



PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Date: April 6, 2009

Meeting Called to Order: 5:30 p.m.

Meeting Adjourned: 7:06 p.m.

Present: Andy Pelster; Ken Perry; Donna Hawk; Richard Morton; JoBeth McFadden; Bob Washburn (remote); Joe Procopio (Council Rep)

Staff Present: Bob Goebel, P.E., Director of Public Works; Maria Hagen, P.E., Assistant Director of Public Works; Bob Watts, P.E., Transportation Planning Manager; Keith Johnston, Plan Review Engineer; Jason Reynolds, Project Manager-Development Services; Linda Angus, Administrative Assistant-Public Works

Guests: Brad Brown, Castle Centerstone Real Estate

Absent: Lou Zoghby

ITEM/SUBJECT	ACTION/BY	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS
Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda		None
Meeting Minutes	Motion made by Commissioner JoBeth McFadden; seconded by Commissioner Donna Hawk	<p>Richard Morton had a question regarding Douglas County's contribution to FREX. <i>It states in the minutes that the Town will receive the contribution of \$42,000 from Douglas County for FREX – is that correct?</i> Yes, the Town contracts with Colorado Springs and the County contracts with us.</p> <p><i>Do we fund that money ahead of time?</i> Yes, the Town has it in the budget for the full amount and this would reduce our budgeted amount, which was approved by Council in the First Quarter Budget Amendment.</p> <p>It was decided by the Public Works Commission to approve the March 2, 2009 meeting minutes. Motion carries unanimously.</p>
Fourth Street Right-of-Way Vacation – Jason Reynolds		<p>The Town received a request from Castle Centerstone Real Estate for the vacation of a portion of Fourth Street and a portion of Castle Street, which is located north of Fourth Street. Castle Centerstone Real Estate hopes to use this area as a future parking lot. This parking lot would enable Castle Centerstone to begin the third phase of their development on the west side of Perry. Having adequate parking in the Downtown area is very important. After review of the vacation, it was found that there are a number of utilities in the right-of-way. Also, the Downtown Development Authority (DDA) recommended that there be pedestrian access easement retainer with the goal being able to get to the railroad tracks. The downtown plan anticipates some form of pedestrian crossing over the railroad tracks at some point in the future. The other reason for the public access easement reservation is that 416 and 422 N Perry Street require access via the alley to Fourth Street to be able to head northbound on Perry. They do</p>

	<p>have access out to Fifth Street but the median on Fifth Street prevents any sort of turning movements that would get them onto Perry Street. Public Works has reviewed this and found that with the reservations of public access for those properties, the vacation would be appropriate. We do have a request from the railroad for communication easement and staff is attempting to receive documentation regarding the communication easement request. Should the railroad produce this documentation, our recommendation is that the proposed right-of-way vacation be approved.</p> <p><i>If this is approved, does the street still remain public property or does it revert to private property?</i> It would revert to the private property owner. In this case, Castle Centerstone Real Estate owns 404 and 414 Perry and they would own Fourth Street west of where the buildings start. The way Colorado State Law is set up is that when you vacate the right-of-way you can't receive money for it, therefore, it would not generate any revenue for the Town. However, ongoing maintenance costs will be the responsibility of Castle Centerstone rather than the Town.</p> <p><i>In the letters to the northern property owners it was stated that "No Parking" signs would not be provided until parking becomes a problem.</i> We have not received any complaints about there being parking of Castle Centerstone tenants at 416 and 422 Perry. Should we receive complaints, we will place signs there. The goal is to have the northern property owners involved in the site planning to make sure there is adequate access. There is a draft parking layout in the documents. Currently, you have to weave to get to those houses so the preference would be that you have a straight shot to the rear of the property that would roughly follow where the alley is.</p> <p><i>Have there been any negative comments about this proposal?</i> No</p> <p><i>Will the parking be for tenants only?</i> With the approval of the vacation, it becomes private property. The intention is that it would be for tenants and customers of Castle Centerstone Real Estate and the properties that they own.</p> <p><i>When we have public events downtown, what would be the disposition of the property owner towards letting people park there?</i> The parking lot behind the fire station and 390 Perry is owned by the Town and leased to Castle Centerstone Real Estate. One of the provisions of the lease agreement is that during Town events and on evenings and weekends, the property owner provides free parking. The objective of this vacation is to create more efficient overall parking and to allow the retail tenants to provide visitor parking for their</p>
--	---

