

City Council Questions

June 4, 2019 Council Meeting

ITEM 3.1 SOFT-STORY RETROFIT PROGRAM UPDATE

1. Page 6 of staff report – In the three jurisdictions that have streamlined capital improvement pass-throughs, is a pass-through always granted?

The streamlined capital improvement petition still has to be evaluated by hearing officers. If a tenant does not file an objection against the petition request, a hearing officer can forego a hearing and make an administrative decision. In discussions with the relevant jurisdictions with both a soft-story and rent stabilization program, no capital improvement pass throughs have actually been submitted to recover the cost of a soft-story retrofit. Input by staff from those jurisdictions is that the ability for units to go to market upon tenant vacancy and the allowable annual rent adjustment has been able to cover the retrofit costs without needing to submit a petition.

2. In the CSFRA, if a housing provider petitions for a rent increase to cover the cost of seismic upgrades, but is deemed to already be earning a fair rate of return, will they be able to pass through the cost of the seismic upgrades?

The current CSFRA allows a landlord, who does not believe that the permitted annual general rent adjustment provides a fair rate of return, to petition for an upward adjustment of rent based on the maintenance of net operating income (MNOI) methodology. The Hearing Officer or Rental Housing Committee (RHC) shall consider relevant factors as spelled out in the CSFRA Section 1710(a)(2), one of which is the cost of planned or completed capital improvements necessary to bring the property into compliance or maintain compliance with applicable local codes affecting health and safety, and where such capital improvement costs are properly amortized over the life of the improvements. Capital improvements are one of many defined factors that go into the Hearing Officer's consideration when determining on the petition. If the Hearing Officer determines that the landlord has not achieved a fair return under MNOI, then an appropriate pass through amount would be allowed to for the seismic upgrade. However, if the Hearing Officer determines that the landlord has achieved a fair return under MNOI, then the cost could not be passed through.

3. How many petitions have been filed for rent increases beyond the allowed annual adjustment? How many have been granted?

Eleven landlord based petitions have been filed with and accepted by the City. Nine of the 11 have been granted as approved by the Hearing Officer. One of the 11 settled privately through the Hearing Settlement Conference. One was denied by the Hearing Officer because the property owner did not qualify for a petition based increase.

4. How strong of a magnitude of an earthquake (and for how much time) is the retrofit intended to withstand?

Staff does not have exact information about specific magnitudes and length of time a retrofit is intended to withstand, but can explain how the California Building Code (code) incorporates seismic vulnerability. The code requires new construction to be designed in a manner so that a building stays intact long enough to allow occupants to safely exit in the event of an earthquake. This does not guarantee any building can or will survive a large earthquake but the code is

constantly being upgraded to improve the methodology for the engineering design of new construction. Older/existing buildings are not required to update their structural systems to meet the current code. However, retrofit of a soft-story building (if designed and installed properly), will greatly enhance the structure's ability to resist the earthquake forces at the known structural weakness of the soft-story condition, but like new construction, cannot ensure that a building will still be standing after a major event.

5. Is a rental property owner liable for damage suffered by tenants if they do not retrofit their buildings?

This is not an easy legal question to answer because it would depend on the particular facts of each case and would involve a private legal matter between a tenant and the landlord.

6. Will the evaluation phase include identification of owner-occupied soft-story buildings? Are owner-occupied soft-story buildings being retrofitted voluntarily right now?

The evaluation phase will include all soft-story apartment buildings (renter or owner-occupied) that contain three units or more; the evaluation and ordinance are not addressing condominiums or townhomes. If an owner happens to occupy one of those units on site, it may be noted during the evaluation phase but would not exempt them from the process. Soft-story retrofits can currently be performed on a voluntary basis prior to the start of the retrofit phase.

7. Would property owners need to disclose to potential buyers that the property is required to be retrofitted under municipal law?

In general, real estate disclosure requirements relate to the condition of the property. A property owner is required to disclose whether the property is located in an earthquake fault zone or seismic hazard zone, but there is no specific requirement to provide notice of a municipal ordinance that requires a seismic retrofit of the property.

8. How would the relocation assistance be determined if there is a temporary relocation? Would it be the full TRA0 benefits or partial benefits?

If there is a temporary relocation during a retrofit process and the tenant re-occupies the same rental unit after the retrofit, the tenant could be eligible for partial benefits.

9. Would property owners be required to make other modifications to get up to code when they secure permits for seismic retrofitting?

No. The only exception to this may be discovery of a life safety situation while in the field.

10. Do you know roughly what percent of CA cities have adopted mandatory soft-story retrofit ordinances?

We do not have definitive information on all soft-story ordinances in the state, but most such buildings are in the Bay Area and Los Angeles area. We know Alameda, Berkeley, Fremont, Los Angeles, Oakland, San Francisco, Santa Monica and West Hollywood have adopted mandatory soft-story retrofit ordinances, and many other cities in those regions are currently studying the issue.

11. The report says relocation during retrofits is not typical, but possible. As these retrofits will affect a very large percentage of our naturally affordable housing, what measures could we take to make sure retrofit projects don't enable or increase displacement? Could we require relocation assistance, some kind of Building Department assessment of whether relocation is necessary or some other measures?

