CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM City of Missoula CIP Project Request Form FY 2012-2016

| Program Category: | Project Title: | 10 Project # | 11 Project # | 12 Project # |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Parks, Recreation and Open Space | Fort Missoula Regional Park | PR-04 | PR-03 | PR-03 |

Description and justification of project and funding sources:

Development of Fort Missoula Regional Park meets the obligation and promises of the 1995 bond language which specifically named a regional park. The park will provide for active and passive and contemplative recreation, dog walkers, trail users, historians, and naturalists of all ages, abilities and backgrounds. The development can be phased and paid for through GO Bond, Federal funds, or mill levy, Impact fees, Cash in lieu and donations. Agreement with JTL (DBA Knife River) in 2002 granted the City an additional 86.5 acres. Total JT credits to Date: \$340,627.62.. Phase I & II of the Arch/Hist Research were completed and meet HPO and Federal 106 requirements.

The Master Site Plan originally adopted by City Council and County Commissioners in 2002 was revised with Design Development details (or 30% construction documents) and incorporates cultural resource mitigation in December 2008. Projected cost summary attached. Project costs do not include JTL/Knife River ponds or 17 acre triangle portion owned by the City. Council approved using \$40,000 of the JTL/Knife River credits to remove additional excess materials, rough grade, lower pipeline and create pad for composting wood waste.

DNRC Grant to explore economic feasibility of using wood waste product at Champion Mill site to create growth medium for FMRP was successful and grant request for additional \$300,000 for implementation of the grant is currently being considered at the State Legislature.

Friends of Fort Missoula Regional Park have recently reconvened with efforts moving forward on a new capital campaign. The group has met with members of the Mayor's Economic Development Team which supports the renewed effort. The FFMRP will continue to seek private funding for park development.

| Is this equipment prioritized on an equipment replacement schedule? | Yes | No | NA |
|---|-----|----|----|
| | | | х |

Are there any site requirements:

Refer to Fort Missoula Regional Park Site Plan

| | How is this project going to be funded: | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|------|------|-----------|------|------|---------|
| ш | Funding Source | Accounting Code | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | Years |
| 3 | Impact Fees | | | | 150,000 | | | 22,896 |
| 3 | DNRC Grant | | | | | | | 50,000 |
| 쀭 | Knife River Credits | | | | | | | 380,628 |
| | Federal Appropriations | | | | 3,047,885 | | | |
| | Donations/Misc | | | | 3,000,000 | | | |
| | | | - | - | 6,197,885 | - | - | 453,524 |

| | How is this project going to be spent: | | | | | | | Spent in Prior |
|-----|--|-----------------|------|------|-----------|------|------|----------------|
| | Budgeted Funds | Accounting Code | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | Years |
| ш | A. Land Cost | | | | | | | |
| SS | B. Construction Cost | | | | 3,061,143 | | | |
| 믭 | C. Contingencies (10% of B) | | | | 1,279,544 | | | |
| ı X | D. Design & Engineering (15% of B) | | | | | | | 40,000 |
| | E. Percent for Art (1% of B) | | | | 32,713 | | | |
| | F. Equipment Costs | | | | 210,118 | | | |
| | G. Other | | | | 1,614,367 | | | 72,896 |
| | | | - | - | 6,197,885 | - | - | 112,896 |

| | | Does this project have an | y additional impa | act on the operat | ing budget: | | | Spent in Prior |
|--------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|------|------|----------------|
| 2 | Expense Object | Accounting Code | FY12 | FY13 | FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | Years |
| OST | Personnel | | | | 5000 an acre | | | |
| S | Supplies | | | | | | | |
| BUDGET | Purchased Services | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Fixed Charges | | | | | | | |
| B | Capital Outlay | | | | | | | |
| ō | Debt Service | | | | | | | |
| F | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Description of additional operating budget impact: Estimated maintenance costs @ \$5,000 an acre, with total cost TBD by total acreage developed. Revenue from programming g may offset costs.

