



PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Date: August 6, 2012

Meeting Called to Order: 5:35 p.m.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:08 p.m.

Present: Jo Beth McFadden, Richard Morton, Robert Wells, Mike Riedmuller, Kenneth Brink, Martin Karol, Joe Procopio (Council Rep)

Staff Present: Bob Goebel, P.E., Public Works Director; Dan Sailer, P.E., Engineering Manager; Bob Watts, P.E., Transportation Planning & Traffic Engineering Manager; Linda Angus, Administrative Supervisor

Absent: Bob Washburn

ITEM/SUBJECT	ACTION/BY	DISCUSSION/REPORT
		Bob announced that Pam Hutton had resigned. She received an offer with American Association of State Highway Traffic Officials (AASHTO) in Washington DC. Her last day here was August 1. So in the interim, Dan Sailer will be the Acting Assistant Public Works Director.
Call to Order		Chair Jo Beth McFadden called the meeting to order. A quorum was present.
Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda		None
Minutes	Motion made by Commissioner Richard Morton; seconded by Commissioner Martin Karol	It was motioned, seconded and approved by the Public Works Commission to accept the action minutes of July 2, 2012. Motion carries unanimously.
Approval of the Award for the Final Design Contract for the N. Meadows Drive Extension Project – Dan Sailer		<p>Dan Sailer, Engineering Manager, presented this item to the Commission. Dan began his presentation with a basic timeline showing that preliminary design began in December 2011. The full design phase of the project was split into two phases, preliminary and final. This allowed for the selection of the best project delivery method. Once the delivery method was decided on (CM/GC), and Edward Kraemer & Sons (Kraemer) was approved, the preliminary design could be completed. Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness (TSH) and Kraemer being integrated into the preliminary design phase provided a valuable partnership for this project. The goal of providing the 30% plan set for review was accomplished. Now we need to select a consultant for the final design phase.</p> <p>Dan presented an engineering summary outlining the final design phase. He also touched on the costs as it relates to the budget for this phase of the project. TSH's fee proposal for final design phase is \$3.4M which is in line with the industry standard of being roughly 10% of the project costs. It is a little bit</p>

		<p>higher, 10.4%, but as stated in the memo, due to the need for a lot more structure because of the poor soil conditions around US85, some of the original assumptions have changed as we have gotten through the preliminary design. Staff feels this cost is reasonable due to the conditions that have been encountered. The budget also includes \$3.6M to begin the right-of-way process once we have the right-of-way plans cleared and also some legal costs associated with appraisers and legal counsel to assist with the actual acquisition stage, if we have to get into the condemnation aspect. As the Commission is aware, staff has had to do that as part of the right-of-entry on one of the properties.</p> <p>Staff is recommending that the Town retain TSH. Their knowledge of the preliminary design and existing collaboration with the CM/GC provides continuity on the project. They have kept their costs under the preliminary phase budget and we expect they will probably do that during the final design phase also.</p> <p><u>Questions/Comments</u> <i>When staff reviewed the contract, did they find anything that they disagreed with?</i> No, in fact we worked with TSH on shaping the proposal. They reduced some of the costs that they originally put in based on what we had for the requirements of the proposal. Staff is very pleased with what is proposed.</p> <p>The Commission felt that Dan should have outlined in his memo how this cost was negotiated (how many proposals they had to work through to come to this cost). They felt that his memo reflected that there were really no negotiations to get them to 10.4% of the overall project budget. Staff needs to “toot their own horn” in letting Council know that negotiations did take place and as the proposals were refined, the goal was accomplished – this proposal met the needs of the project!</p> <p><i>Does the consultant have to certify that this design actually meets the requirements of the Environmental Assessment and the FONSI that was submitted so we will be in line to get Federal funds (should that happen)?</i> There is a form that goes through the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and CDOT will assist us in this process to make sure that this is completed. Costs for this are included in the proposal.</p> <p><i>If something has to be re-designed is TSH on the hook for this?</i> That’s the beauty of the CM/GC method, the contractor is on board and helps to</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Motion made by Commissioner Mike Riedmuller; seconded by Commissioner Robert Wells</p>	<p>identify and minimize the risk on the backend so it is the expectation that once we have completed the final design, the contractor should have very little concern about any redesign effort.</p> <p><i>When US85 was built and the railroad built the tracks, didn't they have to do soil borings as well? Likely, but the structure requirements are vastly different; because we are much higher due to the interchange, the loading is significantly greater on those types of soils compared to just the road service on top.</i></p> <p>It was motioned seconded and approved by the Public Works Commission to recommend to Town Council that Tsiouvaras Simmons Holderness, Inc. be awarded the professional services contract to complete final design of the N. Meadows Drive Extension project. Motion carries unanimously.</p>
<p>N. Meadows Drive Extension Project Update – Dan Sailer</p>		<p>Dan Sailer presented an update on this project giving more background on where we've been, where we are at, and where we are headed. He presented a basic timeline to the Commission beginning with the approval of the FONSI in March 2011 up to the FIR (Field Inspection Review – 30% design plans) completed in July 2012. He then talked about where the project is going from here –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Design Approval – Aug 2012 • Right-of-way (ROW) Condemnation Ordinance – Sept 2012 • Signed IAR – Nov 2012 • Design Completion – Jan 2013 • Early Construction – Mar 2013 • Full ROW Acquired – Jun 2013 <p>Dan updated the Commission regarding the property owners that the Town has dealt with for the right-of-entry process and also will continue to work with them for the necessary acquisitions and right-of-way needs. All right-of-entries have been acquired except one property, Pine Crest. The Town is pursuing utilization of condemnation to temporarily gain access to complete the borings. The design will be refined after those tests are completed.</p> <p>Dan went over the budget for Phase 1 mentioning the funding partners, transportation funds and bond sales.</p> <p><u>Questions/Comments</u> <i>Is the condemnation ordinance necessary?</i> Staff feels that most of the right-of-way and easements will be able to be acquired through mutual negotiations without the necessity for condemnation. By having this authorization upfront, it allows the Town to get through acquisition process more efficiently than if we</p>