There could be some instances of temporary relocation of tenants as those upgrades are performed on their unit depending on the level of structural repair and modifications needed during the retrofit. If temporary relocation is necessary, it should not last more than a few days with the worst case scenario of a maximum of two weeks. Based on other jurisdiction's experiences, staff believes that permanent displacement will be minimal given that the work will be short-term and landlords have not exited the rental business due to soft-story retrofit requirements. In addition, landlords may be able to recapture seismic retrofit expenses through vacancy decontrol (tenant turnover) where the landlord would be able to reset the rent level when the tenant moves out or through the City's petition process. As mentioned in an earlier question above, this has been the experience in other jurisdictions where petitions have not been filed. Landlords are likely using vacancy decontrol to cover capital improvement costs. The CSFRA/TRAO covers temporary relocation if there is tenant displacement over 30 days. For shorter displacement durations, the TRAO policy would need to be modified to cover displacements of 30 days or less. It is unclear whether Council has the authority to make this relocation assistance modification for CSFRA units. There is a State relocation requirement that requires that the landlord not charge rent for days in which the tenant cannot live in their unit regardless of the duration of the displacement.

12. Could we include a discussion of preventing displacement during retrofits in our Anti-Displacement Strategy?

The Council could include retrofit displacement in the assessment of the Anti-Displacement Strategy. However, staff feels that displacement during retrofits will be minimal.

13. We can take our time and consider this if we do the evaluation phase suggested in the staff report. Can staff research the displacement issue as part of their evaluation phase?

Yes, staff can research displacement during the evaluation phase but recommends aligning this component with the overall work to assess and develop options to address displacement as part of the Council goals workplan item.

14. Can we encourage electric chargers along with retrofits?

No. This is strictly an ordinance to remove the soft-story conditions within the jurisdiction.

ITEM 4.2 FINAL MAP APPROVAL, TRACT NO. 10481, 257-279 CALDERON AVENUE

1. Does the City retain a copy of the CC&Rs submitted for all development proposals?

Community Development (Planning) retains a copy of the final approved CC&Rs for new developments.

ITEM 4.7 CASTRO STREET/MOFFETT BOULEVARD AT CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS, CIP 16-40-VARIOUS ITEMS

1. Why is \$1M from the Merlone Geier community benefit funding this project? What is the nexus?

Merlone Geier provided community benefit funding for the requested increased floor area for the San Antonio Village North development. The community benefit funding is separate from development fees and does not require a relationship nexus to the public improvements. On December 2, 2014, the City Council accepted approximately \$2.3 million from the Merlone Geier as community benefit funding to be used for mobility-related improvements. On March 24, 2015, at the first Study Session for the FY 2015-16 Capital Improvement Program, the City Council directed the funds be used towards Category 2 discretionary projects that support the Council major goals, which included \$1 million to design, permit and construct the Castro/Moffett/Central Intersection Near Term Improvements, CIP 16-40. Merlone Geier community benefit funds were also used for the AGT Study (\$0.3M) and the Rengstorff Grade Separation (\$1.0 M).

ITEM 4.9 NORTHBOUND SHORELINE BOULEVARD/101 OFF-RAMP REALIGNMENT DESIGN, PROJECT 19-59-PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AGREEMENT

1. What were the options considered for the realignment of the off ramp? Why was this option chosen?

One of the objectives of the Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR) is the evaluation of alternatives by the project sponsor and the selection of a preferred alternative by Caltrans. That process is expected to be complete in August 2019. The alternatives evaluated are outlined in the attached staff report dated November 1, 2016. Since that time, variations of the bus lane alignment on the ramp in Alternative 2 have been studied. Staff included the alternative in the June 4, 2019 staff report that we believe is the most likely to be selected by Caltrans as the preferred alternative. Caltrans selects a preferred alternative because the improvements become part of the State highway system when complete.

Staff plans to return to Council to review Caltrans' preferred alternative in fall 2019 after the PSR/PR is approved by Caltrans. Considering the time-sensitivity of this project, staff recommends amending AECOM's contract in advance of completion of the PSR/PR and selection by Caltrans of the preferred alternative as there is preliminary work that can be started on the final design process regardless of the alternative selected by Caltrans.

2. With the new off-ramp, does the Shoreline exit get eliminated, or is this an additional exit?

The new off-ramp would still be the Shoreline exit, but the intersection of the existing off-ramp with Shoreline Boulevard would be eliminated. Access to Shoreline Boulevard from north bound Hwy 101 will be provided via La Avenida.

3. What happens to the remnant parcel?

The remnant parcel will be conveyed to Caltrans along with the new ramp right of way. With the street configuration around the parcel, there is no reasonable way to develop the parcel and allow vehicles in and out. Caltrans may use the parcel for landscaping and highway drainage use.

4. What is the breakdown of the cost for the consultants? (Did they provide the number of hours and hourly wages, etc.)?

A detailed breakdown of hours and costs by task is attached.

ITEM 6.1 DOWNTOWN PARKING MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION ASSESSMENT DISTRICT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019-20

1. Is a formal staff presentation necessary? Can we safely omit it?

The annual Parking District renewal process is based on state and city requirements. A public hearing is required; however, a presentation is not. If the Council wishes, staff can state that this is an annual process and the Council can proceed to take public input.

ITEM 6.2 1720 VILLA STREET RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

1. Is this building all electric? Can we require it to be all electric?

The development is all electric.

2. Is the parking bundled or unbundled? And if it is unbundled is the first space included and then if additional spaces are wanted there is a fee for them?

