | L | |
| Environmental Justice | | | | L | |
| Utilities/Emergency Services | | | | L | Part of CIA |
| Visual/Aesthetics | | | | M | VIA |
| Cultural Resources: | | | | L | |
| Archaeological Survey Report | | | | Ĺ | ASR |
| Historic Resources Evaluation Report | \square | | | L | |
| Historic Property Survey Report | | | | L | |
| Historic Resource Compliance Report | | | | L | |
| Section 106 / PRC 5024 & 5024.5 | | | | L | |
| Native American Coordination | | | | L | |
| Finding of Effect | | | | L | |
| Data Recovery Plan | | | | L | |
| Memorandum of Agreement | | | | L | |
| Other: | · | | | L | |
| Hydrology and Floodplain | | | | L | LHS |
| Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff | | | | L | SWDRs |
| Geology, Soils, Seismic and | | | | L | GDR |
| Topography | | | | | |
| Paleontology | | | | L | |
| PER | | | | L | Pending a |
| | | | | | recommended |
| | | | | | consultation with the |
| | | | | | Los Angeles County of |
| | | | | | Natural History |
| | | | + <u></u> | | IVIUSEUM |
| | | | | | Deredia e COD |
| | | | | | Penaing GSR |
| | | | | | |
| | | | -⊢₽ | | |
| | | | | | |
| All Quality | | | | | Pionocuption study |
| | | | | L. | pending bio studies |
| Energy and Climate Change | | | <u> </u> | <u>L</u> | |
| Biological Environment | | | | L | · |
| Natural Environment Study | | | | M | · |
| Section 7: | | _ | | L | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Formal | | | | L | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| Informal | | | $ \times $ | L | |

Attachment A: PEAR Environmental Studies Checklist

| Environmenta | al Studies | for PA | &ED C | hecklis | st |
|--|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|
| | Not anticipated | Memo to file | Report required | Risk* L M H | Comments |
| No effect | | | | L | unknown |
| Section 10 | \square | | | L | |
| USFWS Consultation | | | | L | |
| NMFS Consultation | | | | L | |
| Species of Concern (CNPS, USFS, BLM, S, F) | | | | L | unknown |
| Wetlands & Other Waters/Delineation | | | | L | |
| 404(b)(1) Alternatives Analysis | | | | L | - |
| Invasive Species | \square | | | L | |
| Wild & Scenic River Consistency | \square | | | L | |
| Coastal Management Plan | \square | | | L | |
| HMMP | \square | | | L | |
| DFG Consistency Determination | | | | L | |
| 2081 | | | | L | |
| Other: | | | | L | |
| Cumulative Impacts | | | | L | |
| Context Sensitive Solutions | <u> </u> | | | L | Part of CIA |
| Section 4(f) Evaluation | | | | <u>L</u> | |
| Permits: | | | | | |
| 401 Certification Coordination | | | | L | |
| 404 Permit Coordination, IP, NWP, or LOP | | | | L | |
| 1602 Agreement Coordination | | | \square | L | |
| Local Coastal Development Permit Coordination | | | | L | |
| State Coastal Development Permit Coordination | | | | <u>L</u> | |
| NPDES Coordination | | | | L | |
| US Coast Guard (Section 10) | | | | L | |
| TRPA | | | | L | |
| BCDC | | | | L | |

ATTACHMENT B - Resources by WBS Code

Project ID: EA: 30710K Description: Liberty Canyon Wildlife Corridor

| Description. Elberty sanyon w | | | - <u>1</u> | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | T | 1 | -r | | - <u>r</u> | 1 | -T | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | T | | T |
|--|-------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------|-------|---|------------|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------|
| WBS Task Activity Code | Division Chief | Office Chief | Senior | Generalist | Biology | Cultural | Haz Waste | Socio- | Storm Water | ECL | Paleo | Noise/Air | Geotech | Design | Hydraulics | Landscape | Planning | Right of Way | Surveys | Total |
| Assigned Unit | | | | | | | - Haste | | Water | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Management | | | | | | · | | | | | | | | Teacher and the second second | | | | | | |
| 100.10 – Project Management - PA&ED | | | | | | | ~ | | | | | | | | | 1. 1. 1. 1. | Contraction of the | 12.4.5.6.8 | | - |
| 100.15 – Project Management - PS&E | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | |
| 100.20 – Project Management - Construction | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 海太太太 。 | | - |
| 100.25 – Project Management - Right of Way | | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | 1.9.1 | 一 花 一 花 | | | | - |
| Total Project Management | - | | - | - | - | - | - | ·= | - | - | | _ | - | | | | | | | - |
| Perform Preliminary Engineering Studies and D | raft Project R | eport | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 160.05 – Updated Project Information | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | A 14 4 | | | 4 4 4 4 | | 国际改善的 。" | - |
| 160.10 – Engineering Studies | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | 1/20 | A | 1 x 1 + 2 + 2 | 11.73 | 120 |
| 160.15 – Draft Project Report | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | RALL CLOSE | | 1000年夏日 | 1 2 4 2 2 | 127 100 100 | - |
| 160.30 - Environmental Study Request | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | 1 5 1 7 1 7. | | Contract of Contract of | 1001 32 0 | C B BOARD | 11 18 3.2 | - |
| 160.40 – NEPA Assignment | *** | | | | | | · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | Contractor a resolution of the | THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF THE | - |
| Total Perform Prelim Eng Studies & Draft PR | - | | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | | - | - | | | 120 | | | | 120 |
| | | | | | | | ··· · · · · | | | · · | | | | | | | | <u>,</u> | | |
| Perform Environmental Studies and Prepare Dra | aft Environme | ental Docum | ent - Task | Management | Activities | T | | | | | | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| 165.05 – Env Scoping of Alternatives | | 1 | 40 | 100 | 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 190 |
| 165.10 – General Env Studies | | | 125 | 500 | 50 | | 175 | 100 | | | 140 | 150 | 100 | | | 300 | | | | 1,640 |
| 165.15 – Biological Studies | | | 125 | | 800 | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 925 |
| 165.20 – Cultural Resource Studies | | | | | | 300 | | 20 | - | | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | 320 |
| 165.25 – Draft Env Document | | 40 |) 150 | 400 | 50 | | | | 100 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | 740 |
| 165.30 – NEPA Assignment | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | ·, | - |
| Total Perform Env Studies & Prepare DED | - | 40 | 440 | 1,000 | 950 | 300 | 175 | 120 | 100 | - | 140 | 150 | 100 | - | - | 300 | - | - | - | 3,815 |
| | | | ** | • | * | | • • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | - | | | | | d | |
| Obtain Permits, Licenses, Agreements and Certi | ifications (PL | ACs) and Re | oute Adopt | tions during F | PA&ED Cor | nponent - ⁻ | Fask Manad | nement Activ | ities | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 170.05 – Regired PLACs | 1 | T | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | ` | 1 | Τ | 1 | T | 1 | 1 | Ι | | T | T | 1 | · | - |
| 170.10 - PLACs | - | | | - | | · · · · | | | · · · · | | | | | | 1 | | | | <i>!</i> | |
| 170 15 - Bailroad Agreements | | | | | · · | | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | Sector Constant | 2 144 ST 144 ST 146 ST 146 ST | | A CONTRACTOR | |
| 170.20 - Freeway Agreements | _ | | | | | · · · · · · | | <u> </u> | | | | | | 1770 - 1770 1770 - 177 | | Carlos Contractor | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | 1200902.ces1.00 120000.022.02.205 | |
| 170.20 – Treeway Agreements | | · | ···· | | | | | | | · | | | | | | | 18.8 | | | |
| 170.20 – Agreement of Material Sites | | | | | | · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | i |
| 170.30 - Executed Maintenance Agreements | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | | | | | Sector Street | |
| 170.40 - Roule Adoptions | | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | · · · · · · · | | | | | | | in the second | the second second | Contraction of the | | | Charles W. | |
| 170.45 - MOU from TERO | | | | | | | | | | | l | | | | | | | ļ | ↓ / | |
| 170.55 – NEPA Assignment | | | | | | | i | | | | | | | | | | | | J | |
| Obtain PLACS & Rte Adoptions during PA&ED | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | <u>"</u> | | - | - | <u> </u> | - | |
| Circulate Draft Environmental Document and Se | elect Preferre | d Proiect Alt | ternative - | Task Manage | ment Activ | ities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 175.05 – DED Circulation | 1 | | 25 | 100 | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | T. | | | 1 | 125 |
| 175.10 – Public Hearing | 1 | ۶ | 3 8 | 48 | 40 | 20 | 20 | | 20 | <u> </u> | | 20 | 20 | | <u> </u> . | 20 | | | 11 | 224 |
| 175 15 – Public Comment Responses & Corr | | <u>├`</u> | 10 | 100 | 100 | 40 | 40 | | 40 | | | 40 | 40 | | | 40 | - | | | 450 |
| 175 20 - Project Preferred Alternative | | | 8 | 40 | 40 | | | | | | | | | 4-d | | | | | | 88 |
| 175.25 - NEDA Assignment | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | <u> </u> | | <u>iv</u> | <u> </u> | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | <u> </u> | |
| Total Circ DED & Select Preferred Proj Alt | | 8 | 51 | 288 | 180 | 0.0 | 60 | | 60 | <u> </u> | | 60 | 60 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | 60 | - | | <u>↓</u> | 887 |
| | _ | <u> </u> | | 200 | 100 | <u> </u> | 00 | L | 00 | | | 1 00 | 100 | | - | 00 | | I | | 007 |
| Prepare and Approve Project Report and Final E | Invironmenta | l Document | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | |
| 180.05 – Final Project Report | | | 8 | 75 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 83 |
| 180.10 – Final Env Document | | 8 | 3 10 | 100 | 100 | 20 | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 20 | | 20 | 1 | | | | | | | | 278 |
| 180.15 – Completed Env Document | | 1 | 8 | 75 | | [| | | <u> </u> | 40 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 1 | 123 |
| 180.20 – NEPA Assignment | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| Total Prep and Approve PR & FFD | - | 8 | 26 | 250 | 100 | 20 | - | - | 20 | 40 | 20 | - | · - | | 1913 - 385 - A. I. | 4 | | | | 484 |
| | _ <u>I</u> | L | <u></u> | 1 200 | | | <u>I</u> | J | L | 1 | 1 20 | J | L | | | | | CONTRACTOR OF AN ADDRESS | | |
| Prepare Base Maps and Plan Sheets for PS&E D | evelopment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 185.05 – Updated Project Information | T | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | Γ | | | | | | | |
| 185.15 – Preliminary Design | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | | | + | 1 | | 1000 State 20 | 200 St. 10 (195) | | DI POL | 14,04 1 7 1 | |
| | | 4 | | 1 | J | · | l | | I | J | | J | I | NAME OF A DESCRIPTION OF A | 1.000 | True way | | I CONTRACTOR OF | Contraction of the | |