| Responsible Person: | Responsible Department: | Date Submitted to Finance | Todav's Date and Time | Preparer's Initials | Total Score |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| moopendible releasin | resoperiorate 2 spartiments | | roddy o Date and Time | a.e | . Ota: Occio |

| Donna Gaukler Parks & Red | eation | 4/6/2011 12:05 | КМ | 44 |
|---------------------------|--------|----------------|----|----|
|---------------------------|--------|----------------|----|----|

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM Project Rating

| Protes Received For Missoula Regional Park To Sale Park The Comments The Accessible to the handlesped. X a late proper recessary to fulfill a curre reactual requirement. Or general control park The comment doubte on the handlesped. X a late proper recessary to fulfill a curre reactual requirement of unit with the park to make the purpose of the park to the handlesped. X a late purpose recessary to fulfill a curre reactual requirement of unit with the comment column. A. Is this propect anywer measured. Will delay result in curtainment of an essential social or account of the park to the comment column. A. Does the propoci propide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be enseweded "No" under the park to the p | | | | / | Project Rating See C.I.P. Instructions For Explanation of Criteria) | | |
|--|--|--|-----------|--------------------------------|--|--------|----------------|
| and Open Space For Missious Regional Park Qualitative Analysis Yes No Comments 1. Is the project necessary to meet federal, same or local legal agreements. The content in includes projects mandated by Court 2. Is the project or meet seement of the content or includes projects an accessable to the handicapped. 2. Is the project or meessary to fulfill a content or includes project be accessable to the handicapped. 2. Is the project or meessary to fulfill a content or includes project or include the Content or name and number in the comment column. 3. Is this project ungently required? Will delay result in curtainment column. 3. Is this project ungently required? Will delay result in curtainment of an essential service. This statement should be checked? Yes "only if an omergrany is footiny indicated, otherwise, and where "Not." It "Yes", be sure to give full justification. 4. Does the project provide for ancibre improve public health and/or public safety? 5. Does the project sessit in maximum swelfer to the community from the project provide for ancibre improvements. If capital campaign rate 1-3 million, provided the community from the project provide result in season is a content or assert in season in the community from the project provide results and project in season in resistant makes the content or assert in season in resistant makes the content or assert in the community from the project require speecy may be a project required to make the speecy of the project required to make the speecy of the project required to make the speecy of the project required to make the speecy of th | Program Category: | Project T | itle: | (, | ne our mendenous for Explanation of Official | | 10 Project # |
| Is its the project necessary to meet federal, state, or food legislary intermets. This circle inclined by Court Outer Temperatures of law or other requirements. Of a pecial concerns is that the project be accessable to the handlaceped. 2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual anguirement? This criterion includes Pederal of State posts which require local participation, Indicate the Gentrame and number in the comment column. 3. Is the project processary to fulfill a contractual anguirement? This criterion includes Federal of State posts which require local participation, Indicate the Gentrame and number in the comment column. 3. Is the project processes and the comment column. 3. Is the project processes and the comment column. 4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or spublic safety? This content hould be entired that the provided of the community from the comment to child the anniversal that the project is suit in maximum beniefly to the community from the commu | · · | Fort Missoula Re | gional Pa | ırk | | | PR-03 |
| sale, or local legal requirements? This criterion includes projects amendated by Court Order to meet requirements. Of law or other requirements of law or other requirements. Of sale grants which require local participation, indicate the Gloral name and number in the common column. 3. Is this project ungently required? Will design the control of the control of the common column. 3. Is this project ungently required? Will design the control of the con | Qualitativ | e Analysis | Yes | No | Comments | | |
| 2. Is the project necessary to fulfill a contractual requirement? This criterion includes Faderal or State grants which require local participation, Incide the Grant rame and number in the comment column. 3. Is this project urgently required? Will devive the contraction of the second service of the contraction of the second service. This satisfacts though the checked Yes' only if an emergency is clearly indicated, view of an emergency indicated, view of an emergency is clearly indicated, view of an emergency indicated in early 2008 and in fail 2010 have demonstrated that approximately 70% of the citizens support paying creased taxes for park improvements. If capital campagn raise 1-3 million, private funds should leverage public funds. 5. Does the project require speedly implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? 6. Does the project require speedly implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or neutral resources, or reduce pollution? 8. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or neutral resources, or reduce pollution? 9. Does the project dependency of the project dependency of the project is a proper of the project of the | state, or local legal requ terion includes projects i Order to meet requireme | irements? This cri- mandated by Court ents of law or other | | x | | | |