The parking is partially bundled. There will be one assigned parking space per unit and the other spaces will be open.

3. In many areas (pages A3.1 lower, A3.2 lower, A3.3, A3.4 lower) the roof appears to be trying to “hide” the height behind it. If there is nothing to hide, it is possible to lower the roof so that there is not a very large roof that is visually unattractive?

Council may comment on the design and provide direction for staff and the applicant to work on the specified areas of the project design. Language could be added to the conditions of approval to ensure this work is completed to the satisfaction of staff prior to issuance of Building Permits.

4. Staff does not recommend the applicant’s BMR alternative mitigation option involving rehabilitation of a property on Mariposa Avenue because no formal proposal has been received. Does staff have an estimate of how long it would take the applicant to prepare a fully documented proposal, staff to evaluate that proposal and schedule it for an upcoming council meeting?

Staff estimates that a comprehensive review of a complete proposal would take a few months given the operational, financial, and legal vetting of that proposal that is needed, as well as potential alternatives. This duration would also depend on the responsiveness of the applicant, as well as of its potential affordable housing partner, in providing staff any requested information in a timely manner as part of the review and in meeting with staff as needed. Staff would want a thorough inspection of the property to occur as well.

5. One possible reason that the alternative mitigation might be attractive is that the Mariposa property could become permanently affordable and tenant displacement could be prevented. What elements would a fully documented proposal need to ensure that the property would become permanently affordable and tenant displacement would be prevented – a statement of work for the Mariposa property (timeframe, materials, budget, contractor selection), tenant relocation arrangements, how current tenants qualify for the housing given their income, a contract with the housing nonprofit to assume ownership? Anything else?

Correct, staff has not analyzed how much rehabilitation of units is required or would cost, relocation agreements, and tenant qualification based on income. Staff's understanding is the Prometheus has explored various Mariposa alternatives with non-profit affordable housing developers, and it is unclear what the acquisition and rehabilitation costs would be for the total project, if and what City subsidy would be requested, how a non-profit developer would finance a Mariposa project overall, and how it would meet the alternative mitigation requirements of the BMR program and be of a greater benefit to the City. At the current asking price for the property, the acquisition cost alone for Mariposa is \$500K/unit. Two years ago, staff toured Mariposa and, via visual inspection, estimated that the rehabilitation cost could be \$200K/unit or more. Actual rehabilitation costs and duration may vary and would require a formal inspection, which could be part of staff's evaluation of the project overall and the potential temporary and permanent displacement.

Acquiring, rehabilitating, and deed-restricting the existing units do not guarantee that permanent displacement would be necessarily avoided. An assessment would include at least the following:

- Assessment of the incomes of the households in each unit,
- Number of persons in each household
- If any of the units has overcrowded conditions
- AMI levels of future deed-restricted units
- Number of units/bedroom sizes and household sizes
- Any external public funding sources and any restrictions that might come with those funding sources.

If the existing tenants at Mariposa have incomes or household sizes that do not meet the requirements of deed-restricted affordable units and/or the BMR program, then displacement could still occur.

There are an unknown number of tenants that would still be displaced if they do not meet the BMR income level. A contract between the City and the housing nonprofit would also have to be in place.

6. How would we convert the units from rent controlled to BMR. What would the rent structure be?

Based on the limited information staff has received of the proposal, Prometheus seeks to partner with a non-profit affordable housing developer who would be given Prometheus' in-lieu payment. The non-profit would acquire the property and possibly seek additional City subsidies, in addition to exploring the availability of external funding sources, and deed-restrict the property. The project would need to comply with the BMR requirements for alternative mitigation, as well as any requirements attached to any sources of funding that the non-profit would seek to finance the project. Prometheus has indicated that the project would have to be set at 80% AMI in order to be financially feasible for the housing nonprofit. However, the BMR program has rents set at weighted average 65% AMI, so having all units at 80% AMI would not meet the BMR requirements

and might dislocate existing tenants. Qualifying renters on the property would be given the option the first right of refusal to rent an affordable unit.

ITEM 7.1 AUTOMATED GUIDEWAY TRANSIT PHASE 2 FEASIBILITY STUDY

1. If deferred, how much staff capacity would be freed up for other projects?

This project will be managed by Jim Lightbody, a part-time contract project manager who works on transportation planning studies, with assistance from a part-time hourly transportation planner. Deferring the study would provide contractor and hourly capacity for a different transportation planning study but would not free up City capital projects or engineering staff capacity.

2. If deferred, what other unfunded CIPs could proceed instead?

The proposed funding source for the \$500,000 in City funds is the General Fund - Transportation reserve. There are currently no unfunded transportation CIPs for \$500,000 or less that could use this funding source and be delivered by the staff that would be freed up. If the project were to be deferred, staff recommends saving the funding for a future transportation study or improvement.

3. What tools does the City have to acquire the right of way that would be needed for an AGT route? Specifically, if a project is zoning compliant, would we be able to require a dedication of land?

The City would explore a number of options for acquiring right of way for an AGT route, including consideration of a community benefit contribution, purchase at fair market value, dedication for a particular project, and if necessary, eminent domain. Dedication requirements for right-of-way as part of development approvals would be assessed on a project by project basis and would depend on whether there is a sufficient nexus between the impacts of a particular project in relation to the right of way. It takes extensive planning and design work, along with CEQA clearance, to develop the plan lines for the AGT route. The AGT Phase 2 Feasibility Study will help determine to what extent the AGT can be constructed within existing right-of-way. Where additional right-of-way may be needed, developments can be encouraged to preserve the future right-of-way in their site plans/building footprints, especially if the necessary right-of-way will not significantly affect the development potential of their property.

