



## AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: Update on the Active River Project Status

Presenter: Chris Adesso/John Rabchuk

*Please check appropriate box:*

	Government Operations	X	Government Services – 05.23.2016
	Planning & Development		City Council
	Public Hearing		

Estimated Cost:	\$0.00 – Information Only	Budgeted:	YES		NO	
-----------------	---------------------------	-----------	-----	--	----	--

**Executive Summary:**

A presentation by John Rabchuk on the Active River Project concept and progress made on concepts discussed during the last presentation. Some of the topics to be covered are as follows:

1. Water Quality Testing
2. Bob Leonard Walk – Grant
3. Kinetic Sculpture Donation
4. Engineering Cost Estimate – River Park Concept Vetting
5. Market, Cost and Funding Analysis
6. Marketing – Active River Logo
7. Park District Activity

**Attachments:** *(please list)*

Active River Project Model Project Summary\*Supplemental Presentation Documentation\*Concept Vetting Engineering Cost Estimate

**Recommendation / Suggested Action** *(briefly explain):*

None – For information only

<i>For office use only:</i>	<i>Agenda Item Number: 4.a</i>
-----------------------------	--------------------------------



## St. Charles Active River Project

### Summary – Model Projects

#### Selected Projects

- Falls Park, Greenville South Carolina
- Chattahoochee River Restoration, Columbus, Georgia/Phenix City, Alabama
- Whitewater Park, Manchester, Iowa

#### Summary points

- ✓ No project is directly comparable
- ✓ Success is due to visionary, broad-based thinking and multi-stakeholder public /private partnerships
- ✓ Removal of aging dam structures (when present) is central to accomplishing recreational and environmental objectives
- ✓ Focusing on the river is key to achieving re-vitalization goals

Note: Information contained herein gleaned from personal conversation and/or published articles. References provided for each case study.



## Overview Falls Park, Greenville SC

Mid-size in population, widest scope, most mature park, 10 years old. No dam removal involved

Population: 61,000

Project Size: 26 Acres

Project timeline: 10 years, Phase 1 completed 2004 (+/- 4.5 years design to finished construction), Phase 2 completed 2014

**Project Partners:** Carolina Foothills Garden Club, City of Greenville, Furman University, City Planning Commission, private developers, FHWA South Carolina Division, South Carolina DOT, Metropolitan Planning Organization, individuals, corporations, state and federal agencies

### Project Elements/Cost

- Phase 1: \$13.9
  - 20 acre public gardens showcasing Reedy River Falls
  - New park building with 2 plaza levels, ADA-accessible ramps and elevator
  - Event space, public restrooms
  - Areas for picnics and quiet contemplation
  - Private restaurant
  - Pedestrian/Bike paths
  - Garden maintenance facility
- Phase 2: \$4.9 Curved pedestrian suspension bridge: 345' long, 12' wide
- Related but not direct components funded through other means (private donations, city capital and other budgets)
  - Removal of existing 4-lane highway bridge over the Reedy River
  - Other infrastructure improvements to improve downtown accessibility and attractiveness
    - Narrow Main Street from four lanes to two
    - Widen sidewalks
    - Plant numerous trees
    - Add al fresco dining areas
    - Showcase public art



## DESTINATION ST. CHARLES

*an Active River Project*

- Falls Park Endowment Fund
  - Created through public/private partnership led by Carolina Foothills Garden Club. Donors include corporations, businesses, foundations, general public
  - Earnings offset annual project maintenance and operating costs.
  - Fund currently \$2.6M. Used to:
    - Purchase major art works
    - Support education Programs
    - Park amenities and enhancements outside the City's normal operating budget
    - Source of emergency, short-term funding for operating funds when and if city funding is not available to maintain the park quality

### Project Benefits

- 1996: 25% vacancy rate in downtown store fronts
- 2016:
  - New residential and retail demand
  - 'Downtown' footprint expanded by almost 50% to accommodate new retail/residential demand
  - Long waiting list of interested downtown merchants and businesses
  - Increased sales tax revenues from even beyond downtown retail area
  - Greenville identity enhanced as a regional destination
  - Attractive to industrial/manufacturing interests, e.g. new BMW manufacturing plant
- Park and bridge sparked a \$65 million development, RiverPlace, completed in 2005, marking the city's largest public-private partnership to date. City estimate - potential private investment in immediate area could reach 10 -20 times public investment. (May 2011)