Project ID: EA: 30710K Description: Liberty Canyon Wildlife Corridor

| Description. Liberty Canyon W | | rnuor | ······································ | . | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | · · · · · | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | · | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------|---------------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|----------|-------|---------------------------------------|----------|---|--|---|--|--|--|-------|
| WBS Task Activity Code | Division Chief | Office Chief | Senior | Generalist | Biology | Cultural | Haz Waste | Socio- Economic | Storm Water | ECL | Paleo | Noise/Air | Geotech | Design | Hydraulics | Landscape | Planning | Right of Way | Surveys | Total |
| Assigned Unit | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Prep Base Maps & Plan Sheets | - | - | - | - | · | - | - | | - | - | | - | - | | 2.5 A. | 374 | | | | - |
| Right of Way Property Management and Excess | Land | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 195.40 – Property Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 195.45 – Excess Land | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | - |
| Total RW Property Mgmt and Excess Land | | - | m | <u> </u> | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - | - | 学习 承希 | | | | | | + |
| Utility Relocation | | | | | | | • | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200.15 – Approved Utility Relocation Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 200.20 – Utility Relocation Package | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Total Utility Coordination | | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | | | | | 1. 1. | | - |
| Obtain Permits, Licenses, Agreements, and Cert | ifications (Pl | LACs) during | PS&E Co | mponent - Ta | sk Manage | ment Activ | /ities | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 205.05 – PLACs Determination | | 1. | | Π | | | | | · · · · · · | T | | | <u> </u> | 1 | Ι | | 1 | | T | |
| 205.10 – PLACs | | | 25 | | 226 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 251 |
| 205.15 – Railroad Agreements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 205.25 – Agreement for Material Sites | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 205.30 – Executed Maintenance Agreements | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a ser and | | | |
| 205.45 – MOU from TERO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 205.55 – NEPA Delegation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Total Permits & Agreements during PS&E | - | - | 25 | - | 226 | - | - | · · · | _ | - | ۳ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | • | 251 |
| Obtain Diskt stilles between to the Diskt of Diskt | | | | · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Obtain Right of Way Interests for Project Right o | r way Certifi | Cation | T | r | r | r | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 1 | T | | T | 1 | 421 23 7.5 | MENNINA CONTRACTOR | MURINALAN | CONTRACTOR DEPARTMENT | ACTING AND A SPECIAL PARA | IN A MARKEN ANTON | |
| Z25.75 – Right of Way Clearance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u>(69, 72, 88, 88</u> | Sec. Sec. | | - |
| | - | - | | | | - | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | - | - | - | - | | | 1999 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - | | | Children Holts | - |
| Prenare Draft PS&F | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 230.05 – Draft Roadway Plans | | | | | 1 | l | | r | I | T | | 1 | 1 | 1. A | | Reference - Second | Contraction and the | | AND AND A PROPERTY OF | |
| 230 10 – Draft Highway Planting Plans | | <u> </u> | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | , | | | | | | | | | | | | | Contraction of the second s References second sec | |
| 230 30 – Draft Drainage Plans | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | Constant and the second | 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1. | Kalandar (Kalandar) | and a second | lan ya 27 yila dan biri biri. Tan ya 27 yila dan biri biri. | 1984 - Self Bill and | |
| 230.35 - Draft Specifications | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a da | | The second s | | | |
| 230.60 – Updated Project Info for PS&F Pkg | | | | | | | | | | | | | · | 2755 21 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | The strange set of the | 1000 | | |
| 230.90 – NEPA Assignment | | | · | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | No. 1 Mar. State No. 1 | | 10045000 | | |
| 230.99 – Other Draft PS&E Products | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | - | | ······ | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | Plup research | | | and the second sec | |
| Total Prepare Draft PS&E | - | | - | | - | - | | - | - | | - | - | | | la diga dina dia dalah | | | | | |
| | · | | | | I | l | L | L | | | L | .L | | | | | | ALCONOMIC DESCRIPTION | 1993 - BERNARD ST. 1993 - 1993 | |
| Mitigate Environmental Impacts and Clean-up Ha | azardous Wa | ste - Task M | anagement | Actitivities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 235.05 – Environmental Mitigation | | | 40 | | 420 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 460 |
| 235.10 – Detailed Site Investigation for HW | | | | | | | 430 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 430 |
| 235.15 – HW Management Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | | | - |
| 235.20 – HW PS&E | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 235.25 – HW Clean-up | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 235.30 – Haz Substances Disclosure Doc | | | | | | | | ······ | | | | ļ | | | | | | | | - |
| 235.35 – Long Term Mitigation Monitoring | | **** | · · | | | | | | | | | | ···· | | | | | | | - |
| 235.40 – Updated Env Commitments Record | | | 4 | 40 | | | | | ······ | 240 | | ļ | | | | | | | | 284 |
| 235.45 – NEPA Assignment | | | | | (00 | | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Wilt Env Impacts & Clean-up HVV | - | ~ | 44 | 40 | 420 | - | 430 | - | - | 240 | - | - | | - | - | - | " | - | - | 1,174 |
| Post Right of Way Certification Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 245.75 – Right of Way Clearance | T | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | Ι | | Τ | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Total Post RW Clearance Work | - | - | | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | | - | | | | 2000 - 200 | | a an | |
| Circulate Review and Dranara Final District DSP | F Packado | | | | | | L | | L | . | | . | | Contract Contraction Contraction | and the second second second | | | | Decoder Barrow Construction of the State | |
| 255.05 - Circ & Rev. Draft Dist PS&F Package | L I denaye | T | R 1 | | 90 | | | 1 | | | | T | 1 | | 1. N | MARKET 196 | | C PONGERS MA | | 00 |
| 255 10 - Undated PS&F Package | | | ° | | | | | | | | | | | | Sha Westerner | | | | | 00 |
| 255 15 - Environmental Reevaluation | | | 10 | 80 | 16 | | | | | | | <u> </u> | | 1988 C. 1922 AN A. 19 | | | 0034555556 | | | 106 |
| 255.20 – Final District PS&F Package | · · | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | 10 | | | | | | | · · · | | | | n dan sanah | | 150.00 / 90 P | AND AND COMPANY | 100 |
| Losies Find Biotriot Ode Tublidge | L | 1 | J | I | | | l | I | L | I | L | L | l | | | | | | 10.43 State (19.40) | - |