City of Mountain View
 NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-Ramp Realignment
 (Project 19-59)
 PS&E Phase
 COST OF PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK

PS&E Support	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3	Task 4	Task 5	Task 6	Task 7	Task 8	Task 9	Task 10	TOTAL
	<i>Project Management</i>	<i>PS&E Support</i>	<i>65% PS&E</i>	<i>95% PS&E (DOE)</i>	<i>100% PS&E</i>	<i>FINAL PS&E</i>	<i>Right of Way Support</i>	<i>Bid Support</i>	<i>DSDC</i>	<i>Right-of-way Closeout</i>	
LABOR											
<i>AECOM (Civil)</i>	\$138,613	\$87,256	\$374,258	\$177,227	\$71,900	\$23,247	\$45,679	\$10,563	\$66,581	\$3,424	\$998,748
<i>AECOM (Environmental Oakland)</i>	\$0	\$24,827	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$24,827
<i>AECOM (Geotech)</i>	\$0	\$63,227	\$6,788	\$4,744	\$4,744	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$79,503
<i>AECOM (Structures)</i>	\$3,527	\$0	\$81,841	\$53,647	\$14,623	\$4,702	\$0	\$0	\$5,094	\$0	\$163,435
<i>AECOM (Traffic)</i>	\$5,757	\$26,702	\$33,086	\$13,433	\$9,595	\$0	\$0	\$959	\$6,050	\$0	\$95,582
<i>AECOM (Surveying)</i>	\$4,313	\$42,766	\$20,844	\$0	\$0	\$1,438	\$43,485	\$0	\$1,797	\$41,329	\$155,972
<i>Labor Escalation (3.3%)</i>	\$3,425	\$5,508	\$11,628	\$5,604	\$2,269	\$661	\$2,006	\$259	\$1,789	\$1,007	\$34,156
SUBCONSULTANTS											
<i>Landscape Architect</i>	\$0	\$14,560	\$25,480	\$18,200	\$16,380	\$0	\$0	\$1,456	\$1,456	\$0	\$77,532
<i>RJA</i>	\$0	\$21,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,000	\$28,000
<i>Bess Testlabs (Utility Pothing)</i>	\$0	\$26,040	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,040
<i>Cal Safety</i>	\$0	\$7,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,500
<i>Subconsultant Markup</i>	\$0	\$2,073	\$764	\$546	\$491	\$0	\$0	\$44	\$44	\$210	\$4,172
SUBCONTRACTED COSTS											
<i>Environmental Drilling</i>	\$0	\$3,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,500
<i>Environmental Testing</i>	\$0	\$5,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,500
<i>Environmental Traffic</i>	\$0	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,500
<i>Geotech Drilling</i>	\$0	\$7,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,200
<i>Geotech Testing</i>	\$0	\$22,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$22,500
<i>Geotech Traffic</i>	\$0	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,000
<i>Subcontracted Markup</i>	\$90	\$1,707	\$45	\$30	\$30	\$9	\$0	\$3	\$32	\$79	\$2,025
MISC. DIRECT EXPENSES											
<i>Misc. Printing</i>	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,300
<i>Postage, Travel, Misc.</i>	\$3,000	\$4,700	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100	\$1,070	\$2,638	\$12,008
SUBTOTAL	\$158,724	\$380,067	\$556,234	\$274,431	\$121,033	\$30,357	\$91,170	\$13,385	\$83,912	\$55,687	\$1,765,000
										Task 11 ADDITIONAL SERVICES	\$100,000
										TOTAL	\$1,865,000

City of Mountain View
NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-ramp Realignment, Project 19-59

