

**GRAND JUNCTION CITY COUNCIL
WORKSHOP SUMMARY
April 4, 2005**

The City Council of the City of Grand Junction, Colorado met on Monday, April 4, 2005 at 7:02 p.m. in the City Hall Auditorium to discuss workshop items. Those present were Councilmembers Harry Butler, Cindy Enos-Martinez, Dennis Kirtland, Bill McCurry, Gregg Palmer, Jim Spehar and President of the Council Bruce Hill.

Summaries and action on the following topics:

1. **UPDATE ON RIVERSIDE PARKWAY PROJECT:** Mark Relph, Public Works & Utilities Director, introduced this update. He noted that a lot has happened since the last update. He said they will cover three areas, where they are, what they've learned and where to go from here. Mr. Relph advised that he is convinced that the City will be able to meet the goals identified within the established budget and the elements will also be there including the aesthetics. He said there will be three teams working on this project and that the teams have performed the industry review, contract requirements, and timing. The intent of a design-build is the plans are taken to 30% and the contractor designs the rest and builds the project. Under the design-build scenario, the contractor takes on the unknown and therefore charges the premium. He stated the benefit for this scenario is that the price is known up front. Mr. Relph said the premium was not to the City's advantage this time. He said once the bids were opened it took two days to evaluate them and the three proposals exceeded the budget by roughly 50%. The design-build process allows for negotiations but due to the magnitude of the difference, it would be to the City's disadvantage to negotiate. He said there was enough variation in the bids that the City could not focus in on a single area. He stated that the City has significant experience in building large roads and had good comparisons. They determined it was in the best interest of the citizens to not pursue the design-build process. The decision was then made to go with the traditional design-bid and build process. The final price will not be known until the final bid award but, this traditional process will truly make the process more competitive. Mr. Relph said one issue that the City had in the bid documents is the inability of the contractors to communicate that their bids exceeded the "upset" price. The local contractors did not submit their lowest price because they expected a negotiation process. He said the meeting with each of the bidders was of enormous value, the top contractors in the country sharing their knowledge and experience. Mr. Relph was confident that the remainder of the design can be carried out and they could go forward. He said they will focus on the design, construction management and the earthwork as far as cost management goes. The traditional design-bid-build process is a strong point of the Public Works staff. He lauded the engineering design company of Carter & Burgess and he related his confidence in them. He introduced Doug Shaffer, Vice President of the Transportation Division, and Jay Brasher from Carter & Burgess.

Mr. Shaffer listed their experience as nationwide, including a large office in Denver. He said they do a wide range of projects and they have a wide range of experienced staff. Mr. Shaffer stated they have performed a lot of work on the western slope and he emphasized their commitment to this project until its completion. He then deferred to Jay Brasher.

Mr. Brasher said he has worked on this project for quite a while and he has spent a lot of time as a design engineer in this area. He said one element of his assignment was to estimate the cost of this project. He said they did a cost check of the estimate that was performed by a previous consultant and the funds were added where they thought it was needed and the other was the timing. They felt that either the design-build or design-bid-build could be done within the time scheduled. He then reviewed how the cost estimates were made. He said since the City must purchase right-of-way they had to bring the design up to a higher level of detail. He said the conflicts with utilities also needed to be identified and required a higher level of detail. Mr. Brasher said they did want the bidders to have some areas to be flexible to incorporate their cost saving ideas. He said the team did account for anticipated increases in prices with fuel and concrete and there were preliminary designs for drainage, not just generic statements. The RFP also included all of the technical requirements and specifications. He said there will be no delay due to the level of detail that has already been done, even though the proposals were rejected, the bidders sat down with the team and reviewed the proposals. He said 2 out of 3 are allowing the City to use their ideas. Mr. Brasher said the detail for the bridge railing was twice the estimate, so the value of that element will be reviewed. He said traffic control and phasing options are included in the bids and will also be reviewed with some elements incorporated into the plan. He said the configuration at 5th Street was set through the 1601 project but innovation was possible in the structures (bridges). He said that some of those ideas will be included, such as the Riverside pedestrian bridge. Mr. Brasher said that one of the bids had a better design for the pedestrian bridge which will be used. Mr. Brasher then deferred to Project Manager Jim Shanks.