	<p>Motion made by Commissioner JoBeth McFadden; seconded by Commissioner Donna Hawk</p>	<p>guests and retail customers. The DDA was created to promote downtown. If you can get the businesses to generate more than they do today, then the increase in retail sales tax goes to the DDA to be able to do more projects downtown.</p> <p><i>Is the railroad really interested in a non-exclusive easement?</i> It has to be a non-exclusive because there are already facilities in the area they are requesting the easement over. The 20' will cover the two telephone lines, the gas line and the overhead power line. If the railroad required an exclusive easement, we have all these existing utility facilities and there would be a conflict. We have asked the railroad to show us whether they have facilities in that area.</p> <p><i>What kind of traffic impact is this going to have on Fifth Street?</i> Currently that alley does go through and provides access to the existing parking lot as well as Fourth Street and the residents that back up into the alley. There is a median out on Fifth Street that protects the railroad crossing as you are heading eastbound. This median makes it very difficult to make a left turn there. Therefore, staff doesn't feel that there will be a traffic impact problem. Also, we are looking at a "Quiet Zone" in downtown at the three crossings and there is the potential that the alley may be closed off to all traffic. It's difficult because the Fire Department has always wanted that access to the back of those homes and that is why it remained with the reconstruction project on Fifth Street.</p> <p>It was decided by the Public Works Commission to recommend approval of the proposed street vacation to Town Council, provided that the Town reserves a blanket utility easement, a public access, and a non-exclusive communication easement for the railroad. Motion carries unanimously.</p>
<p>Recommendation of Contract Award for On-Call Surveying Services – Keith Johnston</p>		<p>The Public Works Department issued a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in early February 2009 for on-call surveying services. In response to that request, the Town received Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) from 37 surveying firms. Public Works Department assembled a four-person team to review and analyze these 37 submittals. The review teams main criteria for selection were overall organization and ability, Town of Castle Rock experience, Douglas County experience, geographic location, and CDOT experience. Of the 37 firms, the review team has chosen four firms to contract with. Those four firms are Aztec Consultants, Foresight West Surveying, Precision Surveying & Mapping, and Woolpert, Inc. Staff recommends that Public Works Commission approve contracts with each of these firms. It is anticipated that these contracts will be substantially less than \$250,000;</p>