		<p>had to come back to Town Council if we found that a property owner wasn't willing to negotiate with the Town. This ordinance will give the Town a head start if condemnation is necessary.</p> <p><i>Commission asked if we could begin construction if all the properties had not been acquired.</i> Dan explained that with the CM/GC process, construction could begin in areas where ROW has been acquired. That's why there is a lapse between the construction start and the final ROW acquisition.</p> <p><i>Commission also asked how the construction is phased for this project.</i> Although the project is designed to 4 lanes, Phase 1 would consist of 2 lanes, full interchange at I-25 and a half interchange at US85. Phase 2 would be complete to 4 lanes and full interchange at US85. When we say it is designed to 4 lanes that means all ROW is acquired, all grading complete and items (drainage, etc.) captured.</p> <p><i>What happens when the State comes through to widen US85?</i> Staff is working with the State to accommodate that in the plans.</p> <p>The Commission was very impressed with how this project is progressing and staff's diligence in all the different aspects.</p>
<p>2012 Budget Analysis for the Taxi Voucher Program – Bob Watts</p>		<p>This agenda item is in response to Town Council's desire to receive a mid-year report on the Taxi Voucher Program. Bob Watts provided the Commission with a little background of the program. This program was established to help the transit dependent population to get transportation to work, medical appointments and shopping within the Town limits. This program has provided 1,329 rides during the first half of 2012; cost per ride is \$8.45. The budget for 2012 is \$18,000 and from January to June we have expended \$11,232. In 2011, this program provided 1,831 rides for the entire year so you can see that we are well above the pace set in 2011. Records indicate that trips to work is number one followed by shopping and then medical. Also, types of riders are as follows: 15 disabled, 11 seniors, and 44 transit dependent. It is expected that if the trend continues, this program will have a \$6,439 shortfall by the end of 2012. The program currently has 133 people registered for the service; 58 of those have been registered this year. Bob talked about some of the glitches in getting taxi drivers down in this area to provide this service.</p> <p><u>Questions/Comments</u> Any chance Douglas County Transit Solutions (DCTS)</p>

		<p><i>will pick up any of these riders?</i> No, not this year; we rely on the Senior Center to help us provide rides especially for the trips other than work, medical appointments and shopping that the taxi program doesn't provide. There are several different organizations out there but this is the most economical for the Town at this time.</p> <p><i>The Commission asked if the Senior Center has picked up any of these riders.</i> Yes, they have provided 700 rides/month for the seniors and disabled which is more than what they thought they could handle since they are dependent on volunteer drivers providing the rides. The Senior Center is also thinking of providing a "shopping shuttle" which would alleviate some of our load.</p> <p><i>Are the reservations made by staff?</i> Yes. <i>What is the impact?</i> It's very restrictive. We reserve rides from 8:00am to 11:30am, Monday through Friday, and then fax the sheets into the dispatcher for the next day's rides. Those costs are not identified in the program costs.</p> <p>On August 14, staff will be asking for Council direction on whether to continue this service at the current level which requires more funding or if we need to reduce the level of service or voucher amount. The Commission felt that this program is worth keeping. With the hospital coming onboard, the Town could see a private business actually locate here in Castle Rock and provide this service. Joe Procopio, Council Rep, added that it is important to determine if the taxpayers should pay for transit through the Town or by an added transit tax.</p>
<p>2011 Motor Vehicle Accident Facts – Bob Watts</p>		<p>Bob Watts gave an overview of the Annual Accident Report for 2011. This report was started back in 2004. Every year Public Works compiles accident statistics from Police reports and creates a summary report. This report is generated primarily for public interest but also to assist the individual departments to help them identify locations where the infrastructure could be the contributing cause toward accidents and for them to address any trends that might be developing. There are three reasons why accidents occur, driver behavior, vehicle maintenance, and infrastructure conditions. Public Works uses statistical modeling to identify the locations where corrections to the roadway environment may improve safety. There is only one location that has been identified as a location where improvements may benefit transportation safety – SH86/Crowfoot Valley Road. This intersection has appeared on our list for years. CDOT is attempting to make some</p>

		<p>improvements to the SH86 and Crowfoot Valley Drive intersection by changing the signal operation so that the Founders left turn movement is only permitted on a protected phase instead of protected/permissive phases, which should reduce right angle and left turn accidents.</p> <p>The Commission appreciates this study being completed each year and feels that it is a good tool in improving safety on Town roads. This information has been presented to the Public Safety Commission and will be provided to Town Council at their October 2 meeting. Once presented to Council, it will be put on the website for public information.</p>
Projects Update – Bob Goebel		<p>An overview of the current Public Works projects/programs was provided to the Commission in their packets. The Commission wanted to give Public Works staff an “Atta boy” for the great work they did on Plum Creek Blvd reconstruction. With the amount of traffic that flows through there, the way the project was scoped in a way to really alleviate a lot of problems.</p>
Council Comments – Joe Procopio		<p>Joe informed the Commission that Council will be discussing the alternative water supply project on Tuesday. Also, Joe explained to the Commission why he voted in favor of the MedVed sign.</p>
Commission/Staff Comments/ Concerns		<p>Commissioner Morton had read in the paper regarding the APWA award Public Works Department received from the Colorado American Public Works Association (APWA) for the “Traffic Signal Management and Operations: A Basic Service Plan” and wanted to congratulate staff! Another fine job!</p>
		<p>There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned. Next meeting September 10.</p>