WBS Code	Task ID	DELIVERABLE	Project Manager	DPM/Highway Design Manager	Senior Utility/Specs Engineer	Sr. Project Engineer	Project Engineer	Staff Engineer	CAD	Admin	Project Controls	Geotechnical Manager	Geotechnical Sr. Engineer	Geotechnical Engineer	Bridge Manager	Sr. Bridge Engineer	Bridge Engineer	Bridge CAD	Bridge QA/QC	Traffic Manager	Sr. Traffic Engineer	Sr. Cost Engineer/OA Manager	Sr. Env Professional	Env Professional	Survey Manager / Senior Land Surveyor	AECOM LABOR TOTAL	
Project Management																											
	1.01	Project Administration																									120
	1.02	Scheduling																									24
	1.03	Agency/Subconsultant Coordination																									146
	1.04	Kick-off, PDT, and City Coordination Meetings (up to 20)																							16		110
	1.05	Technical Meetings (up to 4)													12												52
	1.06	Invoices/Progress Reports																									20
	1.07	Project Filing and Quality Control									20												20				20
	1.08	Risk Management Plan																					2		8		14
	1.09	Health & Safety Plan																					2				4
Task 1		Subtotal	154	240	0	36	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	24	510	
PS&E Support																											
	2.01	Data Collection & Site Reconnaissance				8	16	40	16																		80
	2.02	Field Surveys																								238	238
	2.03	Geometric Refinements	0			8	32	16	24																		80
	2.04	Geotechnical Investigation and Testing						68				38		40								8					154
	2.05	Utility Design Coordination		4	40																						44
	2.06	Potholing																									0
	2.06.01	Design Reports						40																			0
	2.06.01	Storm Water Data Report		20																							60
	2.06.02	Drainage Report		40				120																			160
	2.06.03	Foundation Reports/LOTBs						12	12	8		32	40	44													148
	2.06.04	Geotechnical Design & Materials Report						8	8	8		34		96													154
	2.06.05	Right of Way Hazardous Test Report						8	8	20													20	120			168
	2.06.06	Lane Closure Report																			20	100					120
	2.06.07	Traffic Management Plan Data Sheet																			4	20					24
	2.06.08	Landscape/Aesthetics Concept Plan																									0
Task 2		Subtotal	0	64	40	16	208	144	68	36	0	104	40	180	0	0	0	0	0	24	120	8	20	120	238	1,430	
65% PS&E																											
	3.01	Design Exceptions (List)		2		4	8	16	16																		46
	3.02	Highway Plan Sheets																									0
		Geometric Base Sheets				8	8	8	8																100		132
		Typical Cross Sections				4	16	8	8																		36
		Profiles/Superelevation Diagrams				4	8	8	4																		24
		Utility Relocation/Occupation Plans			20	8	8	8	20																		64
		Retaining Wall Layout Sheets																									0
		Drainage Layout Sheets			40	4	8	20	20																		92
		Pavement Delineation				4	8	20	20																		52
		Inventory of Existing Signs/Signage Plan					4	4	8																		16
	3.03	Structure Type Selection													24	60		60	4								148
	3.04	Electrical Design				40		40	80																		160
	3.05	Design Plan Sheets (Hwy & Structure)																									0
	3.05.01	Highway Design Plans																									0
		Title and Location Map				4	8	8	16																		36
		Typical Cross Sections				8	32	16	24																		80
		Project Control and Monumentation					4	4	16																16		36
		Key Map and Line Index				4	4	4	16																		28
		Layouts	2			24	40	40	32																		138
		Profiles/Superelevation Diagrams				8	16	16	8																		48
		Construction Details	2			40	80	80	40																		242
		Temp Water Pollution Control Plan & Details				8	16	16	8																		48
		Contour Grading				8	16	16	8																		48
		Drainage Plans/Profiles/Details/Quantities				8	32	40	16																		96
		Utility Plans			20	8	24	16	80																		148
		Construction Area Signs/Details/Quantities				4	16	8	8																		36
		Stage Construction Plans & Details	2			8	16	8	8														20				62
		Traffic Handling Plans/Details/Quantities				8	40	80	40														20				188
		Detour Plans/Details/Quantities (incl. in TH Plans)				8	20	20	40											8	20						96
		Pavement Delineation Plans/Details/Quantities				8	32	16	8																		64
		Sign Plans/Details/Quantities				8	32	16	8																		64
		Summary of Quantities				4	12	16	8																		40
		Highway Planting Plans																									0
		Erosion Control Plans/Details/Quantities				8	16	16	8																		48
		Electrical Plans			40	4	32	16	20																		112

City of Mountain View
NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-ramp Realignment, Project 19-59

WBS Code	Task ID	DELIVERABLE	SUBCONSULTANTS					ODCs								TOTAL	
			Landscape Architect	RJA	Bas. Testabs (Utility Potholing)	Cal Safety	Total	Environmental Drilling	Environmental Testing	Environmental Traffic	Geotech Drilling	Geotech Testing	Geotech Traffic	Misc. Printing	Postage, Travel, Misc.		
			SUB	SUB	SUB	SUB											
Project Management																	
	1.01	Project Administration															\$ 38,926
	1.02	Scheduling															\$ 7,298
	1.03	Agency/Subconsultant Coordination															\$ 45,921
	1.04	Kick-off, PDT, and City Coordination Meetings (up to 20)															\$ 37,561
	1.05	Technical Meetings (up to 4)														\$ 2,000	\$ 15,519
	1.06	Invoices/Progress Reports															\$ 4,197
	1.07	Project Filing and Quality Control															\$ 4,905
	1.08	Risk Management Plan															\$ 3,339
	1.09	Health & Safety Plan															\$ 1,058
Task 1		Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 158,724
PS&E Support																	
	2.01	Data Collection & Site Reconnaissance															\$ 10,519
	2.02	Field Surveys		120	50	75	245									\$ 2,800	\$ 82,148
	2.03	Geometric Refinements															\$ 11,507
	2.04	Geotechnical Investigation and Testing															\$ 68,659
	2.05	Utility Design Coordination															\$ 9,623
	2.06	Potholing				167	167										\$ 20,641
	2.06.01	Design Reports															\$ 11,632
	2.06.01	Storm Water Data Report															\$ 29,219
	2.06.02	Drainage Report															\$ 27,627
	2.06.03	Foundation Reports/LOTBs															\$ 27,531
	2.06.04	Geotechnical Design & Materials Report															\$ 40,624
	2.06.05	Right of Way Hazardous Test Report															\$ 21,117
	2.06.06	Lane Closure Report															\$ 4,223
	2.06.07	Traffic Management Plan Data Sheet															\$ 14,997
	2.06.08	Landscape/Aesthetics Concept Plan		80			80										\$ 380,067
Task 2		Subtotal	80	120	217	75	492	\$ 3,500	\$ 5,500	\$ 1,500	\$ 7,200	\$ 22,500	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 4,700		
65% PS&E																	
	3.01	Design Exceptions (List)															\$ 6,564
	3.02	Highway Plan Sheets															\$ 23,129
		Geometric Base Sheets															\$ 5,172
		Typical Cross Sections															\$ 3,399
		Profiles/Superelevation Diagrams															\$ 10,743
		Utility Relocation/Occupation Plans															\$ 15,491
		Retaining Wall Layout Sheets															\$ 7,004
		Drainage Layout Sheets															\$ 2,185
		Pavement Delineation															\$ 27,863
		Inventory of Existing Signs/Signage Plan															\$ 23,635
	3.03	Structure Type Selection															\$ 6,174
	3.04	Electrical Design															\$ 11,507
	3.05	Design Plan Sheets (Hwy & Structure)															\$ 5,861
	3.05.01	Highway Design Plans															\$ 4,122
		Title and Location Map															\$ 20,327
		Typical Cross Sections															\$ 6,799
		Project Control and Monumentation															\$ 34,805
		Key Map and Line Index															\$ 6,799
		Layouts															\$ 6,799
		Profiles/Superelevation Diagrams															\$ 12,901
		Construction Details															\$ 22,699
		Temp Water Pollution Control Plan & Details															\$ 5,172
		Contour Grading															\$ 11,663
		Drainage Plans/Profiles/Details/Quantities															\$ 26,749
		Utility Plans															\$ 15,719
		Construction Area Signs/Details/Quantities															\$ 9,181
		Stage Construction Plans & Details															\$ 9,181
		Traffic Handling Plans/Details/Quantities															\$ 5,429
		Detour Plans/Details/Quantities (incl. in TH Plans)															\$ 22,495
		Pavement Delineation Plans/Details/Quantities															\$ 6,799
		Sign Plans/Details/Quantities															\$ 18,638
		Summary of Quantities															
		Highway Planting Plans		120			120										
		Erosion Control Plans/Details/Quantities															
		Electrical Plans															

