CITY OF LOS ANGELES INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date:	March 30,	2023
-------	-----------	------

To: Municipal Facilities Committee

Chaji K. Abdallah, R.A. From: Steven Fierce, AIA Ohaji K. Abdallah, Asst. Div. Mngr. signed for S.F. Municipal Facilities Program Manager Bureau of Engineering

Subject: PIO PICO PARK/PARKING STRUCTURE (COUNCIL DISTRICT 10) – RECOMMENDATION TO SOLICIT CONSTRUCTION BIDS AND TO IDENTIFY FUNDS IN THE 2023-24 FISCAL YEAR TO CLOSE THE FUNDING SHORTFALL OF APPROXIMATELY \$13.91 MILLION DOLLARS

RECOMMENDATION

The Bureau of Engineering (BOE) recommends that the Municipal Facilities Committee (MFC):

- 1. Recommend that the Board of Public Works (Board) approve the project's advertisement and solicitation for construction bids.
- 2. Instruct CAO staff to work with Council District 10 (CD 10) to identify supplemental funding sources to address the anticipated shortfall of \$11,368,600, for base project scope and an additional \$2,536,000 for Additive Alternates, totaling \$13,904,600 Million, which may include additional contributions of City capital funds that will be pursued as a last recourse through the City Budget process in the upcoming future fiscal years.

Discussion/Background:

The proposed Pio Pico Pocket Park and Underground Parking Structure project (Project) is located at 694 South Oxford Avenue, within the boundaries of the existing parking lot of the Pio Pico Korean Town Branch Library. The Project goals are centered on increasing park space in this dense urban community on City owned property. While addressing the need for more park space, this co-location creates a nexus between the children's activities in the proposed pocket park and the adjacent library.

The 0.6-acre property is part of the existing Pio Pico Library located in the Korean District. The site surrounded by commercial buildings and mix-use development. Currently the site is paved and being used as a parking lot by the patrons of the library. This project represents an opportunity to create a neighborhood pocket park in the Koreatown area.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

It will be the only urban public park in the area serving a population of roughly 40,000 residents, as well as thousands of visitors and those working in the area.



Council District 10's motion (CF14-1174-S9), adopted on June 1, 2016, seeks to invest \$3,000,000 CRA/LA Excess Bond Proceeds (EBP) available to CD 10 toward creating park and open space as identified in the Bond Spending Plan for this Project Area. The Wilshire/Koreatown Redevelopment Project Area originally contained \$6,975,164 in the EBP that was identified for CD 10. While the design and engineering of the Project progressed, CD 10 continued seeking additional funding from the Community Investment for Families Department (CIFD) – Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds, Recreation and Parks Quimby Funds, and the Capital Improvement Expenditure Program (CIEP) to fill the gap for the project budget cost.

The Project involves the demolition of approximately 26,000 square feet of an existing asphalt parking lot, construction of an underground parking structure, development of a pocket park over the parking structure, and improvements to the exterior building façade and entrance canopy of the existing Pio Pico Library (Library).

The current parking allotment for the Library includes 63 onsite parking spaces and 20 offsite metered parking spaces, for a total of 83 existing parking spaces. The Project includes the construction of 50 onsite parking spaces and the conversion of 12 existing parallel street parking spaces into 45-degree angled parking spaces. This will provide an additional 20 permanent metered public parking spaces, for a total of 70 parking spaces.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

In an effort to offset the 13 impacted parking spaces for the Library, the project will provide new bicycle racks accommodating 54 bicycles, which is the Los Angeles Building Code (LABC) equivalent to 13 car parking spaces (1:4 ratio).

Funding Status

Throughout the past year, the BOE has acknowledged, documented, and reported the unusually high cost of inflation and escalation in construction industry to the Municipal Facilities Committee (Attachment No. 1). Due to these significant increases in construction cost, the BOE updated the project budget, available funding, and subsequent project shortfall. To reduce the funding shortfall, the BOE removed its project management and construction management staff costs from the Project budget.

In January 2023, BOE was informed that the Mayor's Office requested the reallocation of \$4,9551,798 of CDBG Funds to be transferred to fund property acquisitions to address the City's homeless projects. CIFD has informed BOE that the funds will not be returned to the project. This new reallocation of funds increases our project shortfall to approximately \$13.91 Million as summarized in the tables below and detailed in the BOE Project Budget Summary (Attachment No 2).

