PROJECT DELIVERY REPORT Trade Corridors Improvement Fund

The submitting agency will be responsible for maintaining documentation of the information entered on this report. (Please type your response, handwritten reports will not be accepted)

A.	Project Informati	ion				Date:	2/21/2017
							EA: F006BA
	TCIF # (Segi	ment):	83		Other Project Identifier (EA, P	roject #, PPNO, etc):	PPNO: 150D
	Droine	d Tille.	Colton Crossing Rail to	- Pail C	rada Canamilia		
	FIOJ O C	at inter	Coton Crossing Hall t	J Mail G	rade Separation		
	Delivery Rep	oort:	Final- Due within six months of project becoming operable. Supplemental - Due at the conclusion of all project activities.				
	Location: C	county:	San Bernardino City:			Colton	
Project Description: In Colton, construct railroad grade separation south of interstate and Ave. to 0.9 ml east of La Cadena Dr. B. Contact Information					st of Rancho		
Implementing Agency: San Bernardino County Transportation Authority Caltrans District:				HQ75			
Contact Person: Paula Be			Paula Beauchamp	ula Beauchamp			90 884-8276
Contact Person: Paula Beauchamp Phone: 907-884-8 Email Address: pheauchamp@sanbag.ca.gov							
	Lailith 740	, on ono.) sogetti sii sii sa	1.60.401			•
C.	Cost		Adopted Program Amo	ount (S)	Current Approved Amount (S)	Actual Expended Amount (\$)	Nat Difference (Dollars)
ı	Environmental Total Amount		\$3,689,000		\$3,689,000	\$3,689,000	\$0
	Dealan Total Amount Right of Way		40,003,000		\$3,088,000	\$3,008,000	30
			\$11,600,000		\$5,570,000	\$5,570,000	\$0
1							
Total Amount Construction TCIF Local Federal			\$26,700,000		\$433,000	\$433,000	\$0
		\$91,305,000		\$27,847,000	\$27,846,147	\$853	
			\$0		<u> </u>	\$0	\$0
		\$28,900,000		\$33,800,000	\$33,800,000	\$0	
	Other UF	P/BNSF	\$39,800,000		\$12,138,182 .	\$12,138,182	\$0
L	Totals	g	\$201,994,000		\$83,477,182	\$83,476,329	\$853
	. Schedule						
			Adopted Program	Date	Current Approved Date	Actual Begin/End Date	Net Difference (Months)
Environmental Phase Begin End Design (PS&E) Phase Begin End Right of Way Phase Begin Erd Construction Phase Begin		na ina in-		04/04/07	04/04/07		
			01/01/07 11/30/10		01/01/07	01/01/07	0
		11/30/10		11/30/10	05/06/11	+2 Months	
		06/01/10		06/30/10	06/31/10	2 Mantho	
		06/21/11		06/21/11	06/30/11	-2 Months	
				00/2////	0000771		
		02/28/11		02/28/11	02/01/11	+1 Month	
		06/30/11		06/30/11	06/01/11	0	
		09/27/11		09/30/11	09/30/11	-1 Month	
	End		03/31/14		03/31/14	03/31/14	0
	Closeout Date					<u> </u>	
	Begin		04/01/14		04/01/14	04/01/14	+1 Month
1	End		05/01/14		05/01/14	08/18/14	-4 Months

E. Amendments List approved amendments		
Amendment #	CTC Meeting	Summary of Changes (Scope, Cost, Schedule)
0	03/15/2010	Original request
2	08/01/2014	Reduce Cost Estimate

F. Project Benefits

Describe and compare project benefits with those included in the approved Baseline Agreement.

	Adopted Benef	its from the MOU Baselin	e	1
Project Outcome	Metric	Determination Approach	2019 Build Case	2006 Baseline
1. Throughput	Rail Freight Volume (Trains feet per day) (No Commuters)	Actual	966,154	683,811
		BNSF Mainline Actual	30.00	10.75
2. Velocity	Transit time through Corridor (MPH)	UP Mainline Actual	42.50	10.75
3. Reliability	Variability in Transit time (Avg Annual Delay Hours)	Actual	(74,852)	N/A
	Decrease highway accidents project	s from occurring by more than	800 accidents over the	life of the

- Avoid three fatal accidents and 100 injury accidents over the life of the project. Reduce the number of heavy truck accidents by an average of 38 incidents per year.
- ·Source: Accident rates from Caltrans "Cal-BC" model
- Average annual reduction in delay for vehicles equals 2.9 MM passenger hours
- -Average annual reduction in time-in-queue for delay equals 2.4 MM hours

