



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TFL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL: info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Amy Rein Worth, Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

Dave Cortese, Vice Chair
Santa Clara County

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Jason Baker
Cities of Santa Clara County

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Mark Luce
Napa County and Cities

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Julie Pierce
Association of Bay Area Governments

Bijan Sartipi
California State
Transportation Agency

Libby Schaaf
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

James P. Spring
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Alix Bockelman
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

February 20, 2015

Mr. Richard Hall
Email: hallsomerset@yahoo.co.uk

RE: Clarifications to Email Questions Received February 5, 2015

Dear Mr. Hall:

Thank you for your continued interest in the I-580 Access Improvement Project. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Bay Area Toll Authority share your interest in opening a 3rd lane eastbound on Interstate 580 as quickly as possible, while still providing a safe facility for toll bridge users.

Questions and Clarifications:

- **What is this? "Section 9, Total Mobilization, Total Section 1-8: \$1,113,900 Is this a shuttle for bikes – can you please clarify?"**

Total Mobilization is defined in the Caltrans Standard Specifications, 2010 as "Preparatory work that must be performed or costs incurred before starting work on the various items on the job site." Caltrans pays for work completed at the job site on a monthly basis. Mobilization is an additional item that allows the contractor to bill the costs associated with starting the job. The contractor is required to exclude those costs from the other contract bid items. The estimates you were provided are conceptual level estimates that will continually be refined as the design progresses to a higher level of completion. The amount allocated for mobilization in these conceptual estimates is simply a flat percentage of the value of the construction items.

- **There are three different, divergent bike path costs: \$26.85m, \$36.25m and \$29m, how is this? Then there was the \$68 m from the last request. Which is correct? Why are the numbers so different?**

The estimates MTC provided to you on November 6, 2014 were based on the estimates used to develop the BATA budget for the project that was approved in June 2014. The \$68 million dollars that you cite assumes that the improved bicycle path in Richmond to/from Point Molate is required for the new path on the RSR Bridge upper deck. While the proposed path will certainly facilitate better access to the RSR bridge, the reason for including it in the project is to mitigate the loss of bicycle access to Point Molate caused by the proposed 3rd lane. Contra Costa County bicyclists have access to Point Molate today via the shoulders on Interstate 580. That access is protected by state law and must be maintained (see California Streets and Highway Code Section 888). This would be the case regardless of the

– more –

status of the bicycle pedestrian path on the upper deck of the bridge. The remaining \$53 million also included operational costs of nearly \$13 million assuming that a movable barrier system on the upper deck would be moved on a daily basis. The revised path configuration would not require that it be moved on a daily basis and would only be moved for specific Caltrans Maintenance activities (maybe 4-6 times a year). Those minimal activities are now assumed to be covered by Caltrans existing maintenance personnel. The \$13 million dollars long term operational costs were removed from the capital construction costs. Taking away both the Contra Costa path costs and operational costs leaves a total of \$40 million from the 2014 estimate. That \$40 million dollars included an annual escalation of 5% from a 2007 Draft PSR that was never approved by Caltrans. This escalation contributed \$10 million to the \$40 million dollar estimates. The 5% escalation was probably a poor assumption by BATA staff given the economic downturn between 2008 and 2012. The subsequent more detailed estimates provided to you last week seem to substantiate that poor assumption. This leaves a capital construction cost and capital outlay support cost of about \$30 million. This is not substantially different from the \$29 million dollars in the current estimate.

On the estimate for a third lane, you have likely noticed a significant increase. The largest increase is the cost of the Contra Costa County path connection to Point Molate. That path is now required as a mitigation due to the proposed 3rd eastbound lane. Another aspect of the cost increase for the third lane can be attributed to a more detailed understanding of the improvements that are being required by Caltrans at each end of the RSR Bridge to accommodate the 3rd eastbound lane (retaining wall reconstruction, on-ramp, and off-ramp modifications.)

- **How did the costs appear to change from \$68 million in just two months?**
The revised estimates take into account the changes that are described above in the second response.
- **Were the bridge security cameras dropped?**
The proposed CCTV cameras are to monitor traffic conditions and to mobilize Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) tow trucks and emergency response vehicles when there is a traffic incident on the bridge. These costs have not been included in the most recent estimates. Caltrans has not requested that security cameras be installed. These are changes from the 2007 estimate. The anticipated costs of the CCTV cameras are expected to be significantly less than the amount estimated for security cameras in the 2007 estimate. The cost of this technology has dropped rapidly since 2007.
- **In the original Nov 6th response there was a figure of \$15m for the loss of the bike path in Point Molate – What happened to this?**
The cost for the new path connection has been added to the cost of the 3rd eastbound lane. This has been the major reason for the cost increase associated with development of 3rd lane. California Streets and Highway Code Section 888 doesn't allow the lack of usage as a reason to eliminate non-motorized access, but this could be a topic for discussion with our elected officials.

- **The original costs included “support costs and 4 years escalation” do the costs you supplied also include these costs?**

The costs do include the support costs. Per the PDF file “RSRaccess-Cost Summary.pdf” that was e-mailed to you on February 5, 2015. The support costs have been estimated at a flat rate of 35% of the capital construction costs. Escalation is also included on page 11 of each of itemized estimates. The construction costs have been escalated to 2018 values, however the actual amount of escalation is significantly less than the amount in the June 2014 BATA budget estimate.

- **Last night Executive Director Dianne Steinhauser of the Transportation Authority of Marin spoke of an additional cost for a "movable barrier" to be used for the Richmond Bridge bike lane - where in this response is this referenced/acknowledged?**

The costs for the movable barrier itself are estimated to be \$6,784,800 on page 4 of the estimate in the PDF file, “Element3-UpperDeck_Path.pdf”. The costs on the Golden Gate Bridge have a significantly higher cost per linear foot due to the fact that the GGB barrier was a specially designed 12” wide steel barrier made specifically for the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District. The barrier currently estimated for the upper deck of the RSR Bridge is an “off the shelf” design. The cost for the 18” concrete barrier is about one third the cost of the 12” wide steel GGB barrier. The item that is not included in the estimates is the cost of the movable barrier transfer machine itself. That cost has been quoted as approximately \$700,000 for a refurbished machine and \$1.0 million for a new barrier transfer machine.

I hope these clarifications are useful to you. Congestion relief for Marin County and the quality of life improvements associated with completing a missing link in the Bay Trail are important improvements for the San Francisco Bay Region and for many motorists paying the toll required to cross the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge every day.

Sincerely,



Peter Lee
Principal, BATA Engineering

PL:CL