

## **Introduction**

This scope of work and cost estimate incorporates the components of WSP's contract modification requests for preparation of the Plains Replacement Pipeline Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Note that the effort for the WSP team (including subconsultants) to provide the County with this contract amendment request and associated communications are not included in this modification request.

## **Scope of Work**

The out-of-scope work for Contract No. BC19183 Tasks 1 through 7 is provided below.

### **Task 1A: Project Management Out-of-Scope Work Completed to Date**

#### Labor

Out of scope cost is \$46,418. The majority of hours are for the WSP project management team to participate in additional bi-weekly project meetings, additional project communications, and additional in-person meetings due to various project changes described below, as well as the extension of the project timeline from 14 months to 22 months.

Labor hours include staff time for participation in 16 additional bi-weekly project meetings to discuss project status, deliverables, and action items, as well as additional communications between the project team, the County, BLM, and other regulatory agencies to discuss project changes and their associated effects on the EIR/EIS. These changes include, but are not limited to: 1) the Applicant change in the project description; 2) the change in alternatives based on the shutdown of the Santa Maria Pump Station and the Santa Maria refinery; 3) the Applicant proposed Buellton re-route; 4) the County's directed change in the baseline analysis and the no-project alternative; 5) the Applicant change in oak tree impacts; 6) the length, scope, and amount of reviews for the EIS; 7) pausing and unpausing the EIS FAST-41 process; and 8) additional project modifications requested by the USFWS, CDFW, and/or the USACE. Hours also include regular tracking and reporting on the schedule with the internal project team.

Labor hours also include additional in person meetings on October 3, 2019, November 13, 2019, November 22, 2019, December 9, 2019, January 15, 2020, and January 29, 2020 with the Applicant, County, BLM, PHMSA, and/or OSFM to discuss: 1) the proposed project and status of technical studies; 2) the PHMSA/OSFM Corrective Action Order; 3) the EIS FAST-41 process and cultural resources reports; 4) the transition of the County Project Manager; and 5) an onsite line drive and review of new project component locations, respectively.

#### ODCs

Out of scope ODCs total \$6,004 for travel costs associated with the in-person meetings WSP attended on the dates identified above. These costs include one airfare from Denver, Colorado to Santa Barbara for one trip; 2,600 miles for vehicle travel from San Diego to Santa Barbara over 4 trips; 12 nights of lodging, 12 days travel per diem, and 6 days full per diem over a total of 5 trips; as well as toll, automobile, and gasoline costs. ODC costs include a 10 percent markup.

### Subcontractors

MRS's cost is \$46,640. Labor includes participation in all project meetings identified above. MRS ODCs include travel and miscellaneous costs for mailings and materials.

SRI's cost is \$2,288. Labor is for SRI's principal archeologist for time spent in additional meetings with the BLM and the Applicant's cultural resources contractor Albion to discuss the cultural resource survey work and reports. All subcontractor costs include a 10 percent markup.

### Task Total

The total out of scope work for Task 1A is \$101,471.

### **Task 1B: Project Management Out-of-Scope Work Remaining**

Labor remaining for Task 1B is estimated to be \$8,331, and includes an additional 52 hours for the WSP project management team to participate in an additional 12 bi-weekly progress meetings and 6 monthly topic-specific conference calls through release of the Draft EIR and EIS and associated public comment period. Bi-weekly project meetings and topic-specific conference calls will be limited to three persons, consisting of Chuck Cleeves, Grant Young, and Luis Perez (MRS) or their delegates.

Task 1B work remaining also includes hours for internal project team meetings, managing internal project management systems on the project, preparation of agendas, preparation of/review of meeting minutes for the conference calls, and updates to the project schedule.

### *Assumptions Constraints*

- Each bi-weekly project meeting is assumed to be ½ hour
- Each topic-specific conference call is assumed to be 1 hour
- No in-person meetings would occur

### Subcontractors

MRS estimates an additional 80 hours for a total cost of \$17,600 for project management hours needed through the release of the draft EIR. This is estimated to be over a 6 month period following resumption of project activity, currently on hold following a Stop Work Order from Santa Barbara County dated January 20, 2021. No project management hours are anticipated from SRI.