City of Mountain View
NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-ramp Realignment, Project 19-59

WBS Code	Task ID	DELIVERABLE	Project Manager	DPM/Highway Design Manager	Senior Utility/Specs Engineer	Sr. Project Engineer	Project Engineer	Staff Engineer	CAD	Admin	Project Controls	Geotechnical Manager	Geotechnical Sr. Engineer	Geotechnical Engineer	Bridge Manager	Sr. Bridge Engineer	Bridge Engineer	Bridge CAD	Bridge QA/QC	Traffic Manager	Sr. Traffic Engineer	Sr. Cost Engineer/OA Manager	Sr. Env. Professional	Env. Professional	Survey Manager / Senior Land Surveyor	AECOM LABOR TOTAL	
	3.05.02	Structure Design Plans/Calculations														32	80	80	100	8							300
		Nonstandard Retaining Walls (Total 2)																									100
	3.05.03	Utility Relocation/Occupation Plans							80																		80
	3.06	Specifications and Special Provisions																									0
		Highway Specs	2		80																						80
		Structure Specs																									0
	3.07	Update Design Reports				4	4		4	8		8	4	24		20											96
	3.08	Quantities and Cost Estimate (Hwy)				4	8	8																			20
	3.09	Construction Schedule	2																				16				18
	3.10	Draft PS&E Forms			8	4	8																				20
	3.11	QC Review				16	16	16															20				68
	3.12	Constructability Review																					40				40
	3.13	Public Meeting/Outreach Support	8	8		8		20	20	8																	72
Task 3		Subtotal	18	58	220	292	592	604	700	16	0	8	4	24	56	160	80	160	12	8	20	116	0	0	116	3,264	
95% PS&E (DOE)																											
	4.01	Supplemental Design Standard Decision Document		20		4	8	8	8																		48
	4.02	Design Plan Sheets																									0
		Highway Design Plan Sheets																									0
		Title, Typical, Key Map, Layout, Profiles	2			8	16	24	16																		66
		Construction Details	2			8	24	32	16																		82
		Temp. Water Pollution Control Plan & Details				4	8	8	8																		28
		Contour Grading				4	8	8	8																		28
		Drainage Plans/Profiles/Details/Quantities				8	24	24	16																		72
		Utility Plans	2		20	8	16	16	40																		102
		Water Plans/Profiles/Details/Quantities				8	40	40	16																		104
		Construction Area Signs/Details/Quantities				4	8	8	8																		28
		Stage Construction Plans & Details	2			8	8	8	8																		34
		Traffic Handling Plans/Details/Quantities				10	32	40	24																		106
		Pavement Delineation Plans/Details/Quantities				8	24	16	8																		56
		Sign Plans/Details/Quantities				8	24	16	8																		56
		Summary of Quantities				4	12	16	8																		40
		Retaining Wall Plan/Details/Quantities				4	12	8	8																		32
		Highway Planting Plans				4	8	8	8																		28
		Electrical Plans				20	4	24	16	20																	84
		Structure Design Plan Sheets																									0
		Nonstandard Retaining Walls (Total 2)													24	60		80	8								172
	4.03	Specifications and Special Provisions																									0
		Highway Specifications and Special Provisions	2	4	40					8																	54
		Structure Specifications and Special Provisions														24											24
	4.04	Update Design Reports		20		4	4			8		8	4	12													60
	4.05	Quantities and Cost Estimate																									0
		Highway Quantities and Cost Estimate				4	16	16																			36
		Structure Quantities and Cost Estimate															30										30
	4.06	Construction Schedule	2																				16				18
	4.07	Draft PS&E Forms				8	8																				16
	4.08	QC Review				16	16	16															40				88
	4.09	Independent Design Check - Structures															100										100
Task 4		Subtotal	12	44	80	138	340	328	228	16	0	8	4	12	24	84	130	80	8	0	0	56	0	0	0	1,592	
100% PS&E																											
	5.01	Plans, Specifications and Estimates																									0
		Highway Plans	8		40	24	40	40	40																		192
		Highway Specifications	4		40																						44
		Highway Estimates				4	8	8																			20
		Structure Plans													8	16		8									32
		Structure Specifications														8											8
		Structure Estimates															8										8
		Structure Independent Check															8										8
	5.02	Update Design Reports								8		8	4	12			8										52
	5.03	Permits		8						4																	12
	5.04	Resident Engineer's File																									0
		Highway RE File				8		40	40																		88
		Structure RE File													8	4		8									20
	5.05	PS&E Forms and Approval		4		4		8																			16
	5.06	QC Review				8	8	8	8														40				72
Task 5		Subtotal	12	32	80	48	56	104	88	12	0	8	4	12	16	28	16	16	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	572	

