

COUNCIL DECISION REQUEST

SUBJECT: CC Cragin Pipeline

MEETING DATE: June 3, 2010

PAYSON GOAL: NEW: EXISTING: X

ITEM NO.:

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE:

SUBMITTED BY: Buzz Walker

AMOUNT BUDGETED: \$43,100.00

SUBMITTAL TO AGENDA
APPROVED BY TOWN MANAGER

EXPENDITURE REQUIRED: \$43,100.00

CONT. FUNDING REQUIRED: -0-



EXHIBITS (If Applicable, To Be Attached): SWCA proposal

POSSIBLE MOTION: I MOVE TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SIGN AN AGREEMENT WITH SWCA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$43,100.00 TO PERFORM ADDITIONAL TASKS NECESSARY TO OBTAIN A SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR THE CC CRAGIN PROJECT PIPELINE AND TO ALLOCATE THE COST TO THE WATER ENTERPRISE FUND.

SUMMARY OF THE BASIS FOR POSSIBLE MOTION: SWCA is currently under contract with the Town of Payson to perform environmental studies necessary for the Town to obtain a special use permit for our upcoming CC Cragin water pipeline construction along E. Houston Mesa Road. SWCA works at the direction of the U.S. Forest Service who is requiring additional work not contemplated at the time of our original contract with SWCA.

PROS: Allows for the most timely acquisition of a special use permit for pipeline construction.

CONS: N/A

PUBLIC INPUT (if any): Public scoping meeting

BOARD/COMMITTEE/COMMISSION ACTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS (if any) (give dates and attach minutes): N/A

FUNDING: ACCT NO. 662-5451-00-8600 C05

Acct:	Budget: 8,785,000	Available: 8,330,107	Expense: 43,100	Remaining: 8,287,007
Acct:	Budget:	Available:	Expense:	Remaining:
Acct:	Budget:	Available:	Expense:	Remaining:

JUN 03 2010 I.1

COUNCIL DECISION REQUEST

BA:

Hope Club

Date:

5/25/10



Sound Science. Creative Solutions.

Phoenix Office
3033 North Central Avenue, Suite 145
Phoenix, AZ 85012
Tel 602.274.3831 Fax 602.274.3958
www.swca.com

May 17, 2010

LaRon Garrett
Town of Payson
Water Service Department
303 North Beeline Highway
Payson, Arizona 85541

Re: Proposal for Additional Environmental Services for the proposed Town of Payson Cragin Pipeline Project in Gila County, Arizona

Dear Mr. Garrett,

It is our understanding that several project issues have arisen in the past few months that will require additional fieldwork and reporting. These issues include (1) relocation of the proposed water treatment plant (WTP) to the west side of Houston Mesa Road, adjacent to the Mesa del Caballo subdivision, (2) two new alignments developed by Sunrise Engineering, and (3) environmental work in support of the geotechnical testing plan. All three of these tasks will require additional fieldwork and reporting; as you are probably aware, these items were not included in our original scope of work or contract amount.

The cost to complete these tasks, as described in the attached scope of work, is a **Time & Materials, Not to Exceed** total of **\$43,100**. If the scope of work and cost estimate is acceptable to you, please let us know so we can work with the Town to make the necessary contract arrangements. SWCA will be able to start work immediately. Please contact Cara Bellavia or me at (602) 274-3831 if you have any questions regarding this proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kenneth J. Houser". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ken Houser
Managing Principal

Attachment

SCOPE OF WORK

TASK 1. ADDITIONAL FIELDWORK & REPORTING: WATER TREATMENT PLANT RELOCATION & ALIGNMENTS #1 AND #2

SWCA has previously conducted fieldwork in support of the cultural resources survey and the Biological Evaluation. Based on engineering information provided by the Town and Sunrise Engineering, it is our understanding that the proposed water treatment plant (WTP) is now on the west side of Houston Mesa Road. Based on engineering information provided by the Town and Sunrise Engineering, it is our understanding that two new alignments (Alignment #1 and Alignment #2) are being considered for the Proposed Action; the new WTP location and the new alignments will require additional fieldwork. The costs proposed for Task 1 includes one day of fieldwork for an SWCA archaeologist and biologist to visit the new survey areas, as well as compliance with USFS reporting requirements, outlined below.