Total Project Budget / Funding					
Funding Source	Funding Amount				
CRA/LA EBP	\$7,176,000				
CDBG FUNDS (Reprogrammed- \$4,951,798)	\$0				
Quimby	\$4,080,482				
CTIEP GAP	\$4,000,000				
Total Project Funds	\$15,256,482				
Costs Categories	Total Costs				
Design Consultant	\$1,542,110				
Other Direct Costs (Artwork, Permit Fees, DWP Power Relocation, and ITA -Telecom System)	\$1,737,650				
BCA, Materials Testing	\$897 <u>.</u> 897				
Estimate Construction Cost	\$20,406,750				
Construction Contingency (10%)	\$2,040,675				
BOE Based Project Cost Estimate	\$26,625,082				
Project Funding Shortfall (Based Contract)	(\$11,368,600)				

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

BOE Based Project Cost Estimate (With Add Alternates)	\$29,161,082
Project Funding Shortfall (With Two Add Alternates)	(\$13,904,600)

In order to fully fund the project cost for the completion of the construction, including the add alternates, additional funds will be requested in future fiscal years.

	Soft Costs	Estimated Const				
Funding Sources	Expended/	FY 23-24	FY 24-25	FY 25-26	Total	
	Committed					
CRA/LA EBP	\$970,267	\$6,205,733			\$7,176,000	
CDBG			\$0		\$0	
Quimby	\$497,000	\$3,583,482			\$4,080,482	
CTIEP GAP			\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000	
Subtotal of approved funds					\$15,256,482	
Projected Shortfall			*\$5,000,000	*\$8,904,600	*\$13,904,600	
TOTALS	\$1,467,267	\$9,789,215	\$9,000,000	*\$8,904,600	\$29,161,082	
Staff to identify su	Staff to identify supplemental funding sources to address the anticipated funding shortfall, which may					

include additional contributions of City capital funds which will be pursued as a last recourse through the City budget process in the future fiscal years.

This report recommends the Committee to approve the solicitation of construction bids, and direct CAO staff to work with Council District 10 (CD 10) to identify funds to address the shortfall of approximately \$13.91 Million Dollars in the future fiscal years noted above. BOE staff will report back to the MFC to present bids received and the updated project shortfall, request the identification of possible funds in future fiscal years, and subsequently seek approval to move forward with the award of the construction contract.

CC:

Bernyce Hollins, City Administrative Officer LaTanya Roux, City Administrative Officer Elis Lee, City Administrative Officer Deborah Weintraub, Bureau of Engineering Bernadette Hernandez, Bureau of Engineering Alex Ngo, Bureau of Engineering

Attachments:

- No. 1 Construction Inflation Report dated 7/28/2022
- N0. 2 BOE Project Budget Summary

CITY OF LOS ANGELES INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Date: 7/28/22

To: Municipal Facilities Committee

From: Deborah Weintraub, AIA, LEEDAP Chief Deputy City Engineer

S. In al Weintrant

Subject: **FUNDING FOR CONSTRUCTION COST INFLATION**

Recommendations:

- 1. That the Bureau of Engineering (BOE) work with the office of the City Administrative Officer to develop a funding strategy for projects that are either in construction and/or starting construction in Fiscal Year 2022-23 due to construction cost inflation, and;
- 2. Reassess market conditions in January 2023 to adjust this strategy accordingly.

Introduction:

The BOE is submitting this report in order to alert our City Hall colleagues of significant price increases we are experiencing in construction cost bids. The construction cost increases have a variety of causes and are extraordinary. In order to deliver committed capital projects to the City residents, the funding allocations for construction projects may need to be augmented.

Background:

Non-residential building inflation between 2011 and 2020 on a national basis was on average 3.7% annually (Zarenski, 2021¹), and 2.4% in California (California Department of General Services). While the pandemic initially decreased construction activity in 2020, in 2021 there was a large increase in demand for construction materials. Unfortunately, this demand was met with serious supply chain challenges, and this resulted in a reduction in the availability of construction materials and higher construction costs.

Between January 2020 to July 2021, prices of all materials and services for new construction performed by contractors has gone up 26.3% on a national average (AGC, August 2021²), and 13% in California (California Department of General Services, 2022). The California Department of General Services also reported that new construction costs in California went up 15.22% from June 2021 to June 2022.