Project ID: EA: 30710K Description: Liberty Canyon Wildlife Corridor

| | | r | T | | 1 | | | | | · | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|-----|------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|---|--|-------------------------|-------|
| WBS Task Activity Code | Division Chief | Office Chief | Senior | Generalist | Biology | Cultural | Haz Waste | Socio- Economic | Storm Water | ECL | Paleo | Noise/Air | Geotech | Design | Hydraulics | Landscape | Planning | Right of Wav | Surveys | Total |
| Assigned Unit | · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | · | | | ************************************** | | | | |
| 255.40 – Resident Engineer's Pending File | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - |
| 255.45 – NEPA Assignment | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Circ, Rev and Prepare Final Dist PS&E Pkg | - | - | 18 | 80 | 96 | | - | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | 194 |
| Contract Bid Documents "Ready to List" | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 260.75 - Env Cert at RTL | | | | . . | T | | · · · · · · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | Γ | T | T | [| 1 | | | | | |
| Total Contract Bid Documents "RTL" | - | - | - | - | - | | | ÷ | - | 1 | - | - | - | | R & DES | | A 25 6 | | | |
| Construction Engineering and General Contract | Administratio | on | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 270.15 – Construction Stakes | | | | · | I | | | | | | I | 1 | r | | | | | | | |
| 270.33 – Construction Inspection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4 | | 2007 - 19 ² - 191 | | | | |
| 270.66 – Technical Support | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Contraction Constraints | | Residence and the second | and the same processing | Maria di Kata | |
| Total Const Engineering & Gen Contract Admin. | - | - | · - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | | | | | | 197 A I | |
| | | -41 | O-) | | <u> </u> | • | | | | | L | . | •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••• | | | | | | | |
| Administration of Permits, Licenses, Agreements | and Certific | ations (PLA | US) and Er | vironmental | Stewardsn | <u>ıp</u> | | | | | r | 1 | r | manufacture of some later | | | | STREAM STREAM | | |
| 280.10 – PLAC Compliance | | | | | 8 | | | · | | 420 | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | 1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1. | | | 428 |
| 280.40 - PLAC Violations | | ****** | | | | | | | | | | | | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | | | | The Association | | - |
| 280.50 – Other Environmental Compliance | | | 40 | | 508 | | | | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | 648 |
| 280.60 – Other Environmental Violations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 280.70 – Updated ECR | | | | | | | | | | 80 | | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | 80 |
| 280.75 – Environmental Reevaluation | | *** | 8 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 88 |
| 280.80 – Updated PLACs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | a de la contra de la La contra de la contr | | | - |
| Total Admin of PLACs and Env Stewardship | - | •• | 48 | 80 | 516 | - | - | | 100 | 500 | | - | - | | | | | | an an third and a state | 1,244 |
| Change Order Administration | | | | | | | | | | | | · . | | | | | | | | |
| 285.05 – Change Order Process | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 285.10 – Functional Support | ····· | | | | | | | | | | | | | active de la | | | | | | |
| Total Change Order Administration | - | | I | - | 54 | - | - | - | | - | - | | - | | | | - | - | 1997) | |
| Disputes and Claims | | | | | | | | | | | | | <u></u> | | | | | | | |
| 290.40 – Potential Claim Record | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | 6.68.69 | | |
| Total Disputes and Claims | | - | 1 | | | - | - | - | - | - | . - | H | - | | | n an an tràinn an tràin 1923 an tràinn an tràin 1944 - An tràinn a | | | | |
| Accept Contract/Prepare Final Construction Estin | nate and Fina | al Report | | 4man | I | | Adrese and the second | | <i>_</i> _ | | | I <u></u> | I <u></u> | | | | | | | |
| 295.35 – Certificate of Environmental Compliance | | | 4 | | 40 | | | | | 40 | | | l | | <u> </u> | | | I | | 84 |
| 295.40 – Long Term Env Mit/Mont after CCA | | | 100 | | 1.070 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 170 |
| Total Accept Contract | m | | 104 | - | 1,110 | - | - | - | - | 40 | - | | - | | | 1 | | | | 1,254 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | A 1 March 199 Barris of the South of Barrison of South | | | CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER OWNER OWNE | | |
| Total Project Hours | | 56 | 756 | 1,738 | 3,598 | 380 | 665 | 120 | 280 | 820 | 160 | 210 | 160 | P. | | 480 | - | - | | 9,423 |