Task 1.1 Biological Evaluation

SWCA completed biological fieldwork for the proposed pipeline and four water treatment plant sites in 2009. The Biological Evaluation, including Migratory Bird Analysis, Wildlife Specialist Report, and a Management Indicator Species Analysis, has not been finalized pending additional engineering data. The new WTP location and Alignment #s 1 and 2 will require additional biological fieldwork to evaluate, as well as revisiting some information to check for updates and revisions to the draft biological reports. The scope of work for biological resources outlined in the March 2007 proposal (see Tasks 3.1) will be completed following the additional fieldwork described herein. This cost for this task assumes that the field work will be completed at the same time as the field work required for Task 1.2.

Task 1.2 Cultural Resources Survey

Northland Research completed a cultural resources survey of the proposed pipeline and four water treatment locations in 2009; the cultural resources survey was submitted to the Tonto National Forest archaeologist in September 2009. The new WTP location and Alignments # 1 and 2 will require that additional fieldwork be completed to completely evaluate cultural resources within the project area. Additionally, an addendum to the existing cultural resources report will need to be completed. Prior to fieldwork Forest Service records will be checked for any previously recorded sites within the new alignments or WTP location. The addendum will include only information gathered during the fieldwork for the new WTP including (1) a map of the survey area, (2) a map of recorded cultural resources, if any, and (3) and a letter describing the survey area, methodology and results. If additional reporting requirements are identified by the Forest Service, a separate scope of work will be prepared.

Task 2.3 Jurisdictional Delineation

SWCA completed Clean Water Act/Jurisdictional Delineation (JD) fieldwork for the proposed pipeline and four water treatment plants in 2009. The JD has not been finalized pending additional engineering data. The new WTP location and Alignment #s 1 and 2 will require additional fieldwork to evaluate the new areas, and revisions to the draft JD reports will need to be made. The scope of

work for JD outlined in the March 2007 proposal will be completed following the additional fieldwork described herein.

Task 1 Schedule

SWCA will begin work immediately after receiving a signed contract. SWCA anticipates completing the final reports within 4 to 6 weeks after receiving the fully executed contract.

Task 1 Assumptions

1. The total area to be revisited will not exceed 25 acres (including the 2 alignments and the new WTP location). All fieldwork will be conducted in a single visit to the project area. If alignments or the WTP site are relocated after the additional fieldwork is completed, a change order will be required.
2. For Task 1.2, if more than 2 cultural resource sites per acre are identified within the new project area, an additional change-order will be required.
3. If for any SWCA staff are not able to survey the project area as a result of access restrictions, additional costs could be incurred beyond the amount proposed herein.
4. Access to private lands, if restricted, will be arranged by the Town.
5. Costs for Task 1.2 do not include submission of the report to any agency other than the Forest Service, or tribal notification or costs and delays as a result of tribal consultation if any Native American tribes attach religious or cultural significance to historical properties in the project area.
6. Any task not expressly described herein is not included in the proposed cost.

Task 1 Cost: \$9,900

TASK 2. GEOTECHNICAL: ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCES

Based on guidance from the Tonto national Forest, a Categorical Exclusion, Cultural Resources Clearance, and Biological documentation will be required prior to issuance of a special use permit to conduct the geotechnical testing plan.

Task 2.1. Categorical Exclusion

It is SWCA's understanding that the Forest Service has determined that this project would be categorically excluded from documentation in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or an Environmental Assessment (EA). The following scope of work assumes that a Categorical Exclusion (CE) is the only documentation required to comply with NEPA for implementation of the geotechnical testing plan.

Once the special use permit application (including geotechnical testing plans) for the proposed project is accepted by the U.S. Forest Service, SWCA can begin work on the project. The CE will be prepared following U.S. Forest Service guidelines for NEPA in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.15, Chapter 30 (Categorical Exclusion Form Documentation). SWCA assumes that no public outreach (scoping meetings, newspaper notifications, etc. would be required) and that no other resource specific surveys (other than the biological and cultural clearances [see tasks 2.2 and 2.3, detailed below]) will be required. Only the proposed action and the no-action alternatives will be analyzed for the cost proposed here.