### Task Total

The total work remaining costs for Task 1B is \$25,931.

### **Task 2A: Technical Resources Peer Review Out-of-Scope Work Completed to Date**

### Labor

Out of scope cost is \$36,620. The majority of hours for this task are due to additional reviews, data gap analysis, and subsequent reviews of Applicant provided data and reports due to the change in the project description in March and April 2020. The proposed project was substantially revised to include new and/or revised pump stations, new pipeline realignments, access roads, HDD information, and relocation of

valves. These changes were reflected in all previously submitted technical studies (approximately 15 documents), and also included process diagrams, grading plans, emissions calculations, and GIS shapefiles (among others). In addition, the peer review was expanded to include two Biological Assessments not included in the original proposal (one Biological Assessment was a stand-alone report for effects to the endangered Steelhead Trout). As most resubmittals did not include track changes or show markups, the peer review required extensive and detailed examination to determine where changes had occurred and to what extent they were carried through the documents.

Because of this, WSP also prepared a detailed data gap analysis document (which included an analysis for each submittal) to determine where supplemental information may be needed from the Applicant. Several iterations of the data gap analysis document were exchanged between WSP and the Applicant until most data gaps were complete. The latest version of the data gap analysis document was provided to the County on October 30, 2019 within the remaining data gaps items stated, consisting of the need for wildlife agency correspondence and a more in-depth description of restoration activities.

Several of the technical studies and associated documents required ongoing resolution with the Applicant, which led to increased labor costs for coordination and multiple review cycles. Examples of this include, but are not limited to the following:

- The Biological Resource Assessment (BRA) and subsequent versions were not prepared according to the County of Santa Barbara or CDFW Guidelines (*Protocols for Surveying and Evaluating Impacts to Special Status Native Plant Populations and Sensitive Natural Communities*, March 20, 2018). In addition, there were errors in the riparian area impact calculations, which resulted in additional work for both the EIR and EIS. The BRA also assumed no impacts from the existing pipeline, which contradicts the Project Description and the EIR/EIS that assume and analyze all impacts from removal of the existing pipeline. The BRA also assumed a permanent disturbance corridor through riparian area, but provided no explanation or mitigation for these permanent impacts. In addition, there was no inclusion of Kern County mitigation measures from the Gas and Oil Zoning Ordinance EIR, nor mention of the BLM Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) from the Resource Management Plan. Therefore, the mitigation measures that were identified within the BRA were not substantial enough for the EIR and EIS. Because of these irregularities, additional time and resources were required to identify and develop descriptions of sensitive habitat, species, and mitigation measures for both the EIR and EIS.
- Large amounts of stream crossing data and soil quantities were embedded in figures rather than tables. WSP created tables for the EIR and EIS, which then went through various cycles of review between WSP and the Applicant to ensure the original excavation quantities were correct. Applicant provided materials were not marked in track changes, so each resubmittal required a complete review to identify where the revisions occurred.
- GIS shapefiles were provided multiple times and were missing certain project components and/or contained altered nomenclature, naming conventions, metadata, and attribute data. This data was reconciliated by GIS staff and project managers. Additionally, GIS data was not itemized (e.g. impact areas were merged, and temporary disturbances were grouped instead of being broken

down by disturbance type). Therefore, GIS staff redefined the impact areas to account for temporary and permanent impacts areas to support the impact discussions.

- The Applicant did not account for all disturbance required to construct the pipeline in the original resubmittals. Access roads were not defined in early iterations, and associated disturbance areas were not provided. The Applicant also submitted exact grading plans rather than buffered project plans as are normally submitted by project proponents, requiring WSP to estimate buffers for project disturbance. These additional buffers would take into account potential impacts (i.e. foot traffic, hazardous waste spills, waters impacts, etc.) outside of areas of direct grading.

#### Subcontractors

MRS costs are for additional reviews on the revised Project Description, Air Quality Technical Report, Noise Study, Sisquoc Gas Pipeline Noise Memo, Biological Resources Assessment, Biological Assessment, Oak Tree Impacts and Mitigation, and Quantitative Risk Assessment. Hours also include QA/QC review of the peer previews provided by WSP. MRS completed out of scope labor includes 46 hours for a total of \$9,284.