Attachment C: PEAR Environmental Commitments Cost Estimate

Standard PSR Only

(Prepare a separate form for each viable alternative described in the Project Study Report)

| PART 1 PROJECT INFORMATION | rev. 11/08 |
|--|---------------|
| District-County-Route-Post Mile | EA: |
| 07 – LA – 101 – 33.0 | 30710K |
| Project Description: | |
| Liberty Canyon Wildlife Crossing Project | |
| Form completed by (Name/District Office | e): |
| Fiona Nagle, D07 Environmental Plannin | g |
| Project Manager: | Phone Number: |
| Reza Fateh | 213-897-8316 |
| Date: 4/3/15 | |

PART 2 PERMITS AND AGREEMENTS

| | Permits and Agreements |
|---|------------------------|
| | (\$\$) |
| Fish and Game 1602 Agreement | 4,912 |
| Coastal Development Permit | |
| State Lands Agreement | |
| Section 401 Water Quality Certification | 1,000 - 2,000 |
| Section 404 Permit – Nationwide (U.S. Army | 0 |
| Corps) | |
| Section 404 Permit – Individual (U.S. Army | |
| Corps) | |
| Section 10 Navigable Waters Permit (U.S. Army | |
| Corps) | |
| Section 9 Permit (U.S. Coast Guard) | |
| Other: | |
| | |
| Total (enter zeros if no cost) | 6,912 |

PART 3. ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FOR PERMANENT IMPACTS

To complete the following information:

- Report costs in \$1,000s.
- Include all costs to complete the commitment:
 - O.K. to break down by phase: Design, ROW, Construction, and/or provide Sub-Total.
 - Capital outlay and staff support. Refer to Estimated Resources by WBS Code. For example, if you estimated 80 hours for biological monitoring (WBS 235.35 Long Term Mitigation Monitoring), convert those hours to a dollar amount for this entry. For current conversion rates from PY to dollars, see the Project Manager.
 - Cost of right of way or easements.
 - If compensatory mitigation is anticipated (for wetlands, for example), insert a range for purchasing credits in a mitigation bank.
 - Long-term monitoring and reporting
 - Any follow-up maintenance
 - Use current costs; the Project Manager will add an appropriate escalation factor.
 - This is an estimating tool, so a range is not only acceptable, but advisable.

| | En | vironm Buil | ental Commitn d Alternative | nents | |
|---|---------------|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| | Estimate | ed Cost i | n \$1,000's | | Notes |
| | Phases | | | | |
| | <u>Design</u> | ROW | Construction | <u>Sub-</u> Total | |
| Long-term Biological monitoring | | | | 1,050 | 2 yrs pre-construction + 5 yrs post-construction |
| Wildlife fencing and jump ramps | | | | 225 | 3000 ft fence @ \$65/ft + 6 ramps @ \$5k/ramp |
| Biological monitoring during construction | | | \$200-300 | \$200-300 | full-time monitor for any work near the valley oaks/streambed |
| WBS 160 (120 hrs total) | | | | | |
| WBS 165 (3815 hrs tot) | | | | | |
| WBS 175 (887 hrs total) | | | | | |
| WBS 180 (484 hrs total) | | | | | |
| WBS 205 (251 hrs total) | | | | | |
| WBS 235 (1174 hrs tot) | | | | | |
| WBS 255 (194 hrs total) | | | | | |
| WBS 280 (1244 hrs tot) | | | | | |
| WBS 295 (1254 hrs tot) | | | | | |
| Total (enter zeros if no cost) | | | | | |

Storm Water Data Report (Cover Sheet)

Attachment – E

Long Form - Storm Water Data Report

| Dist-Count | ty-Route: 07-LA-1 | 101 | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Post Mile | Limits: 33.0 | | | |
| Project Ty | pe: Wildlife Cross | sing | | |
| Project ID | (or EA): 071400 | 0213 (EA 30 | 710K) | |
| Program le | dentification: 40 | 50.400.000 | | |
| Phase: | | PID | | |
| Callega | Π | PA/ED | | |
| Lavars | | PS&E | | |
| Regional Water Quality Control Board(s): Los Angeles | Region 4 | | | |
| Is the Project required to consider Treatment BMPs? | | | Yes 🗖 | No 🖂 |
| If yes, can Treatment BMPs be incorpo | rated into the pro | oject? | Yes | No 🗖 |
| If No, a Technical Data Report at least 30 days prior to the pr | : must be submit rojects RTL date. | ted to the RW. | /QCB List RTL Date: | |
| Total Disturbed Soil Area: <u>4.44 Acres</u> | Ris | k Level: 2 | | |
| Estimated: Construction Start Date: Nov 2018 | Construct | tion Completio | on Date: June 20 | 020 |
| Notification of Construction (NOC) Date to be submitted | ed: <u>Oct 2018</u> | | | |
| Erosivity Waiver | Yes 🗖 | Date: | | _ No 🖾 |
| Notification of ADL reuse (if Yes, provide date) | Yes 🔲 | Date: | | _ No 🖂 |
| Separate Dewatering Permit (if yes, permit number) | Yes 🗖 | Permit # | | No 🛛 |
| This Report has been prepared under the direction of the technical information contained herein and the date upor based. Professional Engineer or Landscape Architect sta | e following Licens on which recomm amp required at F | sed Person. Ti nendations, co PS&E. | ne Licensed Person nclusions, and de L | on attests to the ecisions are $\frac{1}{23}$ |
| Siew Mei Tan, Registered Project Engineer/Landscape | e Architect | | | Date |
| I have reviewed the stormwater quality design issues an | nd find this report | to be complet | te, current and ac | curate: 4/23/15 |
| Reza Fatéh, Projec | t Manager | | Ann | Date |
| David Law | ence for Roser | Castillo X | Varla Junal | 04/23/15 |
| Roger Castillo, Des | signated Mainten | ance Represe | ntative 🖉 | Date |
| CDC. |)) | _ | 2 | 54-24-15 |
| Ron Russak, Desig | gnated Landscape | e Architect Re | presentative | Date |
| All | | | | 4/24/2015 |
| [Stamp Required for PS&E only) Shirley Pak, Distric | t/Regional Desig | n SW Coordin | ator or Designee | Date |
| / | | | | |



Right of Way Data Sheet

Attachment – F

M e m o r a n d u m

Serious Drought! Help Save Water!

To: Rafael Molina , Design Manager Office of Design District 7, Los Angeles Office **Date: 4/24/2015 EA: 30710K** Data Sheet ID NO: ds1230 Project ID # 0714000213

From: Dan Murdoch, Office Chief Right of Way Appraisals, and Planning & Management District 7, Los Angeles Office

Subject: Current Estimated Right of Way Costs for Project Report

We have completed an estimate of the Right of Way costs for the above referenced project based on information received from Siew Mei Tan PE and the following assumptions and limiting conditions apply:

- The mapping did not provide sufficient detail to determine the limits of the right of way required.
- The transportation facilities have not been sufficiently designed so our estimator could determine the damages to any of the remainder parcels affected by the project.
- Additional right of way requirements are anticipated, but are not defined due to the preliminary nature of the estimate.
- We have determined there are no right of way functional involvement's in the proposed project at this time
- Milestone dates per PMs Report. Data Sheet revised on 4-24-15 to reflect correct 33 post mile (pm.)