		<p>therefore, this item will not require Town Council approval. The contract is a standard contract created by our Legal Department. It is a one-year contract that can be renewed each year for three additional years. Firms are selected based on qualifications prior to receiving their rate sheets.</p> <p><i>How do you pick which of the four you will use?</i> It depends upon the project and the expertise required. It is also included in the RFQ language and in the contract itself that there is no guarantee for work. Before we issue the work, we put together a scope of work for that particular activity. The consultant puts a cost together and if we feel that it is reasonable, we approve the task order for that work. If they come in with a number that looks out of line, be it too low or too high, we may go to the next firm.</p> <p><i>Does this complicate the "sole source" contract for the State of Colorado?</i> Our bid process and selection process is the same for Public Works, Utilities and Parks. This process has been approved by our Legal Department. It is open competition based on qualifications and we do award the contract to several firms in an effort to try to save time and expedite the project when it comes time to actually do the survey work. We have firms that were based on qualifications picked ahead of time so that we can move forward in a timely matter. We can say we need some survey work, who's on our list, let's go to this firm, they specialize in railroad (for example), then we can move forward. This process is used a lot in other areas. We have used this process to make selection of consultants on CDOT and Federal projects and they have approved this process. Staff believes that the whole qualifications based process is supported by the Association for Consulting Engineers Council (ACEC). This is similar to what Federal Highways implements. They put out an IDIQ and it's all based on qualifications, not cost. They select 3 or 4 contractors on a three-year basis.</p> <p><i>In the RFQ that went out, did we specifically state that there would be more weight given if you had done work for the Town?</i> No, not specifically Castle Rock but the RFQ asked for references for work done in Douglas County.</p> <p><i>On the agreement it mentions an Exhibit A that wasn't included in the packet info. Was that the rate sheet?</i> Yes, we are still getting rate sheets in and didn't include them with the packet. We are also asking the firms to provide a certificate of insurance along with their rate sheets.</p> <p><i>Is the amount of Workmen's Comp insurance established by the Town?</i> Our Legal Department establishes that amount.</p> <p>We can be comfortable in stating we had 37 qualification</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Motion made by Commissioner Richard Morton; seconded by Commissioner Donna Hawk</p>	<p>statements submitted and we have reviewed those based on our criteria and selected the four best qualified firms. Staff is checking their rates to see if they are generally the same and meet the industry standard.</p> <p>It was noted that in Section 1 "Scope of Services" the second sentence the word "any" is misspelled as "nay". This needs to be corrected.</p> <p>It was decided by the Public Works Commission to recommend to the Town Manager to approve the contracts with the four on-call surveying firms selected. Motion carries unanimously.</p>
<p>Public Works Commission Term Expirations – Bob Goebel</p>		<p>We have two people coming up for term expirations, Ken Perry and Donna Hawk. If they would like to serve again, please fill out the application. These applications are due to the Town Clerk's office by April 24, 2009. Interviews and Council selection will be later in May. Terms are limited to two three-year terms.</p>
<p>Public Works Transportation Master Plan Update Scoping Discussion – Bob Watts</p>		<p>The current Transportation Master Plan was adopted in 2003. This current plan lays out a master plan for street network, the Parks & Recreation bike and pedestrian trail network, and the transit system, which includes information about potential for rail. Normally a Transportation Master Plan would last for approximately 10 years but the Town has grown so fast and so many projects have been completed, our Transportation Master Plan doesn't seem to fit the conditions any more. Since the time this plan was formed, the population has grown 65% and it was only estimated that the population would grow about 40%. We are now in the process of completing about five major projects and quite a few smaller projects. Generally, all this work doesn't get done in this short amount of time. We want to take a look at our plan to update our population estimates, traffic forecasts and to reprioritize the projects that remain. We want to look a little more closely at our bike and pedestrian plans to make sure they compliment our street system and try to make connections into the downtown area a little more convenient. We also want to look at possibilities for the future of commuter rail, if it should ever come through the area, to identify where we might want to locate a transit center. We want to do our best to preserve property that could be used for a Park-n-Ride for our transit system. Once this Transportation Master Plan is updated, it will be used in making the transportation decisions hopefully for the next 10 years. We have hired one of our on-call consultants, Muller Engineering, to perform this work. We expect this update will take 7-9 months to complete. There is quite a bit of traffic modeling that will be done in conjunction with Development Services, as they will provide the information about population and development projections. We will have a series of public meetings and will also have Steering Committee that consists of members</p>

		<p>of Town Council, Planning Commission, Public Works Commission, and a few other agencies. This committee will be the overall guiding committee and will meet probably three times – once in the beginning, once in the middle when we start generating some of the street networks and once towards the end before the plan is finalized and goes to Council for adoption. Once the committee is formed, a time frame for the meetings will be set when it is most convenient for the majority of the group. We will have a Community Advisory Committee that will consist of business associations, homeowner associations, etc. We will have a Technical Committee, which will be mainly staff from the Town, Douglas County, and CDOT. The Technical Committee will meet reasonably frequently i.e. once a month. The other committees will only meet when there is something to be shared, decided or reviewed to get input at different times during the process. Town staff is going to do quite a bit of the public outreach type of work due to our limited budget. The only thing in the existing plan that we are not going to reevaluate is the transit element mainly because that will be a focus of an entirely different study. This is an update of the original plan, not a new plan, so we want to keep a focus on things that have changed in the last six years. We need to have a couple of Public Works Commission members volunteer to serve on the steering committee.</p> <p>Ken Perry suggested that one of the committees have at least a resident that is not related to development. Bob confirmed that there will be citizens involved in the Community Advisory Committee.</p> <p>Bob Washburn and Donna Hawk volunteered with Richard Morton as an alternate.</p> <p>We will be coming back to the Public Works Commission through the Project Update report to keep the Commission informed.</p> <p><i>Are you going to use DRCOG's 2030 as the modeling scenarios?</i> Actually, DRCOG is using 2035. Douglas County is basing their entire master plan on a 2030 time frame and we want to be in their time frame because of all the information they will already have available. Douglas County will be on the Steering Committee as well as the Technical Committee.</p> <p>The executive summary of the 2003 Transportation Master Plan was provided in the Commission packet. If anyone is interested in the full report, we also have those available. Both the executive summary and the full report are also available on the Town's website. On a final note, the road connection between SH85 and I-25 was removed in 2004</p>
--	--	---