### Enhancement/funding strategies: (funding breakout not available)

- City-led "In Full Bloom" \$13 million funding initiative
- City-crafted public private partnership
- 1981 Main Street Streetscape Project reduced Main Street to 2 lanes from 4
- Furman University land donation of 6 ac surrounding the falls to the city
- New pedestrian bridge (Phase 2) funded by Greenville's city hospitality tax



## DESTINATION ST. CHARLES

*an Active River Project*

### Lessons Learned:

- Collaboration between a range of unique partners was critical
- Look at everything as an investment, not a cost. Consider quality of life as well as dollars
- Encouraged first floor commercial tenants in the downtown area: creates noon and early evening foot traffic to local retailers
- Do everything in a balanced way; do not over emphasize one aspect (Residential, commercial, retail, recreational, restaurants, etc.) over any of the others
- Watch stresses on local/regional merchants as high downtown storefront demand adds financial pressure on all but national players
- Creating an accurate cost/benefit analysis is difficult as many benefits are visible but difficult to quantify

### References:

<http://www.fallspark.com/167/Falls-Park>

<https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/11mayjun/05.cfm> (excellent project summary)

<http://www.greenvilleonline.com/story/news/local/2014/10/04/liberty-bridge-falls-park-transformed-downtown/16751269/>

<http://www.architectmagazine.com/project-gallery/falls-park-on-the-reedy>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LDAmLidkS4s>



## Overview    Chattahoochee River Restoration    Columbus, GA; Phenix City AL

Largest population served, multiple dam removal, longest river run, 3 years old

Population: 189,885 (Columbus, GA), 32,822 (Phenix City, AL)

Project Size: 2.5 miles of the Chattahoochee River

Project timeline: 2013

**Project Partners:** Led by UPTown Columbus, Inc. Partners include 2 cities, two states, 2 counties, Federal government, state and federal agencies, environmental/historic groups, private business owners, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Georgia Power, Columbus Water Works,

**Project Elements/Cost:** \$24.4 - \$26 million; Re-establish the Chattahoochee River as an economic engine for Columbus, GA and Phenix City, AL

- Removal of 2 historic dams
- 2-mile world class whitewater run for rafting and kayaking; the world's largest urban whitewater rafting course with an overall 40 elevation drop
- Slow moving water areas for canoeing
- Riparian/Riverine environmental improvements including restored fall line habitat for rare and endangered species such as shoal bass, mussels and shoal spider lilies
- Ancillary but related projects: Improved river access including new Riverwalk, Rails-to-Trails project, new pedestrian bridge and commercial plaza

**Project Benefits:**

- Columbus State University study estimates
  - \$42M in positive economic impact with more than \$2M from new sales and hotel/motel tax revenue
  - Generate  $\geq$  700 new jobs
  - Draw visitors from 5-hour driving radius
  - Attract 188,000 sports participants annually; 144,000 from out of town



## DESTINATION ST. CHARLES

### *an Active River Project*

- Further enhancement of existing assets/investments, e.g. converting abandoned mill buildings to mixed-use developments
- Property value along the river projected to increase as much as 60 %
- Create urban environment attractive to students and talented employees; improved employee retention; reduced recruitment costs
- Catalyst for the restoration of properties within the National Historic Landmark District; historic mills have been restored and repurposed as urban apartments
- More productive fishery

#### Enhancement/funding strategies:

- \$13.8 million (56% of project costs) in private/corporate donations
  - \$5 million from W. C. Bradley Co.
  - \$1 million from Aflac
  - Private money from more than 50 major donors; approximately \$1.7 million from people or organizations outside Columbus with interests mostly in river restoration or revitalizing the historic riverfront
- \$10.6 million in public money
  - \$5 million City of Columbus
  - \$5 million USACE
  - \$600,000 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Open Rivers Initiative
- Combined with other in-process projects: Riverwalk, the Rails-to-Trails Project and the 14th Street bridge and plaza project
- USACE funding support under the Chattahoochee Fall Line Ecosystem Restoration Project
- 1990's purchase of two obsolete mill dams in the 90's using public and private money. Subsequent transfer of dam control to Uptown Columbus, Inc., an NGO chartered to encourage quality development/re-development in Uptown Columbus.