Right of Way Certificate (RWC) lead time will require a minimum of 24 months after maps to appraisal (**MA**). Completed Appraisal maps include HMDD, COS, HW Memo, and RE-49. An executed copy of the new freeway agreement if required for the project. When utility relocation is warranted, utility conflict maps will be required. Additionally a minimum of 18 months will be required after receiving the last revision to the appraisal map. Shorter lead times will require either more right of way resources or an increased number of condemnation suits to be file and present a risk to the RWC project delivery milestone. Due to the passage of Map 21 and the Buy America provision, the Right of Way Certification process will be longer, if Utility Relocation is necessary.

Current Schedule: PRSM Milestone dates per PMs Report.

| PAED (M 200) | MA (M 224) | RWC (M 410) | RTL (M 460) | CCA (M 600) |
|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 12/30/2016 | 5/1/2017 | 3/30/2018 | 6/30/2018 | 6/30/2020 |

R/W DATA SHEET

ID NO ds1230

Date of Data Sheet 4/24/2015

Project Description Route 101 Liberty Canyon Road Wildlife Crossing Project in City of Agoura Hills.

 SENIOR R/W P&M
 Reza Fateh

 ROUTE
 101

 PM_KM
 33.0

 EA
 30710K

 Project ID #
 0714000213

ALT

This cost estimate is valid for the above scoping report only. This is an estimate only and not an appraisal. It may be based on worse case scenarios.

The estimate is subject to change and revision.

The mapping did not provide sufficient nor adequate detail to determine the limits of thr Right of Way required and effects on the improvements.

The transportation facilities have not been sufficiently designed for our estimator to determine the damages to any of the remainder parcels affected by

This cost estimate is pursuant to the following responses supplied by Rafael Molina to the Data Sheet Request Form.

| | YES | NO | Not know | n at this time |
|---|-----|----|----------|----------------|
| Utilities are depicted on plans | | x | | |
| Railroads are depicted on plans | | x | | |
| There are Material and/or Disposal Sites Required | | | x | |
| Caltrans will do the Right of Way work | x | | | |
| There will be a Cooperative Agreement | x | | | |
| This is a reimbursable project | x | | | |
| There is Hazardous Waste potential | | x | | |

RW COST ESTIMATE

| | CURRENT VALUE | ESCALATED VALUE |
|---|---------------|-----------------|
| R/ w acq.(incl.contingency G.w-condemadm.s'tl.)Permits | \$268,240 | \$329,948 |
| Clearance | | |
| RAP (cont rate.) | | |
| Escrow costs (cont rate.) | \$5,608 | \$6,898 |
| Utility relocation costs | \$5,860,000 | \$8,741,975 |
| Estimate of Reimbursed Appraisal Fee | \$6,000 | \$6,000 |
| Total estimated cost | \$6,139,848 | \$9,084,821 |

Escalation Rate Rw .07 Escalation Rate Utilities .08 Cert.date 3/30/18

Comment

Milestone dates per PMs Report. Data Sheet revised on 4-24-15 to reflect correct 33 post mile (pm.)



PM_KM 33.0

EA 30710K

ALT

Parcel Count and Py Info



UTILITY INFORMATION

Please See the Utility Conflict Addendum for Complete Utility Information

| \$5,860,000 | Total Current Cost | Are utility easements required? No |
|-------------|-------------------------|---|
| 6/30/2020 | Const. Completion Date | Are Utility agreements required? Yes |
| 8% | Utility Escalation Rate | Utility types, Facilities & Agreements Description: |
| \$8,741,975 | Total Escalated Cost | |

ROUTE 101 PM_KM 33.0 EA 30710K ALT

RR INFORMATION

| When Branch Lines Or Spurs Are Aff | fected, would Acquisition And Or Paym | ent Of Damages To Businesses And Or Industries Served By Th | 16 |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|----------|
| Involved? | ve man service contracts of Grade Se | parations Reduining Construction And Maintenance Agreements 0 | 5 |
| Explain Branch lines NA | | | |
| Service Contracts or Grade Separation | nis Requiring Construction And Mainten | Grade Aing Requiring ance Agreements Involved. | |
| RAILROAD COST PERTAINING TO C | CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY | | |
| ost of flagging related to projec | t construction activity is a Pha | use 4 cost (construction contract cost). Though | noted on |

| Right of Way Estimate prepared by | Roy Gallegos | <u>UAIE</u> 3/26/15 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Railroad Estimate prepared by | Steve Johnson | 4/9/15 |
| Utilities Estimate prepared by | Cesar Aguilar | 4/21/15 |

I have personally reviewed this R/W Data Sheet and all supporting information I certify that the probable highest and best use estimated values and assumptions are reasonable and proper subject to the limiting conditions set forth and I find this Data Sheet complete and current.

This Data Sheet is not to be signed by Chief unless accompanied by final scoping report(PR,PSR,PSSR) for review and/or signature.

CHIEF

15

Utility Conflicts Id- ds1230 EA- 30710K

| | Description | Quantity | \$/Unit | Total Cost |
|----|---|----------|---------|------------|
| 1 | 30" Water (Las Virgenes Municipal Water) MWD, Vendell PL; (1500 | 1500 | 1500 | 2250000 |
| 2 | 6" M gas (Southern California Gas Co.) Agoura Road; (300 Ft) | 300 | 1200 | 360000 |
| 3 | Manholes Sewer (Las Virgenes Municipal Water) | 2 | 25000 | 50000 |
| 4 | 18" VCP Sewer (Las Virgenes Municipal Water); (300 Ft) | 300 | 1350 | 405000 |
| 5 | Transmission Wooden Pole # 4193951E, Power, Edison, Agoura Rd | 1 | 200000 | 200000 |
| 6 | Transmission Wooden Pole # 4401099E, Edison, Vendell PL | 1 | 200000 | 200000 |
| 7 | Guy Pole Wooden #4401100E, Agoura Rd for Trans. Pole#4401099E | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 8 | Transmission Steel Pole # 44734957E, Edison, Vendell PL (\$450K)) | 1 | 400000 | 400000 |
| 9 | Guy Steel Pole # 4734958E, Vendell For Trans. Pole 44734957 | 1 | 150000 | 150000 |
| 10 | Transmission Wooden Pole # 2279160E, Edison, Vendell PL | 1 | 200000 | 200000 |
| 11 | Guy Wooden Pole # 1611805E, Vendell PL for Trans. Pole# | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 12 | Transmission Wooden Pole # 4403511E, Edison, Vendell PL | 1 | 200000 | 200000 |
| 13 | Guy Wooden Pole #1611803E, Vendell PL for Trans. Pole#4403511E | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 14 | Transmission Wooden Pole # 4403476E, Edison, Vendell PL | 1 | 200000 | 200000 |
| 15 | Guy Wooden Pole # PTC00045, Vendell PL | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 16 | Transmission Wooden Pole # 4193952EE, Edison, Vendell PL | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 17 | Telephone Wooden Pole #593858H, Vendell PL | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 18 | Telephone Wooden Pole #PTc00043, Vendell PL | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 19 | Telephone Wooden Pole #1017611H, Agoura Rd | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 20 | Telephone Wooden Pole #1030562H, Agoura Rd | 1 | 30000 | 30000 |
| 21 | 4-Fiber Optic Overhead Lines, Vendell PI, | 1500 | 200 | 300000 |
| 22 | 4-Fiber Optic Overhead Lines, Agoura Rd | 1500 | 200 | 300000 |
| 23 | 8" Steel Water (Las Virgenes Municipal Water), (600 Ft) | 600 | 600 | 360000 |
| 24 | Fire Hydrant (Las Virgenes Municipal Water) | 1 | 15000 | 15000 |
| | | | | |

Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Data Sheet

Attachment – G

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN DATA SHEET (Preliminary TMP Elements and Costs)

| Co/Rte/PM L | A-101, PM 33.00 EA 30710K / 0714000213 | Alternative No. |
|---------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Project Limit | In Los Angeles County in the City of Agoura Hills on Route 1 | 01 at Liberty Canyon Rd. |
| Project Description | n Constructing a vegetated overpass across Route 101 t | o provide wildlife |
| | crossing just west of Liberty Canyon Road. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1) Public 1 | Information | |
| | a. Brochures and Mailers | \$ |
| Ī | b. Press Release | <u> </u> |
| | c. Paid Advertising | \$50,000,00 |
| | d. Public Information Center/Kiosk | \$ |
| Ī | e. Public Meeting/Speakers Bureau | |
| Ī | f. Telephone Hotline | |
| | g. Internet | |
| [| h. Others | \$ |
| 2) Motoris | sts Information Strategies | |
| | A a. Changeable Message Signs (Fixed) | \$00.00 |
| [| b. Changeable Message Signs (Portable) | \$ |
| [| c. Ground Mounted Signs | \$ |
| [| d. Highway Advisory Radio | \$ |
| [| e. Caltrans Highway Information Network (CHIN) | |
| [| f. Others | \$ |
| 3) Inciden | t Management | |
| | X a. Construction Zone Enhanced Enforcement | |
| | Program (COZEEP) | \$90,000.00 |
| | b. Freeway Service Patrol | \$ |
| | C. Traffic Management Team | |
| Ļ | d. Helicopter Surveillance | \$ |
| L | e. Traffic Surveillance Stations | - <u>_</u> |
| - | (Loop Detector and CCTV) | \$ |
| L | 1. Others | \$ |

4) Construction Strategies

|) Demand Management | |
|--|----|
| A HOV Lange/Dermer (March Charles) | |
| a. nov Lanes/Ramps (New or Convert) | \$ |
| D. Park and Ride Lots | \$ |
| d. Variable Work Hours | \$ |
| e. Telecommute | |
| f. Ramp Metering (Temporary Installation) | \$ |
| g. Ramp Metering (Modify Existing) | \$ |
| h. Others | \$ |
| Alternative Route Strategies | |
| a. Add Capacity to Freeway Connector/Ramps | \$ |
| b. Street Improvement (widening, traffic signal etc) | \$ |
| c. Traffic Control Officers | \$ |
| d. Parking Restrictions | |
| e. Others | \$ |
| Other Strategies | |
| a. Application of New Technology | \$ |
| e. Others | \$ |

Project Notes:

- 1. The scope of work involves constructing a vegetated overpass across Route 101 at Liberty Canyon Road.
- 2. Public Affairs Compaign cost estimate of \$50,000.00 was provided by Judy Gish, Public Information Officer, Caltrans Office of Public Affairs and Media Relations, on 3/12/2015.
- 3. In the instruction to the RE File, inform RE to notify Public Affairs prior to construction to ensure that a PIO is assigned for the project.
- 4. COZEEP cost estimate of \$90,000.00 was provided by Amjad Obeid, Construction Traffic Advisor-South, on 3/16/2015.
- 5. Existing Fixed Changeable Message Signs may be used to manage traffic as needed during construction as follows:

A. CMS # 108 (NB Rte 101 at De Soto Ave).

B. CMS # 98 (SB Rte 101 at Ventu Park Rd).

6. Traffic Management Team is required during full freeway closure for falsework erection and removal.

7. It is anticipated work will be performed in accordance with the Lane Requirements Charts provided in the Maintaining Traffic Specifications.

8. Any changes in construction strategy that would result in a different type of closures other than indicated here shall require a revision for the TMP Data Sheet.

PREPARED BY

Raymond Shehata. Sarah Horn, P.B. Acting S.T.E. Sam Esquenazi **District Traffic Mana**

DATE $\frac{3/17/15}{17/15}$ DATE $\frac{3/17/15}{19/15}$ DATE

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED BY

APPROVED BY

Risk Register

Attachment – H

RISK REGISTER CERTIFICATION (ACCOUNTABILITY CHECKPOINTS) Form PM-0001 (Rev. 4/2013)

The risk register is to approved and signed-off by the deputies* listed below for all scalability levels. By signing this form, you are certifying that you have reviewed the risks documented in the register and agree that they have been managed to the extent possible by the PDT.

| Project Information | Capital Project 🔲 Major Maintenance Project (Check One) |
|--|--|
| Project ID/District-EA | EFIS ID:0714000213/EA:07-30710 |
| Project Description | LA-101-32.8/33.8-IN LA, WILDLIFE CROSSING @ LIBERTY CANYON AT OR IN THE VICINITY OF LIBERTY - WILDLIFE HABITAT CONNECTIVITY |
| Project Manager (PM) | FATEH, REZA |
| Project Risk Manager (for Risk Level 3 Projects) | |
| No Risk Register Certification Required Check Box if pro Sign below and submit this form with PID, PA&ED, PS&E subm | oject is less than \$1 million in total cost and risk register not prepared. hittal, and RE Handoff File (as applicable). |
| Project Manager Signature | |
| PID (Recommended for Capital Projects Only exclud | ing Minor Projects) |
| Project Manager | Assa 120/15 Date: 4/20/15 |
| Deputy District Director, Planning | |
| Deputy District Director*, Design** | blue ban Date: 4 21 15 |
| Deputy District Director, Project Management | $fall = \frac{1}{28/15}$ |
| PA&ED (Required for Capital Projects Only) | |
| Project Manager | Date: |
| Deputy District Director*, Environmental | |
| Deputy District Director*, Design** | |
| Deputy District Director, Project Management | |
| Prior to PS&E (Required for Capital Projects and Mai | ntenance Projects) |
| Project Manager | Date: |
| Deputy District Director*, Design** | Date: |
| Deputy District Director*, Construction | Date: |

-

Date:

Deputy District Director*, Right of Way



RE File Hand-Off (Recommended for Capital Projects and Major Maintenance Projects)



*or the respective Project Delivery Division Chief signatures in the North Region or Central Region

**or Deputy District Director, Maintenance signature for HM Projects designed by the District Maintenance Division

ADA Notice

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-6410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89, Sacramento, CA 95814.