		but still shows on the executive summary and needs to be corrected.
N. Meadows Drive Extension Open House Summary – Maria Hagen		<p>Maria gave the Commission a brief update on the Open House that was held at Castle View High School on Thursday, April 2. There was an estimated 600 people that attended the open house. We suspect the turn out was high due to the Happy Canyon closure issue. There were 110 comments at the open house regarding this project. Since Thursday, there have been approximately 20-30 additional comments submitted. We will be summarizing these comments after the April 17 cutoff date. All of the meeting materials as well as the comment cards are on the Town's website. Overall we have had some good comments from people. It has been a year since our last public meeting so this was a good time to update the public on the status of this project. Our plan is to go back to Town Council and talk with them on April 21. By that time we should have all of the meeting comments summarized. We won't be listing all the comments verbatim, just a summary. This will also be put on the website.</p> <p><i>How was the meeting with the railroad on March 27?</i> There was a lot of railroad staff present, which is a good sign. The Town was represented well with the Mayor, Douglas County Commissioner, and there was also representation from Castle Pines Village, Plum Creek Wastewater Authority, CDOT, Meadows Metro District, Castle Rock Development Company and DevVic. In order for the railroad to make a decision, we were given some follow-up questions to answer before the next meeting, which is a good sign. They were clear in stating they had three interests; the flood plain, the overall grade, and the right-of-way (whether or not it was Federal Land Grant). We have done some research and feel comfortable with the flood plain information. The Town just completed a Plum Creek Master Plan for stream stabilization that defines the flood plain in that area. We have also done some research on the land and feel comfortable that the majority of that land was dedicated by quitclaim by private ownership. There is one little piece in the corner that was dedicated by a land grant that we will not be affecting. As far a grade goes, we are actually improving the situation.</p> <p><i>There was no concern in replacing one curve with two curves?</i> We thought they would have a question on that but they didn't have one question on the curves. The curves still meet their standards. There is a vertical curve, differential sag curve, where it exceeded their distance or length. In our proposal, we are taking that out and making the grade more consistent than it is.</p> <p><i>By relocating the tracks away from SH85, are we eliminating any of the at-grade crossings where they have to blow their</i></p>

		<p><i>whistles?</i> We would be moving the one at Atrium and this would eliminate the need for the whistle at that stop.</p> <p><i>Is the railroad putting you off because all the funding is not all together?</i> No, they are taking us seriously. If we are asking for it they know we want to be able to do it if we need to. It all depends on which alignment is selected. If we get their permission to do this, we have it, but it doesn't influence the decision on the alignment. If it ends up being the Castlegate alignment, we say thank you but we're not going to choose not to do the Atrium alignment. But Castle Rock Development might want to go ahead with it and do it on their own.</p>
Public Works Project Update – Bob Goebel		<p><i>Does the Town have a second chance with the stimulus money for any of our projects?</i> No, unless DRCOG changes their criteria. Design projects are the lowest criteria. They want construction projects.</p> <p>The Southwest Arterial Connection Road project is moving along. We are about half way done with the earth moving. The interchange is still ahead of schedule.</p> <p>Staff would like to schedule the July 6 Public Works Commission meeting for a tour of the Southeast and Southwest Arterial Connection road projects.</p>
Council Comments – Joe Procopio		<p>Joe commented that Mr. Vickers is putting a lot of pressure on the Town to make the decision on the alignment for the N. Meadows Drive Extension project. He has submitted a preliminary plan on what he intends to do. This is not a formal plan yet. He feels he is losing money and would like to see something get under way and that it is entirely the Town's fault. We know that it is not all the Town's fault; there were many players in the mix.</p>
Commission Comments/Questions		<p>Richard Morton wanted staff to know that the meeting for the Rocky Mountain Rail feasibility study that was scheduled for March 28 was rescheduled to April 4. Unfortunately, the April 4 meeting was cancelled due to weather and it is now rescheduled for April 18 at Jefferson County from 9:00am to 5:00pm.</p>
Adjournment		<p>Being no other business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 7:06p.m.</p>