#### Lessons Learned:

- Reconnection of the community (not the kayakers) to the river has been central to the real estate development that followed
- White water parks also attract people interested in biking, walking, tubing, etc.
- Easy access to good outdoor recreation significantly increases the desirability for business and residential development



## DESTINATION ST. CHARLES

*an Active River Project*

### References:

[http://www.phenixcityal.us/edo/Sites/Phenix\\_City/Documents/Economic%20Development/Chattahoochee%20River%20Restoration%20Project.pdf](http://www.phenixcityal.us/edo/Sites/Phenix_City/Documents/Economic%20Development/Chattahoochee%20River%20Restoration%20Project.pdf) : 2010 GA Planning Association Award Submittal

<http://www.ledger-enquirer.com/news/local/article29292949.html>

<http://mclaughlinwhitewater.com/projects/chattahoochee-falls/>

<http://www.chattahoocheeheritage.org/2013/04/river-rising-columbus-whitewater/> Good video explaining project background and showing aspects of completed conditions

<http://www.mnn.com/food/healthy-eating/sponsorvideo/river-restoration-project-to-make-a-big-impact-in-georgia-with-help> Includes short video on project background

[www.ColumbusGaWhitewater.com](http://www.ColumbusGaWhitewater.com) Good promotional videos for river-related activities including zipline

<http://www.enr.com/articles/12209-chattahoochee-river-restoration-churns-up-whitewater-attraction>

<https://smartech.gatech.edu/bitstream/handle/1853/47315/EubanksM-GWRCpaper.pdf>

<http://siteselection.com/onlineInsider/Churn-Stokes-Upturn.cfm>

<http://www.canoekayak.com/start-paddling/new-surf-spot-in-southeast/attachment/columbus-alabama-channel11/#7UWRILDActig3seV.97>



## Overview White Water Park, Manchester, IA

Smallest population, narrowest scope, most recent construction, 2 years old.

Population: 5,179

Project Size: 800' river run

Project timeline: 2014-2015

Project Partners: City, IA DNR, IA Rivers Program, Delaware County, private donors

Project Elements/Cost: Vision to make Maquoketa River defining town attraction

- Dam Removal - Cost: \$1.8
  - Removal of 9' dam
  - Six 18" drops and rocky pools over an 800' run (900' park)
  - Some Class II and III rapids
  - Attractive to kayakers, canoers, tubers
- Riverfront enhancement – Improvements to Howard and Helen Shelly Park (White Water Park)
  - Not yet complete; to be phased in over several years
  - Expand walking/biking trails
  - Public restrooms
  - Parking
  - Donor recognition
  - New connections between city parks
  - Improved fishing and boating access
  - Seating and viewing areas
  - Public space for music events/public celebrations

### Project Benefits:

- Opportunity for joint marketing Eastern IA loop whitewater parks w/ Charles City and Elkader
- Changing downtown dynamics; much stronger focus on river
- New downtown businesses in anticipation of increased visitor traffic; +/- \$2 million in new, local economic activity projected
- Enhanced river use safety



## DESTINATION ST. CHARLES

### *an Active River Project*

- Increased fish species diversity and numbers above old dam site – better fishing
- Healthier, cleaner river
- 2015 River Town of the Year; Future designation as Iowa Water Trail enhances tourism promotion

#### Enhancement/funding strategies:

- Manchester’s “Good to Great” Committee, River and Recreation Subcommittee
- Public/Private Partnerships: City, County, State governments, other public agencies, private businesses, other organizations, land owners, volunteers including:
  - \$600,000 – City of Manchester
  - \$200,000 – IA DNR “Low-Head Dam Mitigation and Water Trails Program
  - \$300,000 – Vision Iowa CAT and RECAT grant
  - \$100,000 – IA State Resource Enhancement and Protection (REAP) Grant
  - \$50,000 - Delaware County
  - \$630,000 – Community campaign for business and private donations
- Iowa DNR Rivers Program

#### Lessons Learned:

- Collaboration is crucial
- State DNR River Program was an important catalyst

#### References:

[http://www.manchesterwhitewater.com/index2.php#/rtext\\_6/](http://www.manchesterwhitewater.com/index2.php#/rtext_6/)

<http://us5.campaign-archive1.com/?u=0af12fc2ab3fcc498129ee6e7&id=32ba0ee6b0&e=0777a35e2e>

<http://www.thegazette.com/subject/sports/recreation/iowas-largest-white-water-course-opens-20150617>

[http://www.manchester-ia.org/index.asp?Type=B\\_BASIC&SEC=%7B8F2ABE16-D2FC-41E9-B3AF-59B25C89BF7F%7D](http://www.manchester-ia.org/index.asp?Type=B_BASIC&SEC=%7B8F2ABE16-D2FC-41E9-B3AF-59B25C89BF7F%7D)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GDCpqFvpNdk> A good video, though without sound, that shows kayaking and tubing in White Water Park.