Mr. Shanks described the detail of going forward and meeting the goals. On Wednesday night there will be a contract amendment with Carter & Burgess to complete the final design. The change is for \$2.9 million. He said that they will also amend the contract to acquire right-of-way for the County at 29 Road, among other right-of-way items. The total for the design will be 40% of what was proposed in the bids. The first construction project design is due August 15th so bids can be awarded in September. About 35 people will be working on the final design and the best of all configuration plans will be incorporated into the plan. He reiterated that some of the areas where cost savings can be realized. The low bid procurement process will bring in competitive bids, they will break the project up into three phases: Phase I - East Phase including D Road from 27 ½ Road to 29 Road, 29 Road to the Colorado River Bridge, then 27 ½ Road south to Los Colonias to 9th Street. The plan is to advertise bids in September and

start October 1st. He said the utility relocations have already started: Phase II – West Phase - design to be completed by the end of February 2006, west of Coke Asphalt (4th Street) all the way west to 24 Road, this includes a bridge extension at Broadway, the pedestrian bridge from Riverside, then the 25 Road bridge separation. Mr. Shanks said the traffic will be a challenge in this phase even though the traffic will be detoured and relocated: Phase III – US 50 Interchange, 9th Street to Coke Asphalt, includes four bridges, and the widening of the river bridges on 5th Street. He said it will be bid out in March, 2006 and the City may not have all the right-of-ways until summer. The project management will be performed in-house with City personnel, augmenting current staff with construction engineers, and using consultant engineers. Mr. Shanks said the estimated project management cost is less than \$5 million, which is half of what was in the bids that were submitted. He said things are ongoing and nothing has stopped. Mr. Shanks said he is also very much committed to completing the project and is looking to complete the project by 2008 which is one year ahead of schedule.

Mark Relph, Public Works Director referred to the proposed phasing will create opportunities for local contractors. He felt that the contractors must balance the pieces with the amount of project management needed. He said the City has made an offer to the two contractors' associations to discuss the possibilities and would like to share with them the City's plan and perspectives in an open manner. He said the information and pricing within the proposals is confidential and anticipates those contractors will be back bidding on the new pieces as designed.

Councilmember Butler commended staff on their work.

Councilmember Kirtland noted he was supportive of the design-build process and has seen it work in other areas but agreed with the decision to reject the proposals. He said he is cautiously optimistic and anticipates continued challenges with the project. He felt there should be a contingency plan in regards to the budget and agreed that the phasing makes good sense.

Councilmember Palmer listed the various elements that affected the price and recognized the successes the City has had with other design-bid-build projects, such as CSEP. He emphasized that the project will be done the way it needs to be done and the talk of limiting the scope does not mean fewer lanes or bridges.

Councilmember Spehar said he too supported the design-build process. However, management costs and negotiations that are not available on the part of the subcontractors were reasons for the higher price. A faster completion date also played into it. He said it will give the contractors the opportunity to prove that this opportunity will be to the benefit of the City as they have lauded previously. He approved of the phasing that was outlined and recommended that it be coordinated with the County and their bridge project. He was pleased

that even under this scenario the City will have 11 months of leeway on the completion time.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez was pleased with the new process and was glad the contractors will have more opportunity to participate. She hoped the citizens will regain their confidence in the City and challenged the contractors to sharpen their pencils.

Councilmember McCurry agreed with what had been said.

Council President Hill agreed, although cautiously optimistic. He was pleased that some of the very best employees will be working on this project. He noted that if Mr. Relph saw any issues at this point he would be telling Council.

Mr. Relph said if he saw issues, he would say and that he has worked on this for 12 years and was very disappointed in the bids. But now he is more confident than ever.