SRI costs are for review of the extensive cultural resources documents (over 400 pages), which were above and beyond the review requirements identified in the original proposal. SRI had been contracted to perform independent peer-review of the Phase I Archaeological Survey Report and Cultural Resources Extended Phase I Scope of Work. Subsequent revised reports were prepared by Applicant's cultural resources contractor, Albion, to address comments from BLM, the County, and SRI's peer review comments, and to incorporate the results of follow-up archaeological surveys of new project areas, including staging areas, access roads, new substations, and the Buellton reroute. BLM requested SRI to review each subsequent revised report. SRI's completed out of scope labor includes 120 hours for a total of \$17,160.

To date, SRI has conducted peer review of the Phase I Report 2018 (initial report); Phase I Survey Report Addendum June 2020; Extended Phase I Report – September 2019 (initial report); Extended Phase I Report – August 2020; Extended Phase I Report – November 2020; Final Report – December 2020; Final Report (Appendix I – Addendum #1) – Phase I Survey – December 2020; and Buellton Reroute – November 2020. Track changes were not provided in each of these reiterations, and reports were inconsistent in the total number of resources identified, and the Area of Potential Effect. As the cultural reports did not indicate where changes had been made, reviews required more in-depth examination and multiple review cycles with the Applicant and BLM.

#### Task Total

The total completed out of scope work for Task 2A is \$63,064.

#### **Task 5A: Draft Project Description and Alternatives Out-of-Scope Work Completed to Date**

#### Labor

Out of scope cost is \$25,292 for: 1) additional iterations of the Project Description and Alternatives for both the EIR and the EIS; 2) revisions to the EIS Chapters 1 (Introduction), 2 (Project Description and

Alternatives), and 3 (Cumulative Scenario) following initial submittal to the BLM due to the Applicant proposed project changes; and 3) the increased timeframe to complete the work.

The Project Description, Environmental Setting, and Alternatives were originally to be provided to the County and BLM within 20 days after the Scoping Meeting. The scoping period ended on March 15, 2019, and draft Alternatives were submitted to the County in October 2019, and draft EIS Chapters 1, 2, and 3 were submitted to the BLM in October 2019, which were all based on the original project design. The Applicant revised their project description in March – April of 2020, and the draft EIR Chapters 1, 2, and 3 were submitted to the County in December 2020. Submittals were delayed 15 – 19 months due to the number of revisions and ongoing data gaps in the Applicant’s resubmittals.

WSP expended additional level of effort to prepare both the PD and Alternatives based on changes proposed by the Applicant, the County, BLM, and other regulatory agencies as detailed below. For the project description, WSP prepared a PD based on the Applicant’s description from November 2018. The draft EIR project description was submitted to the County on May 30, 2019, and resubmitted a more robust description on August 9, 2019 based on County comments. Then between August 2019 and November 2, 2020, WSP revised the Project Description 10 times, largely due to incomplete information required from the Applicant. With each subsequent submittal from the Applicant, substantial work efforts were generated to open the PD back up to fill in data gaps and ensure consistency of descriptions throughout the chapter.

For the alternatives, the EIR and EIS were originally only to include the No Project Alternative and up to three additional alternatives. WSP submitted potential CEQA Alternatives to the County in September 2019, which included a No Project Alternative and 16 potential alternatives. The administrative draft EIR/EIS presents 17 alternatives, six of which are carried forward for further analysis. Of the alternatives developed for the EIR/EIS, six were adapted and modified from the existing ExxonMobil Trucking EIR. WSP also developed comparison tables to provide consistency between the EIR and EIS, and hosted multiple meetings with the County and BLM to discuss the feasibility and descriptions of alternatives. Revisions to the draft alternatives were derived from the following:

- The need for a Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) in the EIS was identified based on USACE NEPA requirements.
- The announced changes to the Phillips 66 Refinery and pipeline system in August 2020 required that the EIR alternatives involving use of the Phillips 66 system be revised.
- The No Project Alternative and baseline discussion were changed based on PHMSA and OSFM requirements to restart the existing pipeline. A restart alternative was prepared by MRS and is detailed in the subcontractor’s costs below.

