

STATE ROUTE 4 BYPASS AUTHORITY
Antioch - Brentwood - Oakley and Contra Costa County

A JOINT EXERCISE OF POWERS AGENCY

MINUTES
November 13, 2003

The STATE ROUTE 4 BYPASS AUTHORITY meeting was called to order in the Brentwood City Council Chambers at 734 Third Street, Brentwood, California by Chair Donald Freitas at 6:56 P.M. and immediately adjourned into Closed Session to consider the following:

A. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS

Property: McBail Homes Development Property (Lone Tree Way, Antioch)
Agency Negotiators: Dale Dennis, Debra Baker
Negotiating Parties: State Route 4 Bypass Authority, McBail Company and Del Prado Co.
Under Negotiation: Instruction to negotiators to concern price and terms of payment

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Annette Beckstrand (Brentwood), Federal Glover (Contra Costa County), Brad Nix (Oakley), and Chair Donald Freitas (Antioch)

ABSENT: None

STAFF: Dale Dennis, Project Manager

Chair Freitas reconvened the meeting at 7:38 P.M. and reported that all Boardmembers were present in Closed Session with the Authority's Real Property Negotiators, where-by a vote of 3-1, with the dissenting being Chair Freitas, the Authority had approved an agreement for a Right of Way (ROW) Contract to acquire the property described in the Contract from McBail Company and Del Prado Co., LLC, as well as the ancillary documents and actions needed to consummate the acquisition, including the execution of the ROW Contract by the Board Chair on behalf of the Authority, the execution of a license for the use by McBail Company or a portion of the property being acquired, acceptance and recordation of the Grant Deeds, and payment of the purchase price and authorization to the Auditor-Controller to issue a check in the amount of the purchase price and deliver it to the County Real Property Division for delivery into escrow.

Chair Freitas advised that was the essence of agreement needed for the construction of the State Route 4 Bypass.

DETERMINATION ITEMS

A. APPROVE Minutes of October 9, 2003 Meeting

On motion by Federal Glover, seconded by Brad Nix, members of the Authority unanimously APPROVED the minutes of the October 9, 2003 meeting, as submitted.

B. ACCEPT Status Report on the SR4 Bypass Project

Mr. Dennis advised that each month he would offer an update on moving forward with the SR4 Bypass Project. He reported that on the environmental side there was a separate item to address the recent Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that was being prepared. From the design perspective, he reported that the process was moving forward and was on schedule. The next submittal for the design of construction Package 1 of Segment 1 would be in December 2003. The 50 percent design for Package 2 was due in late January 2004 and the 65 percent design of Segment 3 was scheduled for April 2004. The process was still moving forward and was still on schedule.

Mr. Dennis added that the current effort was to move forward with utility relocations and permits, which were typically some of the more arduous tasks and ones that could have schedule impacts. He explained that the utility relocations were being fast tracked. In the next few months the ROW required would be finalized and staff would move forward with ROW acquisition for the balance of the project. He mentioned that a separate item would allow the Laurel Road Extension to proceed, to be included as an alternate bid item to be included in the bid package that would be advertised in December 2004.

Mr. Dennis described some outstanding issues with local jurisdictions, such as the sinkhole issue where there had been some failure and where staff was working with City of Antioch staff to address. He noted that there had been a difference of opinion as to the cause of the sinkholes. The City of Antioch was having an analysis performed by its consultant. Once the report was received from the City of Antioch, staff would review it and determine the next steps to be taken to resolve the issue.

Another issue that would need to be addressed was identified as the water-line that had been installed as part of Lone Tree Way improvements, which had failed to produce the adequate amount of pressure. A failure within the improvements constructed for the SR4 Bypass Authority had been discovered. The contractor had been put on notice for a warranty issue. While that contractor had not taken responsibility for that situation, staff was working with the City of Brentwood and the contractor to reach some resolution. The City of Brentwood had completed repair work and the repair had been estimated to cost \$70,000 to \$80,000. Staff would periodically update the Board on the status of that situation. The rest of the project was moving on schedule.