Councilmember Spehar noted that the City complies with its own requirements such as landscaping and imposing those standards on the developers which has led to this community's continued nice appearance, despite of the growth. He encouraged that standards need to be maintained on this project.

Action summary: Councilmembers commended staff on their hard work and expressed more confidence in going forward.

Council President Hill called a recess at 8:50 p.m.

The meeting reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

2. **TRAFFIC CALMING POLICY:** Staff reviewed the proposed changes to the policy and the Model Traffic Code in order to get direction on the proposed changes as well as tying traffic calming into the new neighborhood program.

Jody Kliska, Transportation Engineer, referred to Council the materials that were provided. She reviewed the history of the traffic calming program. It was adopted and used for a period of time and was updated in 2002. She reviewed the table of requests, noting that expired means the documents were sent to a neighborhood and they never responded. The criterion requires an 80 percentile of speeding 6 mph over the speed limit on local streets. The revised proposal is to stay with the ten steps but would eliminate the test project installation; it tends to irritate the neighborhood. The proposal also includes an amendment to the Model Traffic Code, lowering the speed limit in a lot of the older areas to make the unposted speed limit be 25 mph.

Council President Hill asked why traffic calming was an issue in 1997. Ms. Kliska replied it was due to complaints. He asked if she has contacted the City of Golden to see if they have made any adjustments in their policy. She had not but attended a seminar where Arvada's perspective was given. They are opposed to speed bumps and have taken more of an educational approach. She said in contrast, Lakewood has hundreds of speed bumps.

Councilmember Palmer said he is not a speed bump fan and that they are a burden for everyone using the street. He said speed bumps frequently move the traffic to another street so drivers can avoid the speed bumps.

Councilmember Spehar felt the program has increased frustration and it is only 11% effective. He said, as Ms. Kliska said, they are trying to solve social problems with physical tools. He is opposed to public streets turning into private neighborhood streets and feels that it is just moving the problem instead of enforcing it in the first place. He pointed out traffic calming has occurred in his neighborhood and has now created other problems.

Councilmember Butler likes the speed bumps. He said if the traffic moves, put in more speed bumps.

Councilmember McCurry doesn't mind the speed bumps but favored lowering the speed limits.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez is against speed bumps and favored enforcement.

Councilmember Kirtland felt the staff time that has been spent on this has been enormous and most neighborhoods end up being disappointed with the result. He thought there might be some opportunity for more education through the neighborhood program. Some traffic calming techniques have been incorporated into the newer subdivisions. He favored looking at things like what Arvada is doing for the neighborhood program.

Ms. Kliska said Grand Mesa is through with the petition process and is ready to come before Council.

Council President Hill said he appreciated the neighborhood getting together to try to solve their problems. He thought that perhaps adding some flexibility as the changes will reduce the number so significantly that it would be a waste of staff's time and perhaps it would better to eliminate the entire program. He would rather see a change in the process that would allow for neighborhoods to come forward.

Councilmember Spehar agreed that the changes will reduce the number of applications but it will not solve these problems. He agreed with changing the process and looking for alternatives but does not think the program is fixable.

Councilmember Palmer disagreed.

Public Works Director Mark Relph said it appears the majority of Council wants staff to look at other programs like Arvada and bring back some suggestions.

Council President Hill is concerned about the program that is in place. He stated that the program has people in the pipeline and there needs to be a transition.

Councilmember Spehar suggested no new applications should be accepted until the situation is resolved.

City Manager Kelly Arnold stated the majority wants this program to cease and to have staff look at other options.

Councilmember Spehar suggested the pending or in progress applications be addressed.

Upon further explanation, staff was directed to send letters to the applicants that are pending, stating that the program will be discontinued and the three in progress will be addressed.

Sandy Mallory from the Transportation Division said only Grand Mesa has gone through the petitioning process.

City Council thought only that application should be continued. Ms. Mallory supported lowering the speed limit as the unposted limit.

Council supported to bring the Grand Mesa application forward and the rest will need to wait until the program is reviewed. Council President Hill disagreed since the other three were held off intentionally but the majority of Council said they will just review Grand Mesa.