Through 2022, prices for construction materials have continued their ascent and in addition, skilled labor has become even more scarce than previous years. Construction project starts are also being delayed to account for supply chain challenges and labor shortages, and the

¹ Zarenski is a nationally recognized construction economics analyst, author, educator and presenter. Website:

https://edzarenski.com/ . Article: https://edzarenski.com/2022/02/11/construction-inflation-2022/

² AGC is an organization of qualified construction contractors and industry related companies dedicated to skill, integrity and responsibility. Website: <u>https://www.agc.org/</u>

time delays and the uncertainty in product pricing are also resulting in higher bids (Engineering News Record, 2021). Contractors are transferring these risks to the Owner at the time of bidding.

Forecast:

Market analysis is showing the construction cost escalation rate in Los Angeles is currently 7.99% per year (Rider Levett Bucknall (RLB), 2022³), however, RLB is using 8.04% per year in their cost estimate calculations, and HNTB⁴ is using 15%.

Below is a summary of some of the other market forces impacting construction costs. As of February 2022, diesel fuel, steel mill products, lumber, plywood, copper, brass, aluminum, plastic, gypsum, concrete, pavement, and roofing have all gone up drastically and forecasts are predicting that prices through 2022 will exceed peak prices of 2021 (Engineering News Record, 2022⁵). Interest rates are set to continue to rise, and the Russia-Ukraine war creates a lot of uncertainty and has market impacts. Supply chain and labor issues continue to cause a backlog of orders and an inventory shortage, indicating a supply-demand imbalance that will result in higher-priced goods and services. The anticipated pace of inflation is not likely to decelerate until 2023, with manufacturers potentially beginning to catch up to demand in late 2022, potentially with supply chains largely unclogged by late-2023 (CBRE, 2022⁶).

³ RLB is a global cost consultant partner and a nationally recognized project management and advisory firm. Website: <u>https://www.rlb.com/americas/</u>. Article: https://s31756.pcdn.co/americas/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2022/03/City-Market-Insight-LOS-ANGELES-Q1-2022.pdf

⁴ HNTB is a national engineering consulting company, with a strong presence in Southern California. Website: https://www.hntb.com/

⁵ Engineering News Record is a national magazine that covers the engineering and construction industry. Website: https://www.enr.com/

⁶ CBRE is the world's largest commercial real estate services & investment company. Website: <u>https://www.cbre.com/about-us</u>. Article: <u>https://www.cbre.com/en/insights/reports/2022-fm-cost-trends-report</u>.

Data Analysis:



10-Year New Construction Inflation

BOE Bid Results:

In the past couple of years, there has been a wide range of cost changes with a general trend of higher than average cost increases. For example, BOE looked at price escalation data from City bids from 2021 to 2022 for two key construction scopes used on our projects that are typically bid on a unit price basis; concrete sidewalk/driveway and concrete pavement. In the past year the average unit cost of concrete sidewalk/driveway and concrete pavement increased by 79% and 21% respectively. We also found that there was a high variation on the cost changes in AC pavement.

In addition, we looked at 20 Municipal Facility project bids between 2017 to the present. These projects are typically bid on a lump sum basis. Our analysis was to look at the variance between the low bid and City Engineer's Estimate on a project-by-project basis. The average in the variance between the low bid price as compared to the City Engineer Estimate from 2017 through 2021 was that the low bid averaged 5.9% higher than the City Engineer's estimate. In 2022 this number increased dramatically to the low bids averaging 40.68% higher than the City Engineer's Estimate.

BOE Actions:

BOE is in the process of developing a draft cost inflation clause for City construction contracts, which would establish the mechanism for cost adjustments during construction for demonstrated inflationary cost increases and decreases. BOE intends to vet the proposed language with the local construction industry and with our City partners. This will help offset the perceived need by contractors to price risk into their bids.

Additionally, BOE is in the process of revising the suggested inflation rates for project budgeting. Since 2014, BOE suggested using 5% as the inflation rate for all new construction. The below chart is BOE's suggested inflation rates to use for future estimates:

Date	Annual Rate
July 1, 2022 - June 30, 2023	15%
July 1, 2023 - June 30, 2024	12%
July 1, 2024 - June 30, 2025	9%
July 1, 2025 - June 30, 2026	8%
July 1, 2026 - June 30, 2027	8%

The potential recession may cause changes in these inflation rates. Therefore, it is recommended to re-assess these rates in six months.