Mr. Dennis also noted that as requested by Brad Nix, he had evaluated the Balfour Road

Intersection to determine how that would work in the future. He offered exhibits of how that would work. While it looked tight he suggested that there was sufficient ROW to build an interchange at Balfour Road. He otherwise noted the constraints associated with the site and explained that there was a pumping station in the interchange, which was an issue that would have to be addressed when a full interchange was constructed in the future. He suggested leaving it in the loop as an issue that Caltrans would have to consider, although he advised that the relocation of that pumping station could cost \$10 million.

Brad Nix expressed concern with the Bypass as it traveled north. He referred to areas where houses had been constructed and where there was an elevation change that would be a concern. He reiterated his concerns for the area between Balfour and Sand Creek Roads where an eight-lane roadway might not be possible.

Mr. Dennis reported that Mark Thomas had evaluated that situation and there was room to build eight lanes. He referenced a number of factors that might be misleading related to the location of existing lanes (No. 2 and No. 3 lanes), the potential encroachment of a community wall within the ROW and the potential need for retaining walls. In addition, he explained that even with the eight-lane facility, there was sufficient room for a median for transit. While some expensive retaining walls might be required with the transit component, no houses would have to be removed. He reiterated, when asked by Mr. Nix, that there was sufficient room for eight lanes plus a transit median wide enough for BART at 45 feet in width.

In response to Annette Beckstrand, Mr. Dennis explained that there was one location within the Bypass where a sound wall had been constructed on Bypass Authority property and not on the home owners property. Staff was dealing with that issue and planned to sell back the two feet involved.

Brad Nix emphasized that the two-foot encroachment referenced by Mr. Dennis should not be sold back until the Board had discussed the issue.

Federal Glover agreed with the need for a field trip to be apprised of the situation. He was not comfortable with the situation. He questioned the alignment as it traveled north. Mr. Dennis agreed to schedule a field trip for the board to review the project in the field.

Brad Nix stated that he had asked for blueprints to show where the lanes would be located given the limited space available.

With respect to another aspect of the project, Mr. Dennis stated that there was a piece of correspondence in response to a request last month of understanding what had been accomplished by the County Public Works Department (PWD) over the last few years. Mr. Dennis advised that if there were questions, he requested they be asked at this time so that PWD staff could leave.

Chair Freitas referred to the November 4, 2003 letter from the County PWD.

With respect to PWD staff, Annette Beckstrand referred to traveling east going west in front of the Slatten Ranch project in front of Jeffrey Way, where a sign identifying the SR4 Bypass had been placed and where there was no Bypass access at that location. Given the confusion created by that sign she explained how cars had been maneuvering in and then out of the left turn lane for Jeffrey Way. As a result and given the safety concerns created by that misleading sign, she urged that the sign be removed. She commented that it looked as if the sign was marking the north on ramp that did not yet exist. She requested that staff check to ensure that there were no other similar signs creating confusion in the area of the Bypass.

Brad Nix agreed with the dangerous situation, stated that he had been confused by that same sign and emphasized the liability concern.

City of Antioch Traffic Engineer Ed Franzen volunteered to have the removable sign panels removed.

Mr. Dennis stated that he would work with City of Antioch staff to correct that situation.

Annette Beckstrand stated that in the past the Board had asked to be provided a more comprehensive status of the Bypass budget.

Mr. Dennis stated that staff was working to provide that information to the Board and would plan to bring a revised budget back to the Board in December or January 2004.

With regards to the November 4 letter, Chair Freitas referred to the bullet on the second page: "Multiple alignments and interchange/intersection alternatives were studied at the direction of Authority staff and we ended up with a different precise alignment. The final alignment was an iterative process that took time and money to develop." While he understood the process he suggested that was repetitive. He also referred to the bullet: "Ultimate Geometric Approval Drawings (GADs) were submitted to Caltrans and approved by Caltrans. The changing of the horizontal alignment and various interchange alternatives evaluated in the planning process required the ultimate geometrics to be modified numerous times before the final ultimate GAD was submitted."