Task 2.2. Biological Evaluation

For this project, three biological reports are required by the USFS: a short form Biological Assessment and Evaluation, a short form Migratory Bird Analysis, and a short form Management Indicator Species Analysis. During the same field visit required for Task 1.1, an SWCA biologist will visit the two proposed geotechnical testing locations (TP 5A and B3) to complete the biological reports; these two locations are not within the 100 foot corridor previously evaluated. The final report will include an evaluation of all 29 geotechnical testing locations. SWCA will utilize existing data gathered during a survey of the pipeline in 2009 to complete the reporting. Based on habitat types and features present, the geotechnical testing locations will be evaluated and the three reports described here completed. SWCA will work with the USFS Biologist, John Wilcox, to complete these reports.

Task 2.3. Cultural Resources Evaluation

An SWCA archaeologist will need to visit two proposed geotechnical testing locations (TP 5A and B3) to complete the cultural resource evaluation; these two locations are not within the 100 foot corridor previously evaluated¹. Prior to fieldwork, records will be checked at the Forest Service for any previously recorded sites within the two new locations. The final report will include an evaluation of all 29 geotechnical testing locations. SWCA will utilize existing data gathered during a survey of the pipeline in 2009 to complete the report. Based on the 2009 report, SWCA will prepare a letter report that includes an introduction, project description, results of investigations, recommendations, and references cited. The report will include descriptions and maps of known sites within the project area.

¹ Cultural Resources Survey, Cragin Reservoir Pipeline Project, Payson Ranger District, Tonto National Forest, Gila County, Arizona (2009)

The report will provide recommendations regarding the management of any significant cultural resources identified in the project area.

Task 2 Schedule

SWCA will begin work immediately after receiving signed notice to proceed. SWCA anticipates completing the final reports within 4 to 6 weeks after receiving notice to proceed.

Task 2 Assumptions

7. Fieldwork for Task 2 can be done at the same time as Task 1.
8. The total survey area will not exceed 2-acres (only the two geotech locations [TP 5A and B3]). All fieldwork will be conducted in a single visit to the project area. If additional geotech locations are identified, or relocated, a change order will be required.
9. For Task 2.2, if more than 1 site per acre is identified, a change-order will be required.
10. This task assumes that no jurisdictional delineation will be required by the Forest Service.
11. SWCA assumes that no public outreach (scoping meetings, newspaper notifications, etc. would be required)
12. No other resource specific surveys (other than the biological and cultural clearances [see tasks 2.2 and 2.3]) will be required.
13. Only the proposed action and the no-action alternatives will be analyzed for the cost proposed here.
14. Cost assumes that only one round of revision by the USFS will be required.
15. Any task not expressly described herein is not included in the proposed cost.

Task 2 Cost: \$16,800

TASK 3. CONSIDERATION OF EA ALTERNATIVES

Based on SWCA's March 2007 proposal, our costs included an evaluation of the Proposed Action and No Action alternatives. As you know, based on scoping comments, the internal Forest Service alternatives development meeting, and comments from Forest Service staff, six additional alternatives have been identified (2 alignments, four water treatment plants). Development and analysis of these additional alternatives has required, and will continue to require, a substantial effort from SWCA.

Items included in the costs for this task include:

- SWCA prepared for and facilitated an alternatives development workshop with the Forest Service on May 4, 2010;
- The project Scoping Report will need to be revised to include additional feedback from Forest Service staff as a result of the alternatives development workshop; and
- SWCA resource staff will be required to analyze an additional six alternatives when considering impacts in the EA;

Task 3 Assumptions

16. No additional alternatives will be identified for analysis;
17. Alternatives, as currently identified, will not change in a way to alter our analysis.

Task 3 Cost: \$10,100

TASK 4. SF 299 APPLICATION PREPARATION & COORDINATION

SWCA's assistance from 2007 through 2009 with the SF 299 special use permit application, coordination with the Forest Service, Gila County, and Town of Payson, was not included in our original scope of work.

Task 4 Cost: \$4,200

TASK 5. PUBLIC SCOPING EFFORTS

SWCA expended approximately \$12,000 more than in our original cost estimate to complete the public scoping. These additional costs can be attributed to extra scoping poster boards (our original scope included preparation of 3 boards, while 8 boards were required by the Forest Service), and additional time and meetings to develop these boards with the project team. Our original scope of work also included costs for two public scoping meetings, while only one meeting was required. In light of this, our overages on this task (March 2007 Proposal Task 2) are reduced to consider the fact that less public scoping meetings were required.

Task 5 Cost: \$3,000