| Toda of State participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column. 3. Is this project urgenty required? Will depart of the comment column. 3. Is this project urgenty required? Will depart of the comment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes only if an empragency is clearly rise-cated, otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification. 4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safely? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor. 5. Does the project tresult in maximum berrieff to the community from the investment dollar? 5. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? 6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? 8. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? 8. Does the project more or expand upon essential City services where such services as a recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective? 9. Does the project specifically relate to the maximum effective sears and effective? 9. Does the project specifically relate to the maximum effective sears and effective? 9. Does the project specifically relate to the facilities is well-documented. Availability of reactionnal facilities. 10. Master Park Plan: Goal 1.3 "Ensure that future demands are met through the development of new facilities is well-documented. Availability of reactionnal facilities." | | | | | | | |
| participation. Indicate the Grant name and number in the comment column. S. Is this project urgently required? Will delay result in cutaliment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "yes", be sure to give full justification. 4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or public safety? 5. Does the project result in maximum banelit to the community from the unvestment dollar? 5. Does the project result in maximum banelit to the community from the unvestment dollar? 6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? 8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City errorices where such sorvices are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective? 9. Does the project specifically relate to the defendance of the project specifically relate to the facilities is an important cancer and the development of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreations also delices is an important cancer and the development of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreations also delices is an important cancer in community whether and perceived economically in phases, and or incommunity and parks as a bigh priority. The lack of adequate recreation uses to the historical cultural and increased demands necessating Assistant action. Inadequate societifications. | tractual requirement? T | his criterion includes | | | | | |
| lay result in curtaliment of an essential service? This statement should be checked "Yes" only if an emergency is clearly indicated; otherwise, answer "No". If "Yes", be sure to give full justification. 4. Does the project provide for and/or improve public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or public safety? This criterion should be answered "No" unless public health and/or safety and be shown to be an urgent or critical factor. Raw Quantitative Analysis Raw Comments Comments Weight Tota Range Comments Surveys conducted in early 2008 and in fall 2010 have demonstrated that approximately 70% of the citizens support paying creased taxes for park improvements. If capital campaign raise 1-3 million, private funds should leverage public funds. (0-3) 6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? (0-3) 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? (0-3) The project is being designed to meet all of these criteria. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource values both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and a resources by following a design that encompasses the entire site. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource values both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and a resources by following a design that encompasses the entire site. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource values both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and a resources by following and design that encompasses the entire site. The design will encourage access by mass | participation. Indicate the | e Grant name and | | X | | | |
| prove public health and/or safety? This criterion should be answered "No" un- less public health and/or safety can be shown to be an urgent or critical factor. Raw Quantitative Analysis Comments Comments Comments Weight Tota Scon Surveys conducted in early 2008 and in fall 2010 have demonstrated that approximately 70% of the benefit to the community from the investment dollar? Surveys conducted in early 2008 and in fall 2010 have demonstrated that approximately 70% of the citizens support paying creased taxes for park improvements. If capital campaign raise 1-3 million, private funds should leverage public funds. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? The potential for economic develop is significant. The Economic Development leadership has requested research. BBER has been asked to conduct. Current multi use fields are inadequate in quantity and quality. The project is being designed to meet all of these criteria. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource qualutural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? The project is being designed to meet all of these criteria. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource values both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and resources by following a design that encompasses the entire site, can be developed economically in phases, and consolidates active recreation uses for maximum maintenance efficiencies. Description of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreational facilities is well-documented. Availability of recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability by residents and thos whom such consolidates active recreation uses for maximum maintenance efficiencies. Assume the project improve | lay result in curtailment of vice? This statement sh "Yes" only if an emerger cated; otherwise, answe | of an essential ser- lould be checked ncy is clearly indi- er "No". If "Yes", | | х | | | |