On Page 3, Chair Freitas referenced the bullet: "Numerous alignment alternatives for March Creek Road were studied and its intersection with SR4BP analyzed before staff could design the 4-mile east-west connector."

Chair Freitas further noted the statement that "During the preliminary design process there were numerous changes to the traffic projections requiring updates to the traffic report

prepared by the Authority's traffic consultant. This required design staff to redesign complete interchanges and intersections each time the report was updated, which added many additional hours of labor not normally anticipated at the preliminary design stage.”

Chair Freitas noted that throughout the document the purpose was to avoid reconstruction change orders, although he suggested that the narrative had indicated that had been the constant throughout the process. While he appreciated the information, his concern was that in each bullet that was almost a task-oriented subject. He wanted to know how much money was being spent doing the numerous multiple change orders. It seemed extraordinary to him that things kept on being repeated again and again. He did not understand the numerous changes in the traffic projections and he questioned the basis for those changes.

Mr. Dennis commented that he had not been involved in the project at that time. He noted that the actual money spent was \$700,000 over the specified period of time and that \$1.18 million had been spent to date, with approximately \$500,000 spent on the 35 percent design. With respect to the changing alignments, he explained that was in the planning process.

Offering an example, Gary Huisingh noted that an interchange layout for the Bypass in Marsh Creek Road would be evaluated at one location and the PWD would be asked to look somewhere else. As a result, there was a lot of moving around to get to the ultimate GAD. He noted that each time an interchange had to be moved the ramps, the elevations and other issues were involved and there was significant work at the planning stage as a result. He commented that one alignment would have impacted a large oak tree, and while not a registered oak it was a tree over a hundred years old. The alignment had been changed in that case to preserve that tree. He added that there had been numerous alignments evaluated in the process.

Chair Freitas inquired what staff was doing institutionally to make sure that would not occur again, to which Mr. Dennis stated that it was a project that had been in process four to five years and when a project takes that long to deliver, circumstances would change. He indicated the approach staff was taking now to ensure that would not occur. An aggressive schedule had been developed and staff was working with Caltrans and local jurisdictions to move the project forward expeditiously, which was the best way to design and construct a project in a cost effective manner.

C. ACCEPT Status Report on the Camino Diablo/Vasco Road Project

Mr. Dennis offered a quick update on the progress of the Camino Diablo/Vasco Road project. He advised that the project consultants were available to respond to questions. Mr. Dennis distributed a summary of the change orders to date. As a summary, he reminded the Board that the agreement entered into the JPA had a \$1.7 million budget

for the project construction and construction management services (CM) and an engineer's estimate of \$1.1 million for construction. The low bid had come in at approximately \$716,000, including the projected \$20,000 in change orders to date, the overall construction cost would be under \$740,000 (not including CM). There had been \$5,000 in change orders identified to date and a planned change order to open all the lanes that were currently being discussed with the contractor at an estimated cost of around \$16,000.

Mr. Dennis reported that the project had moved quickly and that all pavement and work was expected to be completed by the end of November or the first part of December. The outstanding issue was installing the signal poles. The projected timeline for that work was February or March 2004 (depending on weather).

Mr. Dennis reported that County PWD had been working with the contractor to get all the lanes opened as soon as possible.

Rick Deml, Resident Engineer/Project Manager, Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc. advised that the original staging of the project would widen out the roadway on both sides of Vasco Road and wait for the signals to be installed at a later point in time. With that approach, the second through lane in each direction would not be utilized for several months.