| | Project Risk Register for 30710 as of 04/29/15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--|-------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|---|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------|
| No | . Status* | ID | Risk Type | RBS Category | WBS Impacted | Critical Path Impacted? | Title | Risk Statement | Impact Description | Linear/ Non- Linear | Risk Probability | Risk Impact | Impact Consequence Cost/Time | Cost/ Time Score | Cost \$K (Low) | Cost \$K (Most Likely) | Cost \$K (High) | Probable Cost Impact (\$K) | Time in Mos (Low) | Time in Mos (Most | Time in Mos (High) | Probable Time Impact (Mos.) | Rationale (for Rating)* | Response Strategy | Response Action | Mitigation Option (Minimize Prob or Impact) | Risk Triggers | Residual Risks | Secondary Risks | Risk Interaction | Risk Owner | Comments | Last Updated |
| 1 | Active | 24144 | | РМ | 0.100 | | Funding Uncertainties | Funding- No funding source has been identified for the PS&E phase nor for construction of the project. | If funding is not secured for the project, it will not get built. | Linear | 40-59% | High | Cost | 16 (HIGH) | 32500 | 37000 | 42000 | 18397.50 | | | | | | Avoid | Several environmental and conservation as well as local politicians have shown keen interest in the project and we are hopeful that they will collectively be able to fund it. | Probability | A signed PSR is the trigger to begin the efforts to secure funds for the project as the document with lay out what is needed to build the project. | none | none | none | Reza Fateh | | 04/20/2015 09: 43:00 |
| 2 | Active | 24151 | | CON | 5.270.20 | | Cost | Cost of the project may be increased environmental mitigation requirements, design changes and right of way acquisitions. | The construction over the Agoura Road as well as relocating high voltage overhead power lines costs to the project. | Linear | 40-59% | High | Cost | 16 (HIGH) | 3000 | 5000 | 8000 | 2640.00 | | | | | | Mitigate | All utilities need to be identified early on during the PS&E phase and efforts to relocate them should begin quickly to minimize the ninimize schedule. The cost of the relocations will be minimize of eliminate any construction | Impact | As soon as the project footprint is finalized utility research begin and the necessary relocation work identified and coordinated with utility companies. | delays in construction | none | none | Celina Aviles | Cellna needs to keep an eye on the project and begin her utility engineering work to help impacts as discussed above. | 04/17/2015 11:26:00 |
| 3 | Active | 24146 | | Gen | 0.100 | | Maintenance Agreement and Cost of Maintaining Structure | The cost and cost and ref photologic Agoura Hill culvert and associated structures need to be clearly defined and egreed uppon by exit uppon parties. | This is a relatively major structure that is being built within the substantial maintenance throughout is substantial maintenance is of concern to the State and the keeping the bridge in good repair is also a concern as a concern as traveling inglication for the traveling public. | Linear | 60-99% | Moderate | · Cost | 15 (нісн) | 1000 | 10000 | 25000 | 9540.00 | | | | | | Avoid | delays. To mitigate this risk a maintenance and the second second needs to be needs to be sporsor (MRCA) to fully address this aspect of the project. | Probability, Impact | Prior to issuing encroachment permit the maintenance agreement needs to be fully executed. | none | none | none | Reza Fateh | PM to make sure negotiations agreement begin in a timely manner so that it can be fully before the encroachment is issued. | 04/20/2015 10:12:00 |
| 4 | Active | 24162 | | DGN | | | Design Exceptions | The bridge is located at a horizontal curve and the row of bents in the median as well as the abutment worth side create non- standard sight distance and shoulder widths within the project shandard sight distance and shoulder widths within the project shandard sight distance and shoulder widths within the project shandard sight distance and shoulder widths within the scope of the scope of the scope of the scope of the scope of the scope of the scope of the scope of the scope of the | Proposed non- standard features will have to be approved prior to financia support work. | Linear | 40-59% | Moderate | Cost | 12 (MEDIUM) | 1000 | 1500 | 2000 | 742.50 | | | | | | Accept | The proposed non-standard features will be mitigated by moving the abutment wall to the easible. | Impact | Start of PAED phase | none | none | none | Oriance Lee | | 04/29/2015 07:45:00 |
| 5 | Active | 24145 | | ENV | 0.100.10 | | Environmental Permits | The existence of a live stream within the project limits may require extensive and lengthy permitting process from various environmental agencies. | Delivery of milestone PAED might be delayed. | Linear | 20-39% | Moderate | Time | 9 (MEDIUM) | | | | | 0 | 2 | 8 | 00.98 | | Mitigate | The PD team will begin working with the agencies early on to help maximize the use of the available time so that all questions and concerns of the resource agencies can be addressed in a timely manner and | Probability | Completion of draft plans that fully describe the project footprint. | none | none | none | Barbara Marquez | | 04/17/2015 10:54:00 |
| District 7 Project Ri | sk Re | Aegister | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|----------|-------|--|-----|-------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------|--------|----------|------|---------|------|------|-------|------------|---|------|----------|----------|---|---------------------|--|---|------|------|------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | to receive the needed permits. | | | | | | | | |
| | 6 | Active | 24148 | | LEG | 0.100 | | Liability | Concerns have been raised about the possibility of hikers using the overcrossing getting attacked by wildlife, and the liability arising from such event. | There is potential of legal liability for the State in case a hiker is attacked by any of the wikilife such as the mountain lions especially if the attack is fatal. | Linear | 10-19% | Moderate | Cost | 6 (LOW) | 200 | 2000 | 10000 | 589.67 | | | | Transfer | MRCA as the project sponsor will have to accept any such liabilities as they own the project hence are liable for all of the project liabilities lincluding the one being discussed here. | Probability | None | None | None | None | Reza Fateh | Will have to negotiate a maintenance coop which will be the same instrument used to transfer all liabilities stemming from the project to the project to wner. | 04/20/2015 07:46:00 |
| | 7 | Active | 24150 | | DGN | 2.160.10.80 | | Lack of a Geotechnical Report | No field testing of the soil to determine the geotechnical profile of the soil in the project area has been conducted. This exposes the project to additional potential foundation costs if undesirable soil conditions are discovered. | Additional foundation cost may be involved if upon completion of the Geotech and Foundation Report it is determined that the ground in the project area is of undesirable strength or characteristics | Linear | 20-39% | Low | Cost | 6 (LOW) | 100 | 500 | 1000 | 157.33 | | | | Avoid | This risk will be minimized upon completion of the geotechnical report which will perform several test borings that will study the actual soil conditions. | Probability, Impact | Start of the PAED phase. | unforeseen field conditions during construction that may cause additional mitigation work. | none | none | John Ehsan | | 04/20/2015 09:22:00 |
| | 8 | Active | 24161 | | CON | | | Utility Relocation | Utility Relocation costs may end up exceeding the initial estimates due to unexpected complications that may arise during construction. | Potential additional cost and schedule delays upon discovery of unanticipated field conditions. | Linear | 10-19% | Moderate | Cost | 6 (LOW) | 1000 | 2000 | 3000 | 290.00 | | | | Mitigate | Prior field investigation and potholing in addition to coordinating the utility work with the utility companies will eliminate most of this risk. | Probability, Impact | Start of PAED phase during which more detailed utility coordination and potholing will take place to establish exactly what is needed in regard to utilities. | none | none | none | Celina Aviles | | 04/20/2015 09:49:00 |
| | | | | | | | | | TOTAL EX | PECTED IMPAC | 21 | | | | | | | | \$32357(K) | 1 | 0.98 | s (Mos.) | | | | | | | | | | |