| Comments Surveys conducted in early 2008 and in fall 2010 have demonstrated that approximately 70% of the citizens support paying creased taxes for park improvements. If capital campaign raise 1-3 million, private funds should leverage public funds. Comments Comments Comments Comments Comments Comments Surveys conducted in early 2008 and in fall 2010 have demonstrated that approximately 70% of the citizens support paying creased taxes for park improvements. If capital campaign raise 1-3 million, private funds should leverage public funds. The potential for economic develop is significant. The Economic Development leadership has requested research. BBER has been asked to conduct. Current multi use fields are inadequate in quantity and quality. The project is being designed to meet all of these criteria. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource values both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and resources by following a design that encompasses the entire site, can be developed economically in phases, and consolidates active recreation uses for maximum maintenance efficiencies. Co-2) The community strongly supports the development of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreational facilities is well-documented. Availability of recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livebility by residents and thos who may be considering Missoula as a business location. Inadequate soccer fields and increased demands necessitate action. Master Park Plan: Goal 1.3 "Ensure that future demands are met through the development of new facilities/services as well as the upgrade of existing facilities." | prove public health and/ This criterion should be less public health and/or | or public safety? answered "No" un- r safety can be | | x | | | |
| 5. Does the project result in maximum benefit to the community from the investment dollar? (0-3) 6. Does the project require speedy implementation in order to assure its maximum effectiveness? (0-3) 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? (0-3) 8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective? (0-2) 8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective? (0-3) Master Park Plan: Goal 1.3 "Ensure that future demands are met through the development of new facilities." | Quantitativ | ve Analysis | Score | | Comments | Weight | Total Score |
| The potential for economic develop is significant. The Economic Development leadership has requested research. BBER has been asked to conduct. Current multi use fields are inadequate in quantity and quality. The project is being designed to meet all of these criteria. The design will encourage access by mass transfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource values both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and resources by following a design that encompasses the entire site, can be developed economically in phases, and consolidates active recreation uses for maximum maintenance efficiencies. The community strongly supports the development of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability or recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived liv | benefit to the community | | , , | citizen | s support paying creased taxes for park improvements. If capital campaign raise 1-3 million, | 5 | 10 |
| 7. Does the project conserve energy, cultural or natural resources, or reduce pollution? 8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective? (0-2) 1. Does the project specifically relate to the project specifically relate to the pollutions. It is straight of the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and resources by following a design that encompasses the entire site, can be developed economically in phases, and consolidates active recreation uses for maximum maintenance efficiencies. (0-2) The community strongly supports the development of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreational facilities is well-documented. Availability of recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability by residents and thos who may be considering Missoula as a business location. Inadequate soccer fields and increased demands necessitate action. Master Park Plan: Goal 1.3 "Ensure that future demands are met through the development of new facilities/services as well as the upgrade of existing facilities." | implementation in order | to assure its | , , | reques | sted research. BBER has been asked to conduct. Current multi use fields are inadequate in | 4 | 8 |
| 8. Does the project improve or expand upon essential City services where such services are recognized and accepted as being necessary and effective? The community strongly supports the development of the regional park as a high priority. The lack of adequate recreational facilities is well-documented. Availability of recreational facilities is an important factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability by residents and thos who may be considering Missoula as a business location. Inadequate soccer fields and increased demands necessitate action. (0-3) Master Park Plan: Goal 1.3 "Ensure that future demands are met through the development of new facilities/services as well as the upgrade of existing facilities." | cultural or natural resou | | | mass t values resour | ransfer or non-motorized uses. It responds to the historical, cultural and natural resource both on the site and in its relationship to the surrounding properties. It conserves energy and ces by following a design that encompasses the entire site, can be developed economically in | 3 | 6 |
| 9. Does the project specifically relate to the Master Park Plan: Goal 1.3 "Ensure that future demands are met through the development of new facilities/services as well as the upgrade of existing facilities." | upon essential City serv services are recognized | ices where such and accepted as | | adequ import who m | ate recreational facilities is well-documented. Availability of recreational facilities is an ant factor in community well-being, public health and perceived livability by residents and thos ay be considering Missoula as a business location. Inadequate soccer fields and increased | 4 | 8 |
| City's strategic planning priorities or other plans? Goal 1.5 "Provide recreational opportunities and facilities for people of all ages and abilities, including meeting ADA requirements." City Strategic Plan - Quality of Life for all citizens. | City's strategic planning | | (0-3) | facilitie Goal 1 includi | es/services as well as the upgrade of existing facilities." .5 "Provide recreational opportunities and facilities for people of all ages and abilities, ng meeting ADA requirements." | 4 | 12 |
| Total Score | | | | | Total Score | | 44 |