Mr. Deml explained that when he had been out in the field he had noticed that the poles were outside the future travel way. He suggested that the second through lane could be opened if protective measures were put in place for the existing poles so that the public could utilize what looked like the final project at this point in time. He was now working with the contractor to define those protective measures. Paving was scheduled Monday through Wednesday during the week of November 17. If the weather held, he stated that the second lane could be open within a week to hopefully ease congestion. He distributed a written update to the Board.

Mr. Dennis noted that the project was scheduled to proceed next spring, although through acceleration, the project could be completed this fall seven to eight months early.

Federal Glover emphasized that was what the Board wanted to see from all of the projects. He congratulated all those involved in the cost and time savings.

Mr. Dennis stated that County PWD should receive a lot of the credit and was handling the construction management of the project and had also been working to facilitate the early opening of the lanes.

D. APPROVAL Recommended for the Following Amendments to Existing Consulting Services Agreements Related to the Advanced Placement of

Segment 1 Roadway Embankment Material by OC Jones in the Lone Tree Way Interchange Area, and AUTHORIZE the Secretary or his Designee to Sign Them on Behalf of the Authority

1. Mark Thomas and Company in the Amount of \$14,600 for Engineering Design Services
2. Parikh Consultants in the Amount of \$17,500 for Geotechnical Testing Services
3. Harris and Associates in the Amount of \$10,000 for Construction Inspection Services

Mr. Dennis noted that the item had been discussed at the last meeting and this was where staff had the opportunity to accept approximately 50,000 cubic yards of dirt, to be placed south of Lone Tree Way, essentially for free. On additional benefit was the dirt was being brought from one side of the Bypass to the other and not across Lone Tree Way. He had reported last month that he would return with contract change orders to address the consultants work. Of the amendments, he noted that the work being conducted by Parikh Consultants related to geotechnical testing and Harris and Associates related to construction inspection services would have been a cost to the project whenever the dirt was placed. However, he stated that the engineering work was additional work. Therefore, overall, for an additional cost of approximately \$15,000 the project received a benefit of \$200,000 to \$300,000 worth of work.

Chair Freitas referenced the situation related to the Los Vaqueros Reservoir project where soils turned out to be corrosive. As such, he questioned whether or not the soils had been tested.

Mr. Dennis reported that last month there had been a \$3,000 component to the Amendment for Taber for testing the dirt. In fact, some corrosivity had been found. The dirt was being placed so that it would be five feet below finished grade and thereby would not be in contact with structures and would not create a problem.

On motion by Federal Glover, seconded by Brad Nix, members of the Authority unanimously APPROVED the following amendments to existing Consulting Services Agreements related to the advanced placement of Segment 1 roadway embankment material (free dirt) by OC Jones in the Lone Tree Way Interchange area, and AUTHORIZED the Secretary or his designee to sign them for an estimated cost savings to the Authority between \$220,000 and \$300,000.

1. Mark Thomas and Company in the Amount of \$14,600 for Engineering Design Services

2. Parikh Consultants in the Amount of \$17,500 for Geotechnical Testing Services
 3. Harris and Associates in the Amount of \$10,000 for Construction Inspection Services
- E. The following actions were recommended:
1. APPROVE an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the State Route 4 Bypass for the Construction of Segment 1
 2. APPROVE the Construction of Segment 1- Packages 1 and 2 of the State Route 4 Bypass from the SR4/SR160 Interchange to Lone Tree Way and DIRECT the Project Manager to Continue to Take the Necessary Actions for the Construction of Package 1 in 2004 and Package 2 in 2005

Mr. Dennis distributed a handout to identify a change to the Addendum. The change simply indicated the WAPA power line would be relocated to the south side of the canal instead of the north side.

Mr. Dennis reported that the environmental studies had been updated and was a key issue in the construction of Segment 1 to ensure that the current environmental situation had been addressed. He explained that the only significant issues out of the Addendum to the EIR were that it had been determined that sound walls would have to be included in a couple of locations with respect to the Bypass, which had been somewhat discussed last month. Sound studies had indicated the need to construct a sound wall where the Bypass comes out of the cut into the hillside. The sound wall would continue to be constructed down to the Laurel Road interchange to provide sound attenuation for homes in Oakley. He added that a petition had been submitted that included a number of signatures requesting such a sound wall.