Action summary: Council supported bringing the Grand Mesa application forward. The rest will need to wait until the program is reviewed. Staff will review other programs and methods and bring options back to Council.

3. **STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE:** Assistant City Manager David Varley reviewed the Strategic Plan update. He said that a lot of the current goals involved teams, such as the Balance of Economy and Character, Goals 2a and 2b. Goal 2a is evaluating zoning and infrastructure. He advised Assistant to the City Manager Sheryl Trent is getting involved in Goal 2b.

Mr. Varley reviewed the solution to the Open Spaces and the Community appearance. He said under Goal 12, the Gateway Committee continues to meet and will chose some designs for the 24 Road and I-70 interchange. Also, Horizon Drive BID continues to meet and accepted the design presented. He said the treatments will be consistent City-wide, including along the Parkway.

Council President Hill said the Gateway Committee will bring the 24 Road plans to show Council.

Mr. Varley advised CDOT is taking responsibility on some items. He said the Horizon Drive gateway is now ahead of the 24 Road scheduled dates and the similarity at the different gateways will let the visitors know they are still in Grand Junction. Mr. Varley said Goal 16 is completed and Phase II of the Historic Survey is in the hands of the State for review and acceptance. He said Goal 15 is the prioritizing of the Parks Master Plan. He said the team met and came up with five priority projects: 1) Lincoln Park, 2) Pear Park, 3) Bookcliff Middle School, 4) Bluff's West and 5) Canyon View Park.

City Manager Kelly Arnold asked Council to discuss this more as the School District construction schedule is looming.

Mr. Varley said Goal 17 is weeds. He said that team has met twice and has identified some processes to improve the program.

Councilmember Palmer added that a lot of what has been done has not been successful and so they are looking at other options.

Mr. Varley said Goal 22 which is under Shelter and Housing, the team has met with a consultant on pulling the group together to meet objectives. He said the team would like to hire the consultant, Mr. Gonzales, for an amount not to exceed \$25,000.

Councilmember Spehar noted this is not just a City effort, there are a lot of other partners.

Council did not object to the hiring of Mr. Gonzales.

The discussion returned to the partnering with the School District. The first \$18,000 is for construction documents and do a bid alternate, just in case the bids are too high. Mr. Varley said with this commitment it will allow the gym in the new school to be expanded to allow for City recreational use. Secondly, Bookcliff Middle School construction documents will cost \$33,000 for a second gym, also with a bid alternate. He said the School District will front the money and the City will pay it back over a three year period of time, depending on if the project is right on budget, the City would then have priority interest.

Joe Stevens, Parks and Recreation Director, said in addition to the gym, there will be ancillary values in the cafeteria and bathrooms for the City use. The second gym concept will give the City priority use 24 hours a day and the City would have secondary use of the primary gym.

Councilmember Spehar said there are other benefits to the City for the use at these and other schools. Mr. Stevens said the cost in such a shared scenario also saves the City money in sharing of parking and ancillary facilities.

Councilmember Kirtland addressed the worst case scenario and asked if the City could go in later. City Manager Kelly Arnold said that Pear Park would be difficult once it is built. He said that the second gym at Bookcliff will retain a footprint, so it can be done at a later time.

Mr. Stevens noted the School District is moving forward quickly.

Councilmember Enos-Martinez was concerned about moving forward on the Lincoln Park irrigation system.

Council President Hill asked about the Bookcliff Middle School costs. He said the memo identified another \$20,000 to be bid if the City commits to build. Mr. Arnold said it costs \$4,125 to open the bids, so the total for the next step is \$37,125.

Council President Hill recommended moving forward and asked Council if there are any objections in approving \$55,675. There was none.

Action summary: Council approved the hiring of Mr. Gonzales, the housing consultant, for an amount not to exceed \$25,000, and did not object to going forward in partnership with the School District in construction documents and bidding for a cost of \$55,675.

ADJOURN:

The meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