FORT MISSOULA REGIONAL PARK MISSOULA, MONTANA

29-Sep-08
DHM Design/ WGM Group

Preliminary Estimate of Probable Construction Cost

| PHASE ONE IMPROVEMENTS | \$5,259,030.02 |
|---|-----------------|
| (Infrastructure, grading, utilities, parking, 9 Multi-use Fields) Escalation to mid 2010 | \$6,047,884.52 |
| FUTURE PHASES | |
| Area 1 Improvements (Landscaping, perimeter irrigation) | \$977,361.12 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$1,123,965.29 |
| Area 2 Improvements (Entry Road, Parking, Premier Rugby Pitch) | \$3,495,297.99 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$4,019,592.68 |
| Area 3 Improvements (Picnic Pavilion Area) | \$3,123,001.90 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$3,591,452.19 |
| Area 4 Improvements (Parking Lot Expansion) | \$439,925.23 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$505,914.02 |
| Area 5 Improvements (Proposed Future Parking & 36th Ave. Ext.) | \$554,851.56 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$638,079.29 |
| Area 6 Improvements (Championship Soccer Field) | \$2,443,937.42 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$2,810,528.03 |
| Area 7 Improvements (Open Area) | \$1,255,110.01 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$1,443,376.51 |
| Overall Project Total | \$17,548,515.24 |
| Escalation to mid 2010 | \$20,180,792.53 |

(Inflation to midpoint of construction priced in 2008 dollars. Future phases will vary based upon year of construction).