One of the things that would need to be acknowledged was that when it was only proposed as a four lane facility there had not been an expectation that a sound wall would be constructed until the connector ramp had been constructed from SR4 east to SR160 north. There was an understanding that any developments after the Bypass would construct their own walls. The County had approved a development in the area prior to the SR4 Bypass Authority. As such, the responsibility of providing that noise attenuation would fall on the Bypass Authority requiring additional design and higher construction costs.

Mr. Dennis explained that the other area where sound walls would be required on a development approved prior to the environmental was the Nelson Ranch property. The conditions within that development agreement actually required the developer to conduct noise studies and to construct the wall. While that would continue to be pursued, Mr. Dennis noted that the sound wall would be expensive in that situation and the cost might be an issue. He stated that the City of

Antioch was moving forward have the developer either construct or pay for the wall.

Chair Freitas noted that the developer was also being required to dedicate all the necessary ROW for the SR4 Bypass.

Brad Nix sought a clarification of where the sound wall would begin and end in relation to its location adjacent to Oakley, which Mr. Dennis presented and explained where the same height of the cut of the hill would be maintained.

As to plans for landscaping, Mr. Dennis stated that there were no current plans for landscaping for Segment 1. He stated that issues had been raised by the homeowners at the meeting with respect to landscaping between the Bypass and the adjacent properties. He indicated this issue had been raised with Caltrans. Caltrans was considering that request given long-term maintenance issues within the ROW. He added that Caltrans had certain standards that were generally acceptable.

Mr. Nix expressed concern with landscaping for screening purposes.

Laurie Blake, Regional Project Manager, Project Management-East Region for Caltrans District 4, reported that Caltrans was looking to address the issues with respect to landscaping. She could have the Project Manager for Caltrans follow up with Authority staff to address that issue.

Brad Nix emphasized the strong public requests for that landscaping. He requested that Caltrans evaluate that issue and address it. He sought some sort of low water maintenance operation of trees and bushes that would grow to a natural height and require little maintenance but which would soften the wall.

Mr. Dennis stated that staff could pursue that issue with Caltrans.

Chair Freitas stated that one of the things being required on all SR4 East projects that the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) was working on with Caltrans was the planting of plant material, such as ivy or clinging vines to soften the appearance of retaining walls on the highway side.

On another issue, Mr. Dennis reiterated that the other minor change that had taken place with respect to the relocation of Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) facilities was that the facilities would be relocated above the roadway on the south side of the Contra Costa Canal. When following through with some of the preliminary engineering, it had been determined that they would have to be relocated to the south of the canal instead of the north side.

Mr. Dennis recommended the approval of the Addendum with the change as presented.

On motion by Brad Nix, seconded by Federal Glover, members of the Authority unanimously APPROVED an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the State Route 4 Bypass for the construction of Segment 1 and APPROVED the construction of Segment 1 - Packages 1 and 2 of the State Route 4 Bypass from the SR4/SR160 Interchange to Lone Tree Way and DIRECTED the Project Manager to continue to take the necessary actions for the construction of Package 1 in 2004 and Package 2 in 2005.

F. APPROVE Utility Relocation Agreement (No. SNR-RA-TCC04-01) Between the Authority and the United States Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration Related to the Relocation of Aboveground Electrical Facilities in Segment 1, and AUTHORIZE the Secretary or his Designee to Sign on it on Behalf of the Authority

Mr. Dennis identified the critical utilities that needed to be relocated. He stated that the approval of the Addendum was required to allow them to move forward with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document. In addition, the WAPA line needed to be relocated prior to the Contra Costa Water District's (CCWD's) culvert work. The WAPA relocation is planned to be completed by June 2004 and CCWD box culvert work is planned to be completed in August/September 2004.

