

<b>Comparison of Estimates for G2 Implementation in LA River Revitalization Master Plan and the LA River Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study Recommended Plan</b>				
<b>Relevant Document</b>	<b>2007 LA River Revitalization Master Plan (LARRMP)</b>	<b>2013 (Draft) / 2016 (Final) LA River Ecosystem Restoration Feasibility Study Recommended Plan<sup>6</sup> (aka "ARBOR")</b>		<b>CLA / CAO Report (C.F. 13-1641; Date: Sept. 22, 2016)</b>
<b>Project Scope:</b>	The G2 parcel is a component of the Taylor Yard Opportunity Area (TYOA). The TYOA consists of habitat restoration, recreation, river widening, the installation of freshwater marshes, and a wide array of hardscape, structural, and visitor-centered features. <sup>11</sup>	G2 implementation in the ARBOR Plan's "Reach 6" includes riparian corridors and widening of the soft bottom river bed and gradual riparian slope to the overbank. At the upstream end, a back water wetland would be developed at river level. Aquatic riverine habitat and freshwater marsh would be restored in the expanded river bed.		Consistent with the ARBOR Plan.
<b>Estimated Land Cost</b>	\$70-90M <sup>1</sup>	\$43M <sup>7</sup>		\$44.6M <sup>18</sup>
<b>Estimated Site Development</b>	\$136M <sup>2,5,11</sup>	\$39.3M <sup>8,9,10</sup>		\$39.3M
<b>Subtotal</b>	\$206-226M <sup>4</sup>	\$82.3M		\$83.9M
<b>Contingency</b>	\$32M <sup>3</sup>	\$47.5M <sup>17</sup>		\$47.5M <sup>17</sup>
<b>Subtotal</b>	\$238-258M	\$129.8M		\$131.4M
<b>Escalation</b>	\$95-103M <sup>13</sup>	\$5M <sup>14</sup>		*Included in contingency above*
<b>Remediation</b>	*Included in LARRMP Land Estimate*	\$120.7M <sup>16</sup>		\$120.7M
<b>Total Estimate</b>	\$333-361M <sup>15</sup>	\$87.3M <sup>19</sup>	\$255.5M <sup>20</sup>	\$252M <sup>12</sup>

## Notes:

1. The \$70-\$90M estimate is inclusive of remediation.
2. This base estimate included labor and materials for features such as demolition, excavation, concrete, \$233 million of formal plantings and landscaping, and other construction- throughout the TYOA area.
3. Contingencies in the LARRMP estimate were applied in the amount of 30% for general contingency (applied to the construction base cost) and 23% for Design and Administration (applied to the base cost estimate plus aforementioned 30% contingency; not applied to land cost).
4. This total cost range includes the base construction cost, contingencies, and land acquisition estimate, summed; See LARRMP page 10-19 for TYOA in total.
5. Approximation of G2 proportion of TYOA site development features, excluding off-site and including 2/3 of open space features.
6. Authorization of the project is expected to be included in the under-consideration Water Resources Development Act, which has been passed by both the US Senate and House of Representatives, but is not yet enacted.
7. This figure is the as-is land value estimate determined in the 2013 "gross appraisal" for the G2 property.
8. Does not include remediation costs.
9. USACE site development is inclusive of design and administration.

10. The G2 area is not separately estimated in the USACE Plan, rather, it is the primary element of the Reach 6 area. For the purposes of estimation, it is assumed that the G2 area comprises approximately 75% of the Reach 6 implementation effort, which is approximately \$39 million of the \$52 million design and construction cost estimate.
11. Project costs were not developed to a high level of detail for the 2007 LARRMP, as it was intended to set a programmatic vision.
12. BOE report does not include the cost to relocate at least five high voltage Los Angeles Department of Water and Power transmission towers. The relocation of the transmission towers has not yet been determined.
13. Escalated 3%/yr for 2007-2012, and 5%/yr for 2012-2017 for 40%. 4%/yr avg. for 10 years.
14. This represents a 12% real estate escalation per USACE recommendation.
15. In a 2010 response to C.F. 09-1737 requesting an estimation of costs to implement the LARRMP, BOE prepared a report outlining estimates for major projects, including Taylor Yard G2. The estimate given at the time was \$220M. With consistent escalation, that estimate would now stand at \$289M, in line with the other estimates in this summary.
16. Per USACE procedure, the Recommended Plan estimate does not include remediation. The remediation per BOE estimate is included here to allow for an effective comparison.
17. Estimates for both contingency and escalation.
18. This as-is purchase value is known, not estimated.
19. Total of USACE Plan elements, which does not include remediation and added escalation and contingency.
20. Escalation, contingency, and remediation estimates are included in this total here for an effective comparison - those figures are not a part of the ARBOR Plan report, and were developed by the City in regards to the G2 acquisition.