FORT MISSOULA REGIONAL PARK MISSOULA, MONTANA

28-Oct-08
DHM Design/ WGM Group

Phase One Improvements

Preliminary Estimate of Probable Construction Cost

Based upon Design Development Plans

| Phase | e 1 (Infrastructure: Grading, Utilities, Parking, a | nd Area 1- | 9 Mult | i-Use Fields) | |
|-------|---|------------|----------|--------------------|---------------|
| ITEM# | DESCRIPTION | QTY | UNIT | UNIT COST | TOTAL |
| | <u>Demolition</u> | | | | |
| | Erosion Control (silt fence) | 11,180 | LF | \$2.50 | \$27,950.00 |
| | Clear and grub existing vegetation | 21 | AC | \$1,500.00 | \$31,500.00 |
| | Tree Protection (13 trees) | 1 | LS | \$3,000.00 | \$3,000.00 |
| | Remove Existing Wire Fencing | 3,493 | LF | \$1.00 | \$3,493.00 |
| | Remove & Grind existing haul road (use on site for base | | | | |
| | material) | 32,540 | SF | \$0.50 | \$16,270.00 |
| | Remove Existing Trees | 9 | EΑ | \$1,000.00 | \$9,000.00 |
| | Remove exist. gas line | | | | |
| | Remove/relocate existing maintenance bldg. on Ft. site | 1 | LS | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |
| | Site Preparation/ Grading | | | | |
| | Strip & stockpile exist. topsoil (above bowl & at pavement) | 18,248 | CY | \$2.00 | \$36,496.00 |
| | Screen existing topsoil stockpiled on site -(20% loss) | 20,715 | 7 CY | \$1.00 | \$14,600.00 |
| | Screen stripped topsoil (-20% loss) | 14,600 | CY | \$1.00 | \$20,715.00 |
| | Octobri 3thpped top30h (-20% 1033) | 35,315 | | ds. Topsoil availa | |
| | Site Grading (Areas 1,3,4,5 and 6) | 00,010 | total of | doi ropoon avana | |
| | -Cut/ Fill (complete in place) | 165,333 | CY | \$2.50 | \$413,332.50 |
| | Revegetation/ Seeding | 18 | AC | \$2,000.00 | \$35,200.00 |
| | Sports Field Areas (9 multi-use fields)-Area 1 | | | + =, | +, |
| | -Subgrade aggregate material- 3" depth (source near site) | 8,788 | CY | \$18.00 | \$158,184.00 |
| | -Sand Base for sports fields (8") | 23,201 | CY | \$16.00 | \$371,216.00 |
| | -placement of on site topsoil-side slopes (12") | 7,472 | CY | \$2.00 | \$14,944.00 |
| | -placement of on site topsoil-landscape areas (12") | 11,652 | CY | \$2.00 | \$23,304.00 |
| | Placement of Area 3 and Area 6 Topsoil (12") | 4,200 | CY | \$2.00 | \$8,400.00 |
| | , , | 23,324 | total cy | ds. Topsoil neede | ed Phase 1 |
| | Stockpile Area 2 Topsoil (12")-future install | 11,991 | CY | · | |
| | -Fine Grading/ Laser leveling (9 multi-use fields) | 949,133 | SF | \$0.10 | \$94,913.30 |
| | Dust Control (water and calcium chloride) | 1 | LS | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |
| | | | | | |