#### Subcontractors

MRS’ cost is \$20,713. The County requested that MRS prepare a Restart Alternative for the EIR, to address the restart of the existing Lines 901 and 903. The County requested that MRS describe the restart alternative in sufficient detail to assess the impacts in the EIR as a potentially feasible alternative to the

proposed project. Subcontractor ODCs include travel and miscellaneous expenses for mailings and materials.

#### Task Total

The total out of scope work for Task 5A is \$46,005.

#### **Task 6A: Draft EIR and EIS Technical Resource Sections Out-of-Scope Work Completed to Date**

##### Labor

Out of scope cost is \$75,980. The additional cost is largely due to the extension of the length and scope of the EIS, as well as due to multiple revisions to the EIR and EIS technical resource sections to incorporate ongoing project changes.

In June 2019, BLM determined that the entire pipeline, and not just portions of the line that crossed federal lands, would need to be addressed in the EIS. Resource areas outside of federal jurisdictions were required by BLM to be addressed in the EIS as appendices; therefore, WSP incurred added labor costs to analyze, write, and incorporate these additional impact areas into the EIS. This expanded the scope of the EIS significantly from an original 150-page document to a 300 – 500 page document.

In order to minimize impacts to the project schedule, WSP developed technical resource sections of the EIR and EIS in parallel to the Applicant making changes to the project description and technical studies. The existing contract assumes that the EIS could be built based on the developed EIR; however this has not occurred as the timelines have shifted. While WSP waited on additional material to be submitted by the Applicant to supplement the EIR, WSP continued to develop the EIS under the direction of the BLM. This required analysis to be performed for the EIS and a duplication of work that otherwise would not have occurred.

With each iteration of the revised project description, alternatives, and other changes discussed in tasks above, WSP updated the previously written EIR and EIS sections to incorporate the new data associated with the revised project description, GIS shapefiles, and revised technical studies. WSP QA/QC tasks included review hours to ensure technical completeness, organization, and consistency of the work with the scope of the sections of the EIR and EIS.

##### Subcontractors

MRS out of scope cost is \$17,732. MRS labor hours are for revisions to the following technical resources sections of the EIR: 4.1 Air Quality, 4.3 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases, 4.6 Hazardous Materials and Risk of Upset, and 4.8 Noise and Vibration. Revisions were based on updated information provided by the Applicant in the revised Project Description, Plan of Development, and individual technical studies. In addition, MRS' labor hours include additional QAQC of the Administrative Draft EIR sections prepared by WSP to review all new updates and revisions prior to submittal to the County.

SRI's out of scope cost is \$1,144. SRI hours were to revise the Cultural Resources section of the EIR based on revisions to the project description and revised cultural resources studies.

### Task Total

The total out of scope work for Task 6A is \$94,856.

### **Task 7A: Admin/Public Draft EIR and EIS Out-of-Scope Work Completed to Date**

#### Labor

Out of scope cost is \$64,690. The additional hours are due to the extension of the length and scope of the EIS, the addition of an EIS Analysis Plan, as well as adding Kern County significance thresholds and analysis to the EIR (now a CEQA responsible agency).

For the length and scope of the EIS, WSP assumed that the EIS would be 150 pages, and that it would address direct impacts only on federal lands. However; the EIS needed to be supplemented with appendices containing Supporting Information and Tabular Data, and needed to discuss the cumulative effects of the entire Project. This resulted in the additions of Appendices C, D, E, and F corresponding with Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4. The addition of these Appendices has increased the level of effort to prepare the EIS in terms of formatting and editorial support as well as increased the overall length of the EIS.