Average annual reduction from vehicles

- HC = 2.8 tons
- 5. Congestion Reduction

4. Salety

- · CO = 18.6 lons
- NOx = 4.9 tons
 - PM = 1.0 tonsCO2 = 10,982 tons

Average annual reduction from locomotives

- · HC = 42.8 tons
- 6. Emissions Reduction
- · CO = 145.1 tons
- NOx = 67.4 tons
 PM = 5.8 tons
- · CO2 = 23,371 tons
- Average annual gallons saved
- 7. Other Outcomes
- · Gasoline = 907,590
- · Diesel = 79,060
- Oil = 101.583

Note: Project estimates based on information developed for the BNSF and Union Pacific Public Benefit Study for Colton Grade Separation dated February 5, 2008. The Project scope as more specifically described in Exhibit B may be modified as set for the in this Memorandum. The Parties contemplate that prior to project construction, estimates will be revised in accordance with the final Project scope of work and updated methodology as agreed upon between the parties in the Definitive Agreements. The Parties further contemplate these revised estimates will be the basis for companing outcomes five (5) years after Project completion.

Actual Benefits			
Project Outcome	Metric	Determination Approach	Actual 2014
1. Throughput	Rail Freight Volume (Trains feet per day) (No Commuters)	Actual	926,445
		BNSF Mainline Actual	20
2. Velocity	Transit time through Corridor	UP Mainline Actual	20
3. Reliability	Variability in Transit time (Avg Annual Delay Hours)	Actual	(26,710)

- 4. Salety
- · No accidents reported as of project completion
- · Average annual reduction in delay for vehicles equals 905.8 passenger hours
- · Average annual reduction in time-in queue for delay equals 756.8
- 5. Congestion Reduction

Average annual reduction from vehicles

- · HC = .00087
- \cdot CO = .0058
- NOx = .0013
- PM = .0015
- · CO2 = 3.41
- Average annual reduction from locomotives
- · HC = 4.0
- 6. Emission Reduction · CO = 13.7

 - NOx = 6.3
 - · PM = 0.54
 - CO2 = 2194.6
 - Average annual gallons saved
- 7. Other Oulcomes
- Gasoline = 282
- · Diesel = 7,424 Oil = 9,539

G. Differences/Variances Describe differences/variances (if any) and reason for, between approved scope, cost, schedule, and actual.
08/10/2011: Definitive agreements- SANBAG, UPRR, BNSF completed
The most significant change was the reduction in funding due to low bid price. State and railroad funds were proportionately reduced.
Higher construction savings were achieved due to increased efficiency from improved delivery of materials and availability of crews. This reduced flagging costs and project overhead costs.
÷)

H. Lessons-Learned/Best Practic	29
---------------------------------	----

Describe lessons-learned and best practices for future projects.

Careful consideration must be paid when analyzing CCO's, particularly those that reduce work to be performed by a UDBE. Fortunately other CCO's increased UDBE efforts and the project goal was exceeded but this was not evaluated until after the project.

Congestion reduction explanation:

When the actual benefits realized during the first year after project implementation are compared to the expected benefits reported prior to project development, they are not as significant. The Baseline Agreement project benefits report anticipated 2019 conditions, or five years after project opening. Current reported values represent 2014 conditions. When the Baseline Agreement numbers were prepared, the effects of the recession were not yet envisioned. Due to the recession, train activity is dramatically lower than the pre-recession forecasts as the movement of freight is directly influenced by the global economy. The Baseline Agreement highlighted the vehicle and rail benefits associated with the anticipated continued significant growth in goods movement rail related activity that had been realized during the first several years of the early 2000's. While it is anticipated that some of the forecast growth may occur before 2019 and the 2019 values should be more in line with the Baseline Agreement forecast values, it is likely that the levels anticipated in 2006 will not yet be reached. As the rail and vehicle growth did not occur due to the regional and national recession, the full extent of the anticipated benefits have not yet been realized.

Certification Signature

Implementing Agency
I hereby certify to the best of my knowledge and belief, the information in this report is a true and accurate record. The work was performed in accordance with the CTC approved scope, cost, schedules, and benefit information in the Baseline Agreement. Paula Beauchamp (Print name? Project Manager The TCIF Division Program Coordinator and/or the Project Manager from the California Department of Transportation has reviewed the information contained in this report and has verified the information presented is correct. Sarah J. Smith, Branch Chief (Print Name) TCIF Division Program Coordinator/Project Manager (Signature)TCIF Division Program Coordinator/Project Manager The TCIF Program Lead from the California Department of Transportation has reviewed the Information contained in the report and concurs with the approval. **Tony Cano** (Print Name) TCIF Program Lead (Signalure) TCIF Program Lead

Distribution: 1) Local Agency, 2) Division Program Coordinator/Project Manager, 3) TCIF Program Lead, 4) CTC