| Roadways, Parking and Trails | | | | |
|---|--------------|----|-------------|--------------|
| Traffic Control | 1 | LS | \$10,000.00 | \$10,000.00 |
| Asphalt Surfacing for 900 LF of temporary haul road- (4" asphalt at 18 ft. paved width) | 1,980 | SY | \$12.00 | \$23,760.00 |
| Recycled Base Course for 900 LF of temporary haul road- (8" thickness of 2" minus crushed gravel, 2 ft. shoulders) | 400 | CY | \$10.00 | \$4,000.00 |
| Imported Base Course for 900 LF of temporary haul road- (8" thickness of 2" minus crushed gravel, 2 ft. shoulders) | 200 | CY | \$25.00 | \$5,000.00 |
| Parking Lot/Drive- Curb | 3,345 | LF | \$15.00 | \$50,175.00 |
| Parking Lot/Drive Asphalt (4" depth) | 10,000 | SY | \$12.00 | \$120,000.00 |
| Parking Lot/Drive base course (8" depth) | 2,307 | CY | \$25.00 | \$57,675.00 |
| Concrete Walkways (temp. crusher fines in phase 1) | 22,586 | SF | \$1.75 | \$39,525.50 |
| Concrete Ramps | 9 | EΑ | \$1,200.00 | \$10,800.00 |
| Asphalt Trails | 50,693 | SF | \$1.75 | \$88,712.75 |
| Striping | 4,081 | LF | \$2.00 | \$8,162.00 |
| Thermoplastic handicap symbol | 13 | EΑ | \$300.00 | \$3,900.00 |
| HC parking signage, post and footing | 13 | EΑ | \$250.00 | \$3,250.00 |
| Sleeving for future lighting and landscape | 500 | LF | \$20.00 | \$10,000.00 |
| <u>Utilities</u> | | | | |
| Dry well sumps | 17 | EΑ | \$2,000.00 | \$34,000.00 |
| 8" DI Potable Water Main | 520 | LF | \$55.00 | \$28,600.00 |
| 8" Gate valve | 1 | EΑ | \$1,200.00 | \$1,200.00 |
| Fire Hydrant | 1 | EΑ | \$3,500.00 | \$3,500.00 |
| Hot-tap Main Connection to Existing 12" Main | 1 | EΑ | \$3,000.00 | \$3,000.00 |
| City Excavation Permit for Water main and service | 1 | LS | \$1,600.00 | \$1,600.00 |
| 2" HDPE Sanitary Pressure Sewer Service | 620 | LF | \$22.00 | \$13,640.00 |
| Pressure Sewer Cleanouts | 2 | EΑ | \$1,100.00 | \$2,200.00 |
| Connect Pressure Sewer to Existing Manhole | 1 | LS | \$1,500.00 | \$1,500.00 |
| City Excavation Permit for sewer service | 1 | LS | \$390.00 | \$390.00 |
| Remove and Replace Gas Line | 1 | LS | \$31,600.00 | \$31,600.00 |
| 3-Phase Power (from Northwestern) | 1,600 | LF | \$25.00 | \$40,000.00 |
| Single-Phase Power (from Northwestern) | 250 | LF | \$15.00 | \$3,750.00 |
| Electrical Connection for Irrigation Pump Station & Controller | 1 | LS | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000.00 |
| Electric for Parking Lot Lights | 1200 | LF | \$20.00 | \$24,000.00 |
| Parking Lot Lights -double head | 2 | EΑ | \$6,500.00 | \$13,000.00 |
| Parking Lot Lights -single head | 10 | EA | \$4,000.00 | \$40,000.00 |
| Landscaping | | | | |
| Soil Preparation (rototilling amendments 2 cyd/ 1000 sf) | 949,133 | SF | \$0.10 | \$94,913.30 |
| Sports Field (9 multi-use fields) locally grown sod | 949,133 | SF | \$0.50 | \$474,566.50 |
| Turf areas outside fields | 323,782 | SF | \$0.10 | \$32,378.20 |
| (Phase 1-non-irrigated seed/ phase 2 irrigated seed) | | | | |
| Non-Irrigated Native Seed, includes mulching (perimeter & slopes) | 201,742 | SF | \$0.10 | \$20,174.20 |
| <u>Irrigation</u> | | | | |
| -Water Collection System (pump station/vault/ pond if mult. wells) | 1 | LS | \$45,000.00 | \$45,000.00 |
| -Central Control System (w/ weather station, computer, software) | 1 | LS | \$30,000.00 | \$30,000.00 |
| -Turf System (Mainline. Rotors, valves, wiring, etc.) | 949,133 | SF | \$0.40 | \$379,653.20 |
| -Shrubs & Tree Drip System | future phase | | | |
| | - | | | |

| Wood Rail Fence | 3,600 | LF | \$22.00 | \$79,200.0 |
|---|-------|----|-------------|------------|
| Picnic Tables | 17 | EA | \$900.00 | \$15,300.0 |
| Benches | 8 | EA | \$800.00 | \$6,400.0 |
| Pet Stations | 4 | EA | \$350.00 | \$1,400.0 |
| Trash Receptacles | 4 | EA | \$800.00 | \$3,200.0 |
| Trash dumpster Enclosure (1 yd. containers) | 1 | LS | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000.0 |
| Bicycle Rack | 2 | EA | \$800.00 | \$1,600.0 |
| Sanolets enclosure (groups of 2) | 2 | EA | \$5,000.00 | \$10,000.0 |
| Sanolets Gravel Base | 4,200 | SF | \$0.70 | \$2,940.0 |
| Playground Equipment (climbing structure) | 1 | LS | \$45,000.00 | \$45,000.0 |
| Swings | 1 | EA | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000.0 |