In April 2019, after Public Scoping, BLM directed WSP to prepare an EIS Analysis Plan prior to drafting the technical resource sections (Chapter 3) of the EIS. The Analysis Plan consists of the criteria required by the BLM to provide an analytical and consistent base for the NEPA analysis of the Proposed Project and Alternatives in the EIS. It presents the data requirements, direct and indirect effects, area of analysis, analysis methodology, and effects thresholds for each of the 13 resource areas to be analyzed in the EIS. A draft Analysis Plan was prepared and submitted to BLM in August 2019. Comments from BLM were addressed, and the final Analysis Plan was submitted to BLM in September 2019.

In October 2020, The County informed WSP that Kern County would be a responsible agency that would also rely on the EIR. Because of this, WSP added Kern County significance thresholds and information specific to the county into the EIR in order to address Kern County CEQA requirements.

#### Subcontractors

MRS out of scope cost is \$17,732. MRS labor hours are to complete revisions to the following technical resources sections of the EIR: 4.1 Air Quality, 4.3 Climate Change and Greenhouse Gases, 4.6 Hazardous Materials and Risk of Upset, and 4.8 Noise and Vibration. MRS' labor hours also include additional QAQC of the remaining Administrative Draft EIR sections prepared by WSP to review all new updates and revisions prior to submittal to the County.

### Task Total

The total out of scope work for Task 7A is \$82,422.

### **Task 7B: Admin/Public Draft EIR and EIS Out-of-Scope Work Remaining**

#### Labor

Out of scope cost is \$62,022. Additional hours are estimated for additional Kern County review of the Administrative Draft EIR, and additional BLM State Office review of the Administrative Draft EIS. These

added agency reviews will likely add comments and added effort to respond and modify the documents as appropriate. These reiterations will require additional time to complete as well as an increased level of effort in order to meet and maintain acceptable document standards. Additionally, the extra time required will result in a greater amount of management and increased requirements from the various subject matter experts. Based on the additional length of the EIS, and the additional reviews of the EIR by Kern County and EIS by BLM, this task will result in an incremental increase in level of effort than was included in the original 2018 proposal.

#### Task Total

The total remaining out of scope work for Task 7B is \$62,022.

#### **Restored Contingency**

The project contingency budget remaining is \$40,701. This request proposes to restore the original contingency budget to \$147,701, with an additional \$107,000.

#### **Total Contract Modification Request**

WSP is requesting an amendment to Contract BC19183 for a base amount of \$475,771 with a restored contingency amount of \$107,000, for a total of \$582,771. See the attached detailed cost spreadsheet for a breakdown of costs by staff, rates, and ODCs for each Task.