# Active River Project Update

Government Services Committee May 23, 2016



Established water quality testing program with high school environmental science students and Friends of the Fox. Test for dissolved oxygen, phosphorus and biological content on monthly basis for next ten years.



Created expanded landscape design and furnishings plan for Bob Leonard Walkway. Raised \$60K and applied for additional \$20K grant. Will request city approval once all funding in place.



Kinetic sculpture donation for placement on Johannsen's Island by Anderson family. Solar lighting (timed). Met with Brownstone Homeowners Association.



Developed engineering cost estimate for concept feasibility study for RiverPark component. Prove/disprove ability to construct RiverPark without negative consequences.



Developed detailed market, cost and funding analysis of three successful downtown river projects. Greenville, SC; Manchester, IA; Columbus, GA



Initiated marketing program to continue to educate the community, identify the smaller components that we complete in the short term and to set the stage for private fund raising efforts.



Working with Row America on long range plan to construct rowing skull storage facility at Ferson Creek Park that would be provide rental slots for skulls from other clubs and individuals.

Nest



Initiated design concept study for expanding power boat launch and parking at Boy Scout Island. Includes creating new river channel into lagoon, dredging and floating gardens.

s

:



Initiated design concept study to bring cycle and pedestrian pathways north of Freedom Trail along railroad embankment. Assumes new trails will be created under Main Street bridge.

P



Continue discussions with Union Pacific Railroad, City and Park District concerning abandoned right of way from west of Randall Road east through City.

i

t

ation from Greenville Mayor White for STC delegation (City, Park District, River Corridor) to visit Greenville SC.

Authorize funding of feasibility study as proposed.

**Concept Feasibility Study  
River Park Concept Feasibility Study  
Fox River**

Route 0  
Local Agency City of St. Charles  
Section 0  
Project 14-0262  
Job No. 0  
Existing Structure No. 0

Method of Compensation:  
Standard Hourly Rate

\*Firm's **approved rates** on file with IDOT's  
Bureau of Accounting and Auditing:

Complexity Factor ( R ) 0.0  
Calendar Days 540

**CHECKS**  
TOTAL (THIS SHEET)  
TOTAL (HOURS BY TASK)

Date: 4/3/2016

**Cost Estimate of Consultant's Services in Dollars**

Element of Work	Employee Classification	Man-Hours	Hourly Rate	(MH) x Hourly Rate	Services by Others	In-House Direct Costs (IHDC)	Total	TOTAL COST BY TASK
1 Data Collection					\$ -	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00	<b>Task: 1</b> \$10,408.00 \$9,208.00
	Engineer VI	12.0	\$185.00	\$2,220.00			\$2,220.00	
	Engineer III	12.0	\$117.00	\$1,404.00			\$1,404.00	
	Engineering Technician III	14.0	\$116.00	\$1,624.00			\$1,624.00	
	S2O Shipley	18.0	\$220.00	\$3,960.00			\$3,960.00	
2 Field Survey & Base Map					\$ -	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>Task: 2</b> \$22,094.00 \$22,094.00
	Engineer VI	8.0	\$185.00	\$1,480.00			\$1,480.00	
	Engineer V	2.0	\$165.00	\$330.00			\$330.00	
	Engineering Technician III	60.0	\$116.00	\$6,960.00			\$6,960.00	
	Engineering Technician II	108.0	\$97.00	\$10,476.00			\$10,476.00	
	Senior Scientist	0.0	\$170.00	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	ERS III	12.0	\$94.00	\$1,128.00			\$1,128.00	
	S2O Shipley	1.0	\$220.00	\$220.00			\$220.00	
	S2O Engineer	10.0	\$150.00	\$1,500.00			\$1,500.00	
3 Hydraulics					\$ -	\$0.00	\$0.00	<b>Task: 3</b> \$7,705.00
	Engineer V	9.0	\$165.00	\$1,485.00			\$1,485.00	
	Engineer IV	37.0	\$140.00	\$5,180.00			\$5,180.00	
	S2O Shipley	2.0	\$220.00	\$440.00			\$440.00	
	S2O Engineer	4.0	\$150.00	\$600.00			\$600.00	
4 Alternatives Analysis					\$ -	\$ 1,200.00	\$ 1,200.00	<b>Task: 4</b> \$61,033.00 \$59,833.00
	Engineer VI	63.0	\$185.00	\$11,655.00			\$11,655.00	
	Engineer V	32.0	\$165.00	\$5,280.00			\$5,280.00	
	Engineer IV	26.0	\$140.00	\$3,640.00			\$3,640.00	
	Engineering Technician III	64.0	\$116.00	\$7,424.00			\$7,424.00	
	Senior Scientist	20.0	\$170.00	\$3,400.00			\$3,400.00	
	ERS III	6.0	\$94.00	\$564.00			\$564.00	
	S2O Shipley	36.0	\$220.00	\$7,920.00			\$7,920.00	
	S2O Engineer	133.0	\$150.00	\$19,950.00			\$19,950.00	
5 Report and Summary					\$ -	\$835.92	\$835.92	<b>Task: 5</b> \$4,065.92 \$3,230.00
	Engineer VI	6.0	\$185.00	\$1,110.00			\$1,110.00	
	Engineer V	0.0	\$165.00	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	Engineer IV	4.0	\$140.00	\$560.00			\$560.00	
	Engineering Technician III	0.0	\$116.00	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	Senior Scientist	0.0	\$170.00	\$0.00			\$0.00	
	S2O Shipley	3.0	\$220.00	\$660.00			\$660.00	
S2O Engineer	6.0	\$150.00	\$900.00			\$900.00		
6 Meetings and Coordination					\$ -	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00	<b>Task: 6</b> \$7,655.00 \$6,455.00
	Engineer VI	13.0	\$185.00	\$2,405.00			\$2,405.00	

**Concept Feasibility Study  
River Park Concept Feasibility Study  
Fox River**

Route 0  
 Local Agency City of St. Charles  
 Section 0  
 Project 14-0262  
 Job No. 0  
 Existing Structure No. 0

Method of Compensation:  
 Standard Hourly Rate

\*Firm's **approved rates** on file with IDOT's  
 Bureau of Accounting and Auditing:

Complexity Factor ( R ) 0.0  
 Calendar Days 540

Date: 4/3/2016

**CHECKS**  
 TOTAL (THIS SHEET)  
 TOTAL (HOURS BY TASK)

**Cost Estimate of Consultant's Services in Dollars**

Element of Work	Employee Classification	Man-Hours	Hourly Rate	(MH) x Hourly Rate	Services by Others	In-House Direct Costs (IHDC)	Total
	Engineer V	8.0	\$165.00	\$1,320.00			\$1,320.00
	S2O Shipley	9.0	\$220.00	\$1,980.00			\$1,980.00
	S2O Engineer	5.0	\$150.00	\$750.00			\$750.00
<b>Totals</b>		743.0		\$ 108,525.00	\$ -	\$ 4,435.92	\$ 112,960.92

**TOTAL COST BY TASK**

Route  
 Local Agency  
 Section  
 Project 14-0262  
 Job No.  
 Existing Struct 14-0262

**WORK HOUR ESTIMATE FOR CONSULTING SERVICES**  
**Concept Feasibility Study**  
**River Park Concept Feasibility Study**