Mr. Dennis highlighted some changes to the Agreement identified in the staff report and explained that the WAPA power line would need to be relocated to the south side of the canal, but in doing so, there may be some impacts to the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) bike path. As such he explained that the Agreement had been modified to include a paragraph requiring coordination with regard to the EBRPD bike path, and coordination with the CCWD 2.4 kv transmission line. Another change to the Agreement had related to cost. The last page of the exhibit included in the staff report presented a detailed breakdown of the cost of the relocation.

In response to the Chair, Mr. Dennis reported that the poles were estimated to be 70 to 80 feet tall and could not be installed adjacent to the existing line. It was therefore best to move the facilities to the south side. Either way, he explained that the same amount of construction was involved.

Chair Freitas stated that the WAPA 69kv lines were unattractive and sometimes conflicted with a city's desire for development. He asked whether or not Mr. Dennis had discussed that issue with the cities of Antioch and Oakley to keep those jurisdictions aware of the appearance of the lines.

On the question of undergrounding, Mr. Dennis reported that because of the high voltage, a 69 kv line could not be undergrounded.

Brad Nix referred to the dollar figures on the contracts and inquired how those figures compared with the original estimates, to which Mr. Dennis advised that staff had not developed estimates prior to receiving these estimates. Typically utility companies relocated their own facilities and the cost would depend upon the actual cost of relocation.

Brad Nix emphasized the need for estimates; simply as a good business practice to track costs.

Federal Glover agreed and noted that the Authority Board had been outraged at some of the costs.

Chair Freitas concurred and commented that there seemed to be a new item presented by staff each month. He stated that the Board had placed a tremendous amount of trust in staff and in some respects that trust had been misguided.

Mr. Dennis advised that staff was in the process of reviewing all of the contracts to develop a complete budget spreadsheet for each project in the area of construction, ROW and utilities. That spreadsheet was currently being prepared.

Chair Freitas emphasized that there was no way to measure effectiveness without a timeline and spreadsheet budget.

On motion by Federal Glover, seconded by Brad Nix, members of the Authority unanimously APPROVED Utility Relocation Agreement (No. SNR-RA-TCC04-01) between the Authority and the United States Department of Energy, Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) for the relocation of aboveground electrical facilities in Segment 1, and AUTHORIZED the Secretary or his designee to sign it on behalf of the Authority.

G. APPROVE an Amendment to the Existing Agreement for Cost Reimbursement Between the Authority and the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) in the Estimated Amount of \$722,000 to Reimburse CCWD for Costs Related to the Construction of a Box Culvert for the CCWD Canal Impacted by the Segment 1 Project and AUTHORIZE the Secretary or his Designee to Sign on it on Behalf of the Authority

Mr. Dennis distributed last minute changes and explained that other than word engineering, CCWD staff had requested a modification to Item 6, paragraph c) on Page 2 where a 100 percent deposit of the low bid plus 10 percent for construction change orders in a lump sum had been requested in lieu of the original 25 percent deposit. The basis for the request was that the work was only expected to take 30 to 60 days to complete once the contractor had been brought on board.

Mr. Dennis stated that the numbers were the same as last time with the \$722,000 budget and he reminded the Board that CCWD had agreed to cap its administrative costs at \$20,000, but the engineering and construction costs were estimated costs. He added that the CCWD was in the process of retaining an engineering firm to do the design.

Federal Glover thanked Chair Freitas for his work in the cost savings involved with the project due to the Chair's due diligence.

On motion by Federal Glover, seconded by Brad Nix, members of the Authority unanimously APPROVED an Amendment to the existing Agreement for Cost Reimbursement between the Authority and the Contra Costa Water District (CCWD) in the estimated amount of \$722,000 to reimburse CCWD for costs related to the construction of a box culvert for the CCWD Canal impacted by the Segment 1 Project, and AUTHORIZED the Secretary or his designee to sign it on behalf of the Authority.