Name	Labor Category	Role	Rate	Task 1A - PMP Completed		Task 1B - PMP Remaining		Task 2A - Tech Resources Peer Review - Completed		Task 5A - PD & Alternatives - Completed		Task 6A - Technical Resource Sections - Completed		Task 7A - Admin/Public Draft EIR/EIS - Completed		Task 7B - Admin/Public Draft EIR/EIS - Remaining		
				Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost	Hours	Cost	
David Albers	ES 1	Managing Director	221	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Jone Guerin	ES 2	Project Director	201	60	12,060	10	2,010	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	10,452	
Jone Guerin	ES 2	QAQC	201	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	6,432	48	9,648	40	8,040	0	0	
Chuck Cleeves	ES 3	CEQA Lead	181	158	28,598	21	3,801	40	7,240	20	3,620	40	7,240	39	7,059	33	5,973	
Erin Lynch	ES 3	Hydro and Water Quality	181	0	0	0	0	12	2,172	0	0	48	8,688	25	4,525	47	8,507	
Susan Serreze	ES 3	Geo, Soils, Paleontology	181	0	0	0	0	12	2,172	0	0	24	4,344	14	2,534	30	5,430	
Joseph Donaldson	ES 3	Visual	181	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	724	4	724	0	0	
Leslie Kirchlir-Owen	ES 4	Cultural Resources	171	0	0	0	0	32	5,472	0	0	16	2,736	20	3,420	32	5,472	
Silvia Yanez	ES 4	Air Quality, GHG	171	0	0	0	0	16	2,736	0	0	48	8,208	26	4,446	14	2,394	
Erin Bench	ES 5	Biology	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	1,500	2	300		
Joseph Carlo	ES 5	Biology	150	0	0	0	0	32	4,800	0	0	72	10,800	50	7,500	14	2,100	
Benjamin Cole	ES 6	Hazardous Materials	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	3,288	16	2,192	12	1,644	
Amy Cook	ES 6	Editor	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	1,507	5	685		
Carl Sadowski	ES 6	Traffic/Transportation	137	0	0	0	0	8	1,096	0	0	16	2,192	4	548	4	548	
Jessica Forbes-Guerrero	ES 6	Recreation, Env Justice	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	2,192	32	4,384	4	548	
Grant Young	ES 8	NEPA Lead, Land Use, GIS	120	48	5,760	21	2,520	56	6,720	88	10,560	72	8,640	100	12,000	120	14,400	
Zachary Michalk	ES 9	Visual	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	1,664	0	0	28	2,912	
Nicole Hurley	IS 4	GIS	117	0	0	0	0	36	4,212	40	4,680	48	5,616	23	2,691	1	117	
Sandra Brown	Admin	Editor	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	1,620	6	540		
<b>Subcontractor Labor Cost</b>				<b>266</b>	<b>46,418</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>8,331</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>36,620</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>25,292</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>75,980</b>	<b>432</b>	<b>64,690</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>62,022</b>	
<b>Other Direct Costs</b>				<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Unit</b>	<b>Cost</b>	
Travel		Airfare - DEN to SB	500	1	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Travel Per Diem	12	53	636	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Per Diem	6	71	426	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Lodging	12	124	1,488	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Lodging Tax	12%		179	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Auto Rental	4	75	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Local Mileage	2600	0.575	1,495	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Tolls	10	30	300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Gasoline			75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Travel		Airport Parking	4	15	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>					<b>5,459</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Markup</b>			<b>10%</b>		<b>546</b>													
<b>Total ODCs</b>					<b>6,004</b>													
<b>Subcontractors</b>																		
<b>MRS</b>																		
Luis Perez	CEQA DPM	Project Management	200	212	42,400	80	16,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Luis Perez	CEQA DPM	EIR QAQC	200	0	0	0	0	4	800	32	6,400	12	2,400	12	2,400	0	0	
Greg Chittick	Sr. Engineer	Haz, Risk, Air, GHG, Noise	200	0	0	0	0	20	4,000	58	11,600	27	5,400	27	5,400	0	0	
Dean Dusette	Sr. Planner	Air Quality, GHG	180	0	0	0	0	2	360	4	720	4	720	4	720	0	0	
Ted Mullen	Sr. Engineer	Bio, Oaks	200	0	0	0	0	8	1,600	0	0	10	2,000	10	2,000	0	0	
Lauren Brown	Sr. Planner	Bio, Oaks	140	0	0	0	0	12	1,680	0	0	40	5,600	40	5,600	0	0	
<b>MRS ODCs</b>																		
Travel					55							55						
Miscellaneous					55							55						
<b>SRI</b>																		
NA	P. Arch	Cultural Resources	130	16	2,080	0	0	120	15,600	0	0	8	1,040	0	0	0	0	
<b>Subtotal</b>					<b>228</b>	<b>44,590</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>24,040</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>18,830</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>17,160</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>16,120</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Markup</b>			<b>10%</b>		<b>4,459</b>		<b>1,600</b>		<b>2,404</b>		<b>1,883</b>		<b>1,716</b>		<b>1,612</b>		<b>0</b>	
<b>Total Subcontractors</b>					<b>49,049</b>		<b>17,600</b>		<b>26,444</b>		<b>20,713</b>		<b>18,876</b>		<b>17,732</b>		<b>0</b>	
				<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Cost</b>	
<b>Total Hours/Costs</b>				<b>494</b>	<b>101,471</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>25,931</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>63,064</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>46,005</b>	<b>593</b>	<b>94,856</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>82,422</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>62,022</b>	

Modification Subtotal 475,771  
Contingency 107,000  
**Project Modification \$582,771**

Contract BC19183 \$1,149,916  
**Contract with Modification \$1,732,687**

Existing Contingency 40,701  
**Replenished Contingency 147,701**