City of Mountain View
NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-ramp Realignment, Project 19-59

WBS Code	Task ID	DELIVERABLE	SUBCONSULTANTS					ODCs								TOTAL
			Landscape Architect	RJA	Best Testaba (Utility Pathology)	Cal Safety	Total	Environmental Drilling	Environmental Testing	Environmental Traffic	Geotech Drilling	Geotech Testing	Geotech Traffic	Misc. Printing	Postage, Travel, Misc.	
	3.05.02	Structure Design Plans/Calculations					0									
		Nonstandard Retaining Walls (Total 2)					0									
	3.05.03	Utility Relocation/Occupation Plans					0									
	3.06	Specifications and Special Provisions					0									
		Highway Specs	20				20									
		Structure Specs					0									
	3.07	Update Design Reports					0									
	3.08	Quantities and Cost Estimate (Hwy)					0									
	3.09	Construction Schedule					0									
	3.10	Draft PS&E Forms					0									
	3.11	QC Review					0									
	3.12	Constructability Review					0									
	3.13	Public Meeting/Outreach Support					0									\$ 500
Task 3		Subtotal	140	0	0	0	140	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 500
95% PS&E (DOE)																
	4.01	Supplemental Design Standard Decision Document					0									
	4.02	Design Plan Sheets					0									
		Highway Design Plan Sheets					0									
		Title, Typicals, Key Map, Layout, Profiles					0								\$1,000	
		Construction Details					0									
		Temp Water Pollution Control Plan & Details					0									
		Contour Grading					0									
		Drainage Plans/Profiles/Details/Quantities					0									
		Utility Plans					0									
		Water Plans/Profiles/Details/Quantities					0									
		Construction Area Signs/Details/Quantities					0									
		Stage Construction Plans & Details					0									
		Traffic Handling Plans/Details/Quantities					0									
		Pavement Delineation Plans/Details/Quantities					0									
		Sign Plans/Details/Quantities					0									
		Summary of Quantities					0									
		Retaining Wall Plan/Details/Quantities					0									
		Highway Planting Plans	80				80									
		Electrical Plans					0									
		Structure Design Plan Sheets					0									
		Nonstandard Retaining Walls (Total 2)					0									
	4.03	Specifications and Special Provisions					0									
		Highway Specifications and Special Provisions	20				20									
	4.04	Structure Specifications and Special Provisions					0									
	4.05	Update Design Reports					0									
		Quantities and Cost Estimate					0									
		Highway Quantities and Cost Estimate					0									
		Structure Quantities and Cost Estimate					0									
	4.06	Construction Schedule					0									
	4.07	Draft PS&E Forms					0									
	4.08	QC Review					0									
	4.09	Independent Design Check - Structures					0									
Task 4		Subtotal	100	0	0	0	100	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -
100% PS&E																
	5.01	Plans, Specifications and Estimates					0									
		Highway Plans	80				80								\$1,000	
		Highway Specifications	10				10									
		Highway Estimates					0									
		Structure Plans					0									
		Structure Specifications					0									
		Structure Estimates					0									
		Structure Independent Check					0									
	5.02	Update Design Reports					0									
	5.03	Permits					0									
	5.04	Resident Engineer's File					0									
		Highway RE File					0									
		Structure RE File					0									
	5.05	PS&E Forms and Approval					0									
	5.06	QC Review					0									
Task 5		Subtotal	90	0	0	0	90	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -

City of Mountain View
NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-ramp Realignment, Project 19-59