Description	Engineer VI	Engineer V	Engineer IV	Engineer III	Engineering Technician III	Engineering Technician II	Senior Scientist	ERS III	S2O Shipley	S2O Engineer	In House Direct Costs
<b>1 Data Collection</b>											
1.1 Field Visit	8								18		
Photo Documentation				8							
1.2 Topographic Mapping					2						
1.3 GIS Data											
Parcel Data					2						
Utility Info	2				2						
1.4 Bathymetric Survey	2			4	8						
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>56.0</b>			<b>12.0</b>	<b>14.0</b>				<b>18.0</b>		<b>\$ 1,200.00</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>				<b>21%</b>	<b>25%</b>				<b>32%</b>		
<b>2 Field Survey &amp; Base Map</b>											
2.1 <b>Cross Sections and Ground Topo</b>											
a Horizontal & Vertical Control						4					
b Topographic Survey	2					40			1	3	
c Cross Sections						20					
d Wetland Survey						4					
e Structure Survey						40					
2.2 <b>Wetland Reconnaissance</b>								12			
2.3 <b>Base Map</b>											
a Organize Data gathered in Task 1	2				4						
b Integrate ground topo					8						
c Cross sections		2			8						
d Base Map Exhibits	4				40					7	
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>201.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>		<b>60.0</b>	<b>108.0</b>		<b>12.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>10.0</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>		<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>		<b>30%</b>	<b>54%</b>		<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5%</b>	
<b>3 Hydraulilcs</b>											
3.1 Procure FEMA Model		1	3						1		
Review Model		2	6								
Convert to HEC RAS		3	16								
3.2 Hydraulic Analysis											
Update Model		3	10								
Update flood Profiles			2						1	4	
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>52.0</b>	<b>9.0</b>	<b>37.0</b>						<b>2.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>		<b>17%</b>	<b>71%</b>						<b>4%</b>	<b>8%</b>	
<b>4 Alternatives Analysis</b>											
4.1 Purpose, location and configuration									1		
Review base conditions and hydraulic model	1	4							3	3	
Establish initial concepts	8	4							10	25	
Alternatives vetting	8	4					4		3	3	
City Review	4	4									
Prioritize Concepts	2								3	3	
4.2 Alternative Development	2	2							1	10	
4.2.1 Hydraulic Evaluation									10	35	
Hydraulic Regulatory compliance		2	8								
4.2.2 Alternative Refinement	2	2								5	
4.2.3 Plans and Exhibits											
Project Overview	4				8				3	22	
Geometric Plan Sheets	4				24						
River Profile			2		4				1	4	
Cross Sections	2				8					7	
Details	4	4			12				1	8	

Route  
 Local Agency  
 Section  
 Project 14-0262  
 Job No.  
 Existing Struct 14-0262

**WORK HOUR ESTIMATE FOR CONSULTING SERVICES**  
**Concept Feasibility Study**  
**River Park Concept Feasibility Study**

Description		Engineer VI	Engineer V	Engineer IV	Engineer III	Engineering Technician III	Engineering Technician II	Senior Scientist	ERS III	S2O Shipley	S2O Engineer	In House Direct Costs
	Adjacent Land Use	4				8						
4.2.4	Regulatory Compliance											
	Environmental Concerns	2						6				
	Permit Requirements		6	4				6	6			
4.2.5	Cost Estimate	8		12							8	
4.2.6	Schedule	8						4				
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>380.0</b>	<b>63.0</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>26.0</b>	<b>64.0</b>		<b>20.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>36.0</b>	<b>133.0</b>	<b>\$ 1,200.00</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>			<b>17%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>17%</b>		<b>5%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>35%</b>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Report and Summary</b>											
5.1	Alternative Feasibility / Preferred Alternative										6	
	Existing Conditions											
	Project Goals and Objectives											
	Project Constraints											
	Process Description											
	Preferred Alternative											
	Regulatory Coordination											
	Exclusions											
5.2	Costs	2		4								
5.3	Recommendations	2								3		
5.4	Executive Summary	2										
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>19.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>						<b>3.0</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>\$ 835.92</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>			<b>32%</b>	<b>21%</b>						<b>16%</b>	<b>32%</b>	
<b>6</b>	<b>Meetings and Coordination</b>											
6.1	Project initiation (kickoff) meetings (1 meetings @ 3 pers @ 2 hrs)	2	2							2	2	
6.2	Regulatory Coordination Meetings (3 meetings @ 2 pers @ 2 hrs each)	2	4									
6.3	City coordination meetings (2 meetings @ 2 pers @ 2 hrs each)	4	2							2		
6.4	Active River Coordination (1 meeting @ 2 pers @ 2 hrs each)	2								2		
6.5	Report review with City and Active River (1 meeting @2 pers @ 3 hrs.)	3								3	3	
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>35.0</b>	<b>13.0</b>	<b>8.0</b>						<b>9.0</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>\$ 1,200.00</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>			<b>37%</b>	<b>23%</b>						<b>26%</b>	<b>14%</b>	
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>743.0</b>	<b>102.0</b>	<b>51.0</b>	<b>67.0</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>138.0</b>	<b>108.0</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>69.0</b>	<b>\$ 4,435.92</b>
<b>PERCENT</b>			<b>14%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>21%</b>