

Date: Tuesday, November 16, 2021

Subject Fish Creek Feasibility and Economic Study Suggested Scope of Services and Rough Order Magnitude Cost

This is a suggested scope of services and a rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost to supplement the Friends of Fish Creek's request to the Anchorage Assembly to support a Fish Creek technical feasibility and economic development study in the 2022 budget. **This document is intended to provide guidance on potential costs and is to be used for informational purposes only.**

Task 1 Project Management: This task will cover general project management tasks, including meetings, coordination, and internal functions in support for the contract and study.

Task 2 Feasibility Study: This task assumes development of a feasibility study to assess daylighting (restoring the creek to the surface from an underground pipe) Fish Creek between Cuddy Midtown Park and Minnesota Drive at Tudor Road. The study would review the Fish Creek watershed, examine the creek's history, assess its current route and infrastructure, and provide alternatives for daylighting. It is suggested that it specifically address the feasibility in regards to civil design, hydraulics and hydrology (H&H), utility conflicts, maintenance, right-of-way (ROW), permitting, public involvement, and the economics of daylighting within the proposed project area. Each component of the study is described in greater detail below.

Task 2.1 Research – This task would identify and analyze the applicable previous work done on the creek corridor in the proposed project area. Assistance from Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) to obtain applicable record drawings is assumed. The information obtained from this task would provide baseline knowledge for subsequent tasks.

Task 2.2 Alternatives Development and Refinement – This task would utilize information analyzed in Task 2.1 Research, input from MOA, and input from stakeholders/community partners to assist in developing and refining alternatives for the proposed project area. Refinement of alternatives would inform the scope for subsequent tasks.

Task 2.3 Civil Site Design – This task would analyze impacts to existing properties and planned projects based on current MOA site regulations and codes. Traffic, stormwater drainage, and roadway ROW conflicts would be considered in a conceptual-level civil site design. Based on the design, a conceptual-level opinion of probable cost (OPCC) for further design and construction would be included and discussed.

Task 2.4 H&H Analysis – This task would include research of historical imagery, analysis of the current watershed and drainage basins, assessment of its current route, and alternatives for daylighting. Preliminary channel and floodplain sizing would be conducted. Stormwater connections and treatment (if required) would be discussed. Floodplain impacts would be considered and, if applicable, FEMA floodplain changes discussed.

Task 2.5 Utilities Conflicts – This task would include research of utilities for the alternatives to identify potential conflicts and provide concepts for possible solutions. Proposed utility relocation would be included in the OPCC with the assistance and input of public and private utility providers.

Task 2.6 ROW Analysis – This task would identify landowners, agencies, organizations, and stakeholders that may require coordination for land acquisition, easements, agreements, and partnerships for the alternatives. Probable acquisitions would be included in the OPCC and proposed land agreements would be discussed.

Task 2.7 Permitting Assessment – This task would identify anticipated current federal, state, and local permitting required for the alternatives.

Task 2.8 Public Involvement – This task would identify the community’s interest and level of support for the various alternatives being considered. A stakeholder group would be formed, and meetings would be conducted with this group. Two public opening houses would be held to allow the public to interface with the proposed project. Additional information would be provided via email and through community councils in the project area.

Task 2.9 Economic Assessment – This task will identify the public economic benefits of Fish Creek daylighting, quantify them to the extent possible, and compare them against the potential costs of proposed alternatives. Benefits which cannot be quantified will be considered qualitatively. Examples of benefits that could be considered include: low impact development (LID) impacts, infrastructure improvement and maintenance impacts, stormwater infiltration, floodplain resiliency, recreational opportunities, property value/neighborhood revitalization, and habitat improvements for aquatic life. Costs that would be accounted for in the analysis include initial investment, land acquisition, construction considerations, floodplain re-assessment, and annual maintenance.

Task 2.10 and 2.11 Draft and Final Study Report – The deliverable is assumed to be a Summary Report in draft and final versions with preliminary design sketches and OPCC values.

Rough Order Magnitude Cost

A ROM costs for the suggested scope of services provided above is provided in the table below. Additional detailed scoping will be required before a formal proposal can be provided. These costs are for informational purposes only and do not constitute a formal fee proposal.

Assumed Project Tasks	Rough Order Magnitude Cost
Task 1 – Project Management	\$45,000
Task 2.1 – Research	\$20,000
Task 2.2 – Alternatives Development and Refinement	\$20,000
Task 2.3 – Civil Site Design	\$25,000
Task 2.4 – H&H Analysis	\$10,000
Task 2.5 – Utility Conflict	\$20,000
Task 2.6 – ROW Analysis	\$25,000
Task 2.7 – Permitting Assessment	\$5,000
Task 2.8 – Economic Development	\$50,000
Task 2.9 – Public Involvement	\$45,000
Task 2.10 – Draft Study Report	\$35,000
Task 2.11 – Final Study Report	\$20,000
Total:	\$320,000