MINUTE ITEM

This Galendar Hem No. 26 was approved as Minute Item No 32 by the State Lands. Commission by a vote of to _O et its _ meeting.

CALENDAR LTEM

7/76 W 10292 TMW

38.

PROPOSED EXPENDITURE OF TIDELAND OIL REVENUE FOR SUBSIDENCE REMEDIAL WORK CITY OF LONG BEACH

SUBSIDENCE RENEDIAL BROJECT:

Westside Industrial Park Storm Drain.

SUBSIDENCE LLEMENTS:

City's Analysis: .. A.

Expenditures for work lying within the boundary of the Harvor District are subsidence costs. work is required to restore drainage which has been damaged by subsidence of the land surface throughout the subject areas.

Staff Analysis:

Subsidence costs are included as estimated by the City.

CUST OF PROJECT:

A. City's Estimate: \$871,250 (2nd Phase).

Subsidence Portion: \$791,890...

Staff Comment:

Found reasonable.

100% of the subsidence costs to be borne by the State.

FISCAL IMPACT:

STATUTORY AUTHORITY:

City's Reference: Ch. 138/64, 1st E. S., Sec. 1/(e).

Staff Determination: Agreement. 13.

COMPLIANCE WITH CALLFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT OF 1970:

A Negative Declaration was issued by the Long Reach City Planning Commission on November 5, 1973.

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

Details of the project are set forth in correspondence (dated May 17, 1976, June 3, 1976, and June 14 1976) supplying supportive material and making request for prior approval of the Commission.

EXHIBITS:

Cost Estimate.

Vicinity Map. Ή.

Layout Plan.

Negative Declaration. D.

52,57,58

-1.-

CALENDÁR ÍTBM NO. 38. (CONTD)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

- 1. DETERMINE THAT AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT HAS NOT BEEN PREPARED BUT THAT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION HAS BEEN PREPARED BY THE LONG BEACH CTTY PLANNING COMMISSION ON November 5, 1973.
- 2. CERTIFY THAT THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE ENFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION.
- 3. DETERMINE THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.
- 4. APPROVE COSTS PROPOSED TO BE EXPENDED BY THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, INCLUDING SUBSIDENCE REMEDIAL WORK, AS INDICATED ON EXHIBIT "A" ATTACHED AND BY REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF, FOR THE PERIOD FROM JULY 22, 1976, O TERMINATION DATE; OF THE ITEMS TO BE ALLOWED ULTIMATELY AS SUBSIDENCE COSTS, DEDUCTIBLE UNDER SECTION 4(D) OF CHAPTER 138, STATUTES OF AN ENGINEERING REVIEW AND FINAL AUDIT SUBSEQUENT TO THE TIME WHEN THE WORK UNDER ANY OF THESE ITEMS IS COMPLETED, AND THAT THE WORK CONFORM IN FSSENTIAL DETAILS TO THE PLANS AND BACKGROUND MATERIAL HERET FORE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION. EXECUTION OF APPROPRIATE WRITTEN INSTRUMENTS REFLECTING THE COMMISSION'S APPROVAL.

Attachment: Exhibit WAV.

EXHIBIT "A

File No. W 10292

City Estimated Project Expendi- tures July 22, 1976 to Termina- tion.	Estimated Subsidence Costs
¢871 250	\$701 890

Work Proposed

Westside industrial Park Storm Drain, Units : A and 1-B (Second Phase)

NOBE: The term "1st Phase" covers costs expended for preliminary work subsequent to review of preliminary plans and/or other adequate description. ("1st Phase" costs are restricted to engineering design, field surveys for design purposes, preparation of preliminary and construction plans, special investigation as may be required for design purposes and preparation of specifications for construction.)

The term "2nd Phase" covers additional costs approved subsequent to review of detail construction plans and/or other data sufficient to guide construction operations.

Breakdown of Subsidence Costs:

	Unit	2nd Phase Cost	Subsidence	Cabsidence Anounc
	1-A	\$800,000	90. 08	\$720,640
1	1 - B	71,250	10.000.	71,250
OTA:	SECOND PHASE:	\$871,250		\$791,890

Subsidence Factor for Unit 1-A:

Subsidence Percent, based on construction costs only

Contract Construction cost today minus Contract Construction Cost 1926 divided by Contract Construction Cost today:

\$556,149.00 · \$54,394.66* ÷ \$556,149 = 90.22%

*So long as the total scope of the project remains unchanged, the 1926 contract construction cost shall be fixed at this amount. The original facility is considered fully depreciated as the 50-year life has elapsed.

- 3-

EXHIBIT "A" (CONTD.)

An adjustment in the Second Phase subsidence percentage for Unit 1-A is being made to compensate for subsidence costs already withhold in the project First Phase as follows:

Project Costs

First Phase (Approve is

\$50:000

Second Phase (This

application)

800,000

\$850,000 @ 90.22%

= \$766,870 Subsidence Cost

A preliminary audit of Long Boach City Engineers Ledger indicates total First Phase expenditures actually incurred were \$48,503.31, of which \$44,880.11 has been or will be reported as subsidence costs at 92.53%.

With approval of \$800,000 Second Phase project costs at 90.22% subsidence costs, total approved funds will be:

First Phase:

\$ 50,000.00

Second Phase:

800,000.00

Total:

\$850,000 @ 90.22% = \$766,870 Subsidence Costs

Actual 1st Phase expended:

\$(48,503.31) @ 92.53% = \$(44,880.11)

Subsidence Costs

Approved Balance:

\$801,496.69

\$721,989.89 Subsidence

Costs

Adjusted Subsidence Factor = $\frac{$721,989.89}{$801,496.69} = 90.08$

Subsidence Amount

= \$8.0,000 \times 90.08% = \$720,640.00

Subsidence Factor for Unit 1-B:

Subsidence costs for Unit 1-B will be 100% actual project costs.