| Climbing Net | 1 | EA | \$6,000.00 | \$6,000.00 |
|---|--|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Concrete play edge | 261 | LF | \$18.00 | \$4,698.00 |
| Playground underdrain | 120 | LF | \$15.00 | \$1,800.00 |
| Fibar play surface/ subsurface drain | 6,040 | SF | \$2.25 | \$13,590.00 |
| Crusher Fines | 2,245 | SF | \$2.00 | \$4,490.00 |
| Sports Field Goal Posts | 18 | EA | by others | |
| Misc. Signage | 1 | LS | \$5,000.00 | \$4,500.00 |
| | | | SUBTOTAL | \$3,271,261.45 |
| | 1% for public art 10% unaccounted for items | | | |
| | | | | |
| Mobilization/ General Conditions | 1 | LS | \$327,126.15 | \$327,126.15 |
| Water Supply Development (acquisition of rights, wells, etc.) | 1 | LS | \$250,000.00 | \$250,000.00 |
| Misc. Permits (SWPPP, Paving, ADA) | 1 | LS | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000.00 |
| Performance/ Materials Bond (1%) | 1 | LS | \$32,712.61 | \$32,712.61 |
| Minor Contract Revisions (10%) | 1 | LS | \$327,126.15 | \$327,126.15 |
| Construction Document Preparation (Phase 1) -8% | 1 | LS | \$261,700.92 | \$261,700.92 |
| Construction Administration-Surveying/Testing (Phase 1)-8% | 1 | LS | \$261,700.92 | \$261,700.92 |
| | PHASE O | \$5,259,030.02 | | |

Escalation to mid 2010

\$6,047,884.52

^{*} Verify existing topsoil quantities prior to final bid documents.

| ATHLETIC FIELD OPTIONS (9 multi-use fields) | 950,663 SF TOTAL | | | |
|---|------------------|-------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1 Sand base field with seeding | 00.000 | 01/ | #40.00 | ФО74 000 00 |
| 8 inch depth sand base (soil amendment above) | 23,238 | CY | \$16.00 | \$371,808.00 |
| -subgrade aggregate material- 3" depth (source near site) | 8,802 | CY | \$18.00 | \$158,436.00 |
| sports field seed mix | 949,133 | SF | \$0.35 | \$332,196.55 |
| | | | Total | \$862,440.55 |
| 2 Sand base field with sand grown sod-(Included in base | e estimate abo | - | | |
| 8 inch depth sand base (soil amendment above) | 23,238 | CY | \$16.00 | \$371,808.00 |
| -subgrade aggregate material- 3" depth (source near site) | 8,802 | CY | \$18.00 | \$158,436.00 |
| sports field sod (local grower) | 949,133 | SF | \$0.55 | \$522,023.15 |
| | | | Total | \$1,052,267.15 |
| 3 Sand base field with imported sand grown sod | | | | |
| 8 inch depth sand base (soil amendment above) | 23,238 | CY | \$16.00 | \$371,808.00 |
| -subgrade aggregate material- 3" depth (source near site) | 8,802 | CY | \$18.00 | \$158,436.00 |
| Out of State Delivery | 81,000 | Miles | \$2.50 | \$202,500.00 |
| sports field sod (out of state grower) | 949,133 | SF | \$0.65 | \$616,936.45 |
| , | , | | Total | \$1,349,680.45 |
| 4 Topsoil base field with locally grown sod | | | | ¥ 1,0 10,000110 |
| 12 inch depth topsoil base | 35,209 | CY | \$25.00 | \$880,225.00 |
| -subgrade aggregate material- 3" depth (source near site) | 8,802 | CY | \$18.00 | \$158,436.00 |
| sports field sod (local grower) | 949,133 | SF | \$0.55 | \$522,023.15 |
| oponio nola oca (local giorioi) | 0.10,100 | O. | Total | \$1,560,684.15 |
| 5 Topsoil base field with seed | | | Total | ψ1,300,004.13 |
| 12 inch depth topsoil base | 35,209 | CY | \$25.00 | \$880,225.00 |
| -subgrade aggregate material- 3" depth (source near site) | 8,802 | CY | \$18.00 | \$158,436.00 |
| | | SF | | |
| sports field seed | 949,133 | SF | \$0.35 | \$332,196.55 |
| | | | Total | \$1,370,857.55 |