RL/MA:tt

Box\CMD\Administration\Municipal Facilities Meeting Minutes\MFC Report Construction Inflation

cc: Mary Hodge, Deputy Mayor Aura Garcia, Board of Public Works Teresa Villegas, Board of Public Works Mike Davis, Board of Public Works Vahid Khorsand, Board of Public Works Susana Reyes, Board of Public Works. Gary Lee Moore, Bureau of Engineering Ted Allen, Bureau of Engineering Alfred Mata, Bureau of Engineering Julie Sauter, Bureau of Engineering Jose Fuentes, Bureau of Engineering Richard Louie, Bureau of Engineering

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

		Pio Pico Park Budget	Summary Rev. 3.6.23	_oka		
Α	PROJECT	TITLE: PIO PICO LIBRARY POCKET	PARK &UNDERGR	OUND PARKING STR.		
В	WORK O	RDER NUMBER: E1908188				
		Desire and exacting of under	and a solution star star			
C		SCOPF. Design and construction of underg	ary's exterior building	façade and entrance canop	y and the	
Ŭ	TROJECI	development of a surface level po	cket park above the p	arking structure.	·	
-						
D	CLIENT D	PPARIMENT:	Department of Rec	reation and Parks/ Library D	Department	
Е	BOE CON	ITACT:	Alex Ngo			
F	TYPE OF	ESTIMATE:				
			+5% to 10%	+20% to15%	+30% to 20%	
			Class A	Class B	Class C	
G	PROJECT	COST ESTIMATE:	Pre-design Checklis	<u>st</u>		
		8	PROJECT BUDGET	PROJECT BUDGET	COSTS	REMARKS
			VALUES	TEMPLATE %		
	1 LAND		^	0.00/		
	1.01	Environmental Reviews (Phase I/II)	\$ -	0.0%		
	1.02	Appraisa/Escrow/Title	÷ -		¢	
					3 -	
	2 PRE-D	DESIGN OWNER COSTS				
	2.02	Geotechnical- Actual	\$ 102,034	0.5%		
	2.03	Survey	\$ -			
	2.04	Enviornmental (CEQUA)- Actual	\$ 102,034	0.5%	¢ 004.040	
		Pre-Design Owner Cost Total			\$ 204,068	
	3 CONS	TRUCTION				
	3.01	Pocket Park/Basement Parking Structure	\$ 17,745,000			
	3.02	Escalation through mid-point of const. (Jan. 2024) approx. 15%	\$ 2,661,750			
	3.03	Construction Cost Subtotal			\$ 20,406,750	
	3.04	Sustainability Cost	\$-	0.0%		
	3.05	Design Contingency	\$ -	0.0%		
	3.06	Construction Contingency (10%)	\$ 2,040,675	10.0%		
		Construction Cost Total			\$ 22,447,425	
	4 BOE 0	COSTS - DESIGN PHASE	¢ 440.040	2.00/		
	4.01	Project Management	\$ 448,949 ¢ 47,242	2.0%		
	4.02	Project Elig.	\$ 07,342 \$ 61,220	0.3%		
	4.03	Structural	\$ 01,220 \$ /0.81/	0.3%		
	4.05	Mechanical	\$ 61.220	0.2%		
	4.06	Electrical	\$ 61,220	0.3%		
	4.07	Landscaping/ Civil	\$ 61,220	0.3%		
	4.08	Estimating-Const. Cost Est. Review for three phases	\$ 40,814	0.2%		
	4.09	Bid & Award	\$ 61,220	0.3%		
		BOE Cost Total - Design		4.2%	\$ 904,019	
	5 BOE C	COSTS - CONSTRUCTION PHASE	A			
	5.01	Project Management	\$ 168,356	0.8%		
	5.02		 ⇒ 448,949 € 124,405 	2.0%		
+	5.04	Survey		U.6% 0.2%		
	5.05	BOF Cost Total - Construction	Ψ 07,342	3 7%	\$ 819 331	
	6 TOTA	L BOE COSTS		7.9%		
					\$ 1.927.418	
	7 CONS	ULTANT COSTS				
+	7 01	Docian Consultants (IEAK)	¢ 1.000.000		J	
	1.01	Design Cultsuildills (JFAN)	φ 1,000,000			
	7.02	Env. Consultant for Feasibility Study	\$ 52,670			
	7.03	Contingencies	\$ 77,680		, г	
	/.04	Geotechnical-Design Phase	\$ 66,760 \$ 145,000			
+	1.05	Georechnical-Construction Phase	↓ ↓ ↓			
	/.U6	EIV. WINGANON CONSULTAN (AECOW)	\$ 142,561 \$ E7 420			
	1.01	Consultant Cost Total	ψ 37,439		\$ 15/2110	
		CTION			φ 1,342,110	
	8.01	BCA Inspection & Contract Compliance Review	\$ 673 423	3 በ%		
	8.02	Material Testing	\$ 224.474	1.0%		
	8.03		,			
		BCA Cost Total			\$ 897,897	

