

Jennifer Woodworth

From: Jennifer Woodworth
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 9:41 AM
Subject: Board Questions Re: 8/10/16 Agenda

Good morning all,

Please find staff's answers below in blue in response to questions submitted regarding tonight's agenda. Thank you.

Director Kishimoto

Item 6: Mt. Um EIR addendum

* 11,000 cubic yards more excavated and to be moved: how does that compare with volume we have moved already on Mt. Um (roughly)?

According to field staff, the volume of sidecast material already moved at Mount Umunhum is roughly 7,000 cubic yards.

* Also, I looked at table 1 where we are near the threshold for NOx daily emissions. Adding 100 one-way, 1.7 mile trips/day - 10 g of NOx/mile= about 4 pounds additional per day, not 2 pounds?

The EIR Consultant used detailed assumptions, modeling input parameters and a standardized Road Construction Emissions Model, which is recommended by the Air Quality Management Districts in the region to calculate the pollutant emissions for the air quality section of the EIR and Addendum. In both cases the District used very conservative values and numbers to generate the Maximum Daily Emissions for the Total Construction Phase of 52.4 NOx lb/day. Based on this modeling, the Phase 2 project pollutant emission remains below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Significance Threshold of 54 NOx lbs/day (Table 1 in the Addendum). The 1.9 lbs/day of NOx that would be generated by the Project is a direct output of analyzing multiple variables and parameters that include but are not limited to: project length of time, project type, off-road emission factors, haul truck capacity and etc. Trip miles per day is one of many parameters that the model considers. Thus the results would not equate to approximately 4 lbs/day of additional NOx.

As one of the modeling assumptions, the District recommended the maximum outer limit values of soil material and truck traffic that could be generated from the projects to ensure that the emissions generated was the absolute maximum conservative estimate for the work. We anticipate that the projects' emissions will result in a much lower NOx level.

Results from the model are shown in Appendix 1, which was not included as part of the Board packet because it is over 150 pages of numbers and tables. For your convenience, the detailed modeling results in Technical Appendix 1 is attached to this email and is also posted on the website at <http://www.openspace.org/our-work/projects/mount-umunhum-summit-project>.

Also, on the Mt. Um overall projections which show \$8.93 Million "remaining" - what else is projected to be needed if anything?

The remaining amount of \$8.93 million for Portfolio 23 is designated for additional land purchases to preserve open space and complete new wildlife corridors. Remaining funds may also be used to fund any additional trail connections. Note that that District to date has been working on establishing a major trail connection to the summit via the Mount Umunhum Trail, which may also serve as a spur trail of and connection to the regional Bay Area Ridge Trail.

Below is the specific language related to Measure AA Portfolio 23 as described in the Expenditure Plan with embedded comments related to the status of each commitment:

Sierra Azul: Mt. Umunhum Public Access and Interpretation Projects - \$27,972,000 Open Mt. Umunhum for multi-use public access to summit via road and trail (both the Summit and Road Projects accomplish this commitment). Open Bay Area Ridge Trail and nearby trail connections (Mount Umunhum Trail and the trails that are part of the Summit Project serve to accomplish this commitment). Preserve additional open space and complete wildlife corridor (to date, Measure AA funds have been used to purchase the Meyer Property to help accomplish this commitment).

One more question about Mt. Um projects: report notes the road projects contains discreet elements that can be removed to substantially decrease cost without significantly impacting project goals. Are there some that staff recommends?

The primary goal of the Road Project is to provide safe public vehicular access to the summit of Mount Umunhum via Mt. Umunhum Road. Given our analysis that the low bid received is below both the revised engineer's estimate and the third party cost estimate, the General Manager recommends implementing all of the project elements that were approved by the Board during the May 25, 2016 Special Board Meeting.

Had our analysis determined that the low bid was substantially higher than the two estimates, project elements that improve the life expectancy of the road and associated infrastructure and reduce long-term maintenance and operational costs for the District would have been recommended for potential removal to reduce up front construction costs. These elements include:

- Installation of a double chip seal road surface
- Installation of concrete barriers along the road
- Shallow & deep pavement repairs
- Expanded inlet structures
- Installation of inlet structure headwall

Since the bid received is below fair market value, the General Manager recommends retaining all the project elements to avoid increasing future long-term maintenance costs for the District.



Jennifer Woodworth, MMC

District Clerk/ Assistant to the General Manager

jwoodworth@openspace.org

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022

P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485

E-mail correspondence with the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may therefore be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the Act.

Jennifer Woodworth

From: Jennifer Woodworth
Sent: Friday, August 5, 2016 3:58 PM
Subject: Meeting Materials for 8/10/16
Attachments: Construction Cost Index.pdf

Good afternoon,

The meeting materials for the 8/10/16 Board meeting have been sent. Also please find the response below in blue to a question submitted regarding the FYI sent yesterday. If you have any other questions regarding the Board packet, please submit by 10:00 am Tuesday to allow staff enough time to research and respond. Thank you.

Jen

Director Kishimoto

Thanks for this more comprehensive analysis and, importantly, alternatives. One piece of info I'd like to request is an idea of how much construction cost index has gone up and down over e.g. the past 20 years. As example, I found this on line: <http://www.turnerconstruction.com/content/files/CostIndex2012Qtr1.pdf>

Please see attached PDF for data provided by Turner Construction for the past 20 years, dating back to 1996. This cost index is a National representation. We've also included data from Cumming Construction Management, the District's Third Party Cost Estimator, showing cost index specifically for the Bay Area dating back to 2003, as well as projections for the next three years. To put the projections into context and for ease of explanation, a project estimated at \$1,000,000 in 2016 would likely cost \$1,065,000 in 2017 and \$1,221,156 in 2020, 22% higher than today's estimated value. Please also note the large negative (-) change in the cost index during 2008 and 2009 for Cumming and Turner, respectively. The reason for the difference in year could be attributed to how each organization account for the end of their Fiscal Year.



Jennifer Woodworth, MMC

District Clerk/ Assistant to the General Manager

jwoodworth@openspace.org

Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District

330 Distel Circle, Los Altos, CA 94022

P: (650) 691-1200 - F: (650) 691-0485

E-mail correspondence with the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (and attachments, if any) may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and as such may therefore be subject to public disclosure unless otherwise exempt under the Act.