WBS Code	Task ID	DELIVERABLE	Project Manager	DPM/Highway Design Manager	Senior Utility/Specs Engineer	Sr. Project Engineer	Project Engineer	Staff Engineer	CAD	Admin	Project Controls	Geotechnical Manager	Geotechnical Sr. Engineer	Geotechnical Engineer	Bridge Manager	Sr. Bridge Engineer	Bridge Engineer	Bridge CAD	Bridge QA/QC	Traffic Manager	Sr. Traffic Engineer	Sr. Coret Engineer/OA Manager	Sr. Env Professional	Env Professional	Survey Manager / Senior Land Surveyor	AECOM LABOR TOTAL	
FINAL PS&E																											
	6.01	Bid Documents																									0
		Caltrans District Review (Hwy)	2	8	8	40	16	16	8																		98
		Structure Efforts													16												16
	6.02	Resident Engineers' File				2	4	8	8																		22
	6.03	Survey File				2	4	8	8																	8	30
Task 6		Subtotal	2	8	8	44	24	32	24	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	166	
Right of Way Support																											
	7.01	Utility Coordination & EPVR		2	40				20																		62
	7.02	Right of Way Needs	2	2		40			40																8	92	
	7.03	Boundary Surveys and Land Net																									90
	7.04	Field Locate Right of Way																							40	40	
	7.05	Appraisal Mapping Sheets	1	2					80																36	119	
	7.06	Plats and Legals																							60	62	
	7.07	Right of Way Certification	1	4																					8	13	
	7.08	Utility Certification		2	16																					18	
	7.09	VTA Right of Entry		4																						4	
Task 7		Subtotal	4	18	56	40	0	0	140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	242	500	
Bid Support																											
	8.01	Bidding Assistance	2	8		20																				30	
	8.02	Addendum		4		8			8													4				24	
Task 8		Subtotal	2	12	0	28	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	54	
DSDC																											
	9.01	Construction Meetings (up to 4)	2	8		4																				14	
	9.02	Site visits (up to 4)		2		8	8																			18	
	9.03	RFI	2	20		20	40								2	4	8								8	104	
	9.04	CCO		8		20	40		40													4				112	
	9.05	As-built		2		4			40						2	4	8						4		2	66	
	9.06	Traffic Signal Timing Plan		4		80			20											4	20					128	
Task 9		Subtotal	4	44	0	136	88	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	16	0	0	4	20	8	0	0	10	442	
Right-of-way Closeout																											
	10.01	Right-of-way Closeout	2	8							2															230	
Task 10		Subtotal	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	
Total Project Hours			210	528	484	778	1,308	1,212	1,356	80	22	128	52	228	128	280	242	256	20	36	160	256	20	120	868	8,772	
TOTAL HOURS BY PERCENT			2.4%	6.0%	5.5%	8.9%	14.9%	13.8%	15.5%	0.9%	0.3%	1.5%	0.6%	2.6%	1.5%	3.2%	2.8%	2.9%	0.2%	0.4%	1.8%	2.9%	0.2%	1.4%	9.9%	100.0%	

Rates are average staff rates. Actual rates are based on pay at time of service.

City of Mountain View
NB Shoreline Boulevard and 101 Off-ramp Realignment, Project 19-59

WBS Code	Task ID	DELIVERABLE	SUBCONSULTANTS					ODCs								TOTAL		
			Landscape Architect	RJA	Best Testabca (Utility Pathology)	Cal Safety	Total	Environmental Drilling	Environmental Testing	Environmental Traffic	Geotech Drilling	Geotech Testing	Geotech Traffic	Misc. Printing	Postage, Travel, Misc.			
FINAL PS&E																		
	6.01	Bid Documents																
		Caltrans District Review (Hwy)														\$ 300	\$ 18,083	
		Structure Efforts															\$ 4,808	
	6.02	Resident Engineers' File															\$ 2,998	
	6.03	Survey File															\$ 4,468	
Task 6		Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 30,357
Right of Way Support																		
	7.01	Utility Coordination & EPVR															\$ 11,962	
	7.02	Right of Way Needs															\$ 16,407	
	7.03	Boundary Surveys and Land Net															\$ 16,536	
	7.04	Field Locate Right of Way															\$ 7,349	
	7.05	Appraisal Mapping Sheets															\$ 19,215	
	7.06	Plats and Legals															\$ 11,592	
	7.07	Right of Way Certification															\$ 3,011	
	7.08	Utility Certification															\$ 3,963	
	7.09	VTA Right of Entry															\$ 1,135	
Task 7		Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91,170
Bid Support																		
	8.01	Bidding Assistance		8				8								\$ 100	\$ 8,557	
	8.02	Addendum						0									\$ 4,828	
Task 8		Subtotal	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100	\$ 13,385	
DSDC																		
	9.01	Construction Meetings (up to 4)						0								\$ 220	\$ 4,083	
	9.02	Site visits (up to 4)		8				8								\$ 250	\$ 5,065	
	9.03	RFI						0								\$ 500	\$ 20,904	
	9.04	CCO						0									\$ 18,893	
	9.05	As-built						0									\$ 11,109	
	9.06	Traffic Signal Timing Plan						0								\$ 100	\$ 23,858	
Task 9		Subtotal	8	0	0	0	0	8	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,070	\$ 83,912	
Right-of-way Closeout																		
	10.01	Right-of-way Closeout		40				40								\$ 2,638	\$ 55,687	
Task 10		Subtotal	0	40	0	0	0	40	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,638	\$ 55,687	
Total Project Hours			426	160	217	75	878	\$3,500	\$5,500	\$1,500	\$7,200	\$22,500	\$5,000	\$4,300	\$12,008		\$ 1,765,000	
TOTAL HOURS BY PERCENT			48.5%	18.2%	24.7%	8.5%												
TASK 11 ADDITIONAL SERVICES															\$ 100,000			
GRAND TOTAL															\$ 1,865,000			

Rates are average staff rates. Actual rates are based on pay at time of service.