9 0	9 OTHER DIRECT COST Pio Pico Park Budget Summary Rev. 3.6.23 oka							
9.	9.01	Public Art Work	\$	204,068	1.0%	1	L	
9.	9.02	Building and Safety IDO - Plan check fees	\$	35,000		-	-	
9.	9.03	BOE IDO - Plan check fees	\$	3,000		-	-	
9.	9.04	BOS IDO - Plan check fees	\$	3,000		-	-	
9.	9.05	Fire Dept. IDO - Plan check fees	\$	3,000		-	-	
9.	9.06	DOT Design and installation of meter for temporary parking	\$	32,400		-	-	
9.	9.07A	LADWP IDO - Primary Power Line Relocation (Design Service)	\$	50,000		-	-	
9.	9.07B	LADWP IDO - Primary Power Line Relocation (Street /Site Work)	\$	403,000		-	-	
9.	9.08	ITA	\$	260,000	lump sum	-	-	
9.	9.09	Printing; Reproduction	\$	10,000	lump sum			
9.	9.10	Bid Advertising	\$	5,000	lump sum			
9.	9.11	Existing Library Restrooms Expansion (Construct by GSD),	\$	487,590	lump sum			
9.	9.12	Project Direct Cost Contingencies	\$	241,592	lump sum		Ì	
		Other Direct Cost Total			10.52	\$	1,737,650	
						_		
10 P	PROJE	CT TOTAL COST				\$	26,625,082	
11 C	CONSTI	RUCTION COST ESCALATION						
11	1.01	Projected Construction Cost Escalation (see line 3.02)						
		Projected Escalation Total				\$	-	
						_		
12 PI	PROJE	CT TOTAL COST w/o BOE soft cost				\$	26,625,082	
F		NG SURPLUS/(SHORTFALL) w/o BOE Soft Cost				\$	(11.368.600)	
	UNDI					- [*]	(11,000,000)	
13 F	UNDI	NG SOURCES (CF 14-1174-S37) and (CF 14-1174-S9)				-	r	
	15.01	CRA/LA EBP Fund No. 57D/22/22L9TN (Expended by 09/2024)			\$ 7,176,000			
	15.02	CDBG FUNDS Re-programed to other projects (\$4,951,798)						
		CDBG FUNDS PY 44 FMS Acct. 424/43R716 (\$2,000,000)			\$ -			
		CDBG FUNDS PY 45 FMS Acct. 424/43S716 (2,000,000)			\$ -			
		CDBG FUNDS PY 46 FMS Acct. 424/43T716 (951,798)			- \$			
	15.03	Quimby RAP BR 17-042, 309/89/89460K-B3			\$ 4,080,482			
	15.04	CIEP Gap Fund 100/54/00R629			\$ 4,000,000			
		Total Funding Available				\$	15,256,482	
14 🗛		LTERNATES (Includes 15% contingencies):						
		Add Alternate 1: Existing Library Facade Treatment (West Front Entr	ance)			\$	863.000	
		Add Alternate 2: Evicting Library Eccode Treatment (Pouth Fact 9 M	orth)			¢	1 672 000	
15 -		And Alternate 2. Existing Library Façade Treatment (South, East & No	лuт)			•	1,073,000	
15 T	IOTAL	ADD ALTERNATES				\$	2,536,000	
16 P	PROJE	CT TOTAL COST WITH (3) ADD ALTERNATES:			I	\$	29,161,082	
┯╴	ייסיאנו					•	(12 004 400)	
		NG SURFLUS/(SOURTFALL) W/U BUE SOTT COST				>	(13,704,000)	
			Alox N	20	Dato	1	rev 1/26/23	
		Prepared by:	Alexin	go	Dale.		Tott HEGEO	
		Prepared by:		yu	Date		3/6/2022	
		Reviewed by:	Ohaji K. Al	odallah	Date:		3/6/2023	
		Reviewed by: Approved by: Approved by:	Ohaji K. Al	odallah	Date: Date: Date:		3/6/2023	
		Reviewed by:	Ohaji K. Al	odallah	Date:		3/6/2023	