Jacked Box Culvert Estimate by FHWA-CFLHD

Attachment – I

CA PRA SAMO 99(1) Santa Monica Mountains Recreation Area/ Caltrans -Wildlife Tunnel Study

PROJECT FEASIBILITY COST ESTIMATE - April 2015 Update 13' X 13' JACKED BOX CULVERT Completed by: FHWA-CFLHD

4/17/15 9:25 AM

| Item Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | I tem Cost | Section Cost |
|---|------------|----------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| I. ROADWAY ITEMS | | | | | |
| Section 1 Earthwork | | | | | |
| Roadway Excavation | 10,000 | CUYD | \$15.00 | \$150,000.00 | |
| Clearing & Grubbing | 6 | ACRE | \$3,000.00 | \$20,000.00 | |
| Top Soil Reapplication | 4,300 | CUYD | \$20.00 | \$90,000.00 | ************* |
| | | | 5 | ubtotal Earthwork | \$260,000.00 |
| Item Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost | Section Cost |
| Section 2 Pavement Structural Section | <u>_</u> | | | | |
| Asphalt Concrete | 1,000 | TON | \$125.00 | \$125,000.00 | |
| Aggregate Base | 1,600 | CUYD | \$65.00 | \$105,000.00 | |
| | | Sub | total Pavement | Structural Section | \$230,000.00 |
| | - | | | | |
| Item Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost | Section Cost |
| Section 3 Drainage | | | | | |
| Large Drainage Facilities (13 ft x 13 ft RCB, jacked) | 305 | LNFT | \$10,000.00 | \$3,050,000.00 | |
| Storm Drains | 1 | LPSM | \$60,000.00 | \$60,000.00 | |
| neadwaits/ willgwalls | <u> </u> | LPSIM | \$75,000.00 | \$75,000.00 | ¢2 195 000 00 |
| | | | | Subtotal Dialitage | \$3,185,000.00 |
| Item Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost | Section Cost |
| Section 4 Specialty Itoms | Quantity | Onit | Unit Frice | Ttelli cost | 560110030 |
| Barriers and Guardrails | 700 | INFT | \$45.00 | \$35,000,00 | |
| Utility Coordination/Potholing | 1 | LPSM | \$100,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | |
| Hazardous Waste Investigation and/or Mitigation Work | 1 | LPSM | \$100,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | |
| Removal of Structure (Building) | 1 | LPSM | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000.00 | |
| Environmental Compliance (NPS Monitoring) | 1 | LPSM | \$100,000.00 | \$100,000.00 | |
| | | | Subtot | al Speciality Items | \$385,000.00 |
| ltem Decerintien | Overstitue | L I with | Unit Drive | Litera Cost | Castion Cast |
| Tem Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Item Cost | Section Cost |
| Section 5 Traffic Items | | 1 | - | - | |
| Monitoring/Plan) | 1 | LPSM | \$150,000.00 | \$150,000.00 | |
| | <u>4</u> | | Sub | ototal Traffic Items | \$150,000.00 |
| | | | | | |
| Item Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | I tem Cost | Section Cost |
| Section 6 Planting and Irrigation | | | | | |
| Highway Planting | 1 | LPSM | \$150,000.00 | \$150,000.00 | |
| Irrigation Modification (Plant Irrigation System) | 1 | LPSM | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000.00 | |
| | | Subto | tal Planting and | Irrigation Section | \$200,000.00 |
| lane Decemination | Overstitut | Linit | Linit Drive | Litera Cont | Continu Cont |
| Tem Description | Quantity | Unit | Unit Price | Ttem Cost | Section Cost |
| Section 7 Roadside Management and Safety | | | | | |
| Erosion Control Slope Protection | 1 | LPSM | \$30.000.00 | \$30,000,00 | |
| Maintenance Vehicle Pull outs | 1 | LPSM | \$50,000.00 | \$50,000.00 | |
| Roadside Facilities (Gates, Pedestrian Crossings, Trails, | 1 | LDSM | \$75,000,00 | \$75,000,00 | |
| etc.) | ' | LF SIVI | \$75,000.00 | \$75,000.00 | |
| Wildlife Fencing | 4,000 | LNFT | \$10.00 | \$40,000.00 | |
| | | roodcid | e Management | and Safety Section | \$195,000.00 |
| | Subtotal I | toausiu | | CTIONS, 1 thm. 7 | \$4 60E 000 00 |
| | Subtotal F | toausiu | TOTAL SE | CTIONS: 1 thru 7: | \$4,605,000.00 |
| Section 8 Minor Items | Subtotal I | toausiu | TOTAL SE | CTIONS: 1 thru 7: | \$4,605,000.00 |
| Section 8 Minor Items | Subtotal I | Coausiu | TOTAL SE \$470,000.00 TOT | CTIONS: 1 thru 7: \$470,000.00 | \$4,605,000.00 \$470.000.00 |
| Section 8 Minor Items | | Coausiu | TOTAL SE \$470,000.00 TOT | CTIONS: 1 thru 7: \$470,000.00 TAL MINOR ITEMS: | \$4,605,000.00 \$470,000.00 |
| Section 8 Minor Items Section 9 Roadway Mobilization | 10% | Causiu | TOTAL SE \$470,000.00 TOT \$510,000.00 | CTIONS: 1 thru 7: \$470,000.00 CAL MINOR ITEMS: \$510,000.00 | \$4,605,000.00 \$470,000.00 |

CA PRA SAMO 99(1) Santa Monica Mountains Recreation Area/ Caltrans -Wildlife Tunnel Study

PROJECT FEASIBILITY COST ESTIMATE - April 2015 Update 13' X 13' JACKED BOX CULVERT Completed by: FHWA-CFLHD 4/17/15 9:25 AM

Item Description Quantity Unit **Unit Price** Item Cost Section Cost I. ROADWAY ITEMS Section 10 Roadway Additions Supplemental Work 10% \$510,000.00 \$510,000.00 Contingencies 25% \$1,270,000.00 \$1,270,000.00 \$1,780,000.00 TOTAL ROADWAY ADDITIONS: TOTAL ROADWAY ITEMS (Subtotal Sections 1 thru 10): \$7,365,000.00

2011 Estimate Summary

| PSR Preparatio | n | \$65,000.00 | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| PA/ED | | \$350,000.00 | | | | | |
| Geotech Invest | igation & Draft Report | \$250,000.00 | | | | | |
| PS&E (8%) | | \$590,000.00 | | | | | |
| Construction A | dministration (12%) | \$890,000.00 | | | | | |
| | Project Total (2011) | \$9,510,000.00 | | | | | |
| | SAY | \$9,600,000.00 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Demme | Low | \$8,700,000.00 | | | | | |
| Range | High | \$10,600,000.00 | | | | | |

Construction Cost Escalation (2011 to 2015)

| 2012 | 2.2% | \$220,000.00 | | | | |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2013 | 0.6% | \$60,000.00 | | | | |
| 2014 | 1.3% | \$130,000.00 | | | | |
| 2015 | 0.0% | \$0.00 | | | | |
| | Total Escalation | \$410,000.00 | | | | |
| P | roject Total (2015) | \$10,010,000.00 | | | | |
| | SAY | \$10,100,000.00 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Dongo | Low | \$9,100,000.00 | | | | |
| капде | High | \$11,200,000.00 | | | | |