H. APPROVE a Consulting Services Agreement Amendment with Mark Thomas and Company Inc. to Increase the Payment Limit by \$1,179,938 to a Total Not-to-exceed Amount of \$8,110,070 and Extend the Term to June 30, 2005, to Perform Engineering and Design Studies Including the Preparation of Plans, Specifications and Estimates Necessary to Construct the Laurel Road Extension, and AUTHORIZE the Secretary or his Designee to Sign on it on Behalf of the Authority

Mr. Dennis stated that the item was based on direction from the Board to move forward with the design of the Laurel Road Extension. He had negotiated the contract amendment with Mark Thomas. The current estimated construct cost was \$10.8 million. He stated that this amendment included budget for a new environmental document. He expected that the consultant would prepare a Negative Declaration as the appropriate level of document for the project. He added that he had worked with City of Oakley staff to review the scope and dollars and Oakley staff had been consulted in the process. He recommended approval of the amendment to the Mark Thomas Agreement.

On motion by Brad Nix, seconded by Annette Beckstrand, members of the Authority unanimously APPROVED a Consulting Services Agreement Amendment with Mark Thomas and Company Inc. to increase the payment limit by \$1,179,938 to a total not-to-exceed amount of \$8,110,070 and extended the term to June 30, 2005, to perform engineering and design studies including the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates necessary to construct the Laurel Road Extension, and AUTHORIZED the Secretary or his designee to sign it on behalf of the Authority.

I. AUTHORIZE the Project Manager to Begin Negotiations with Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc. to Provide Construction Management Services for Segment 1, Construction Packages 1 and 2, and to Issue a Notice

to Proceed (NTP) for a Not-to-exceed Amount of \$20,000 for the Constructability Review for Construction Package 1.

Mr. Dennis stated that staff had gone through a selection process to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP), which had been issued last month. Eight proposals had been received. A selection panel with representatives from the cities of Oakley, Antioch and Brentwood and Caltrans had been convened to conduct the selection process. Four firms had been interviewed and one of the firms selected was present.

Mr. Dennis characterized the team as one of the best teams assembled for construction management work. He commented that the intent and part of the RFP was to ensure that the firm was brought on early enough to conduct a constructability review. He indicated the recommendation was for the Board to authorize staff to begin negotiations and issue an NTP for the constructability review for an amount not-to-exceed \$20,000.

On motion by Federal Glover, seconded by Brad Nix, members of the Authority unanimously AUTHORIZED the Project Manager to begin negotiations with Parsons Brinckerhoff Construction Services, Inc. to provide Construction Management Services for Segment 1, Construction Packages 1 and 2, and to issue a Notice to Proceed (NTP) for a not-to-exceed amount of \$20,000 for the constructability review for Construction Package 1.

MEMBER REPORTS

Chair Freitas expressed concern with the practice of providing information to Boardmembers at the meeting, which did not allow Boardmembers adequate time to review the information submitted. He urged staff to provide the necessary material to the Board in a timely manner prior to Board meetings.

Mr. Dennis acknowledged the request and indicated that staff would try to minimize handouts at the future Board meetings.

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. November 4, 2003 Letter from Contra Costa County Public Works, Design Division on Design Services to Date for Segment 3 of State Route 4 Bypass

The letter had been discussed earlier in the meeting.

Federal Glover sought a light agenda for the December 11 meeting. Brad Nix requested a status on the effort to evaluate transit to East County and whether staff had been able to meet with Tri Delta Transit staff, to which Mr. Dennis stated that he had scheduled a meeting next week with Tri Delta Transit staff. To date, efforts had included a meeting with CCTA staff and a review of some of the recently prepared

documents on this subject.

Mr. Nix asked that a status update be provided at the December 2003 meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the State Route 4 Bypass Authority, Chair Freitas adjourned the meeting at 8:38 P.M. to the next meeting on December 11, 2003.

ATTEST:

Anita L. Tucci-Smith
Minutes Clerk