



PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION
Regular Meeting

Date: May 4, 2009

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

Meeting Adjourned: 6:58p.m.

Present: Andy Pelster, Ken Perry, Donna Hawk, Richard Morton, Lou Zoghby, Bob Washburn (remote), Joe Procopio (Council Rep)

Staff Present: Maria Hagen, P.E., Assistant Director of Public Works; Chuck Childs, P.E., Engineering Manager; Frank Main, Project Manager; Kev Freeman, Assistant Director of Development Services; Linda Angus, Administrative Assistant- Public Works

Guests: Katie Kruger, Colorado Springs Resident

Absent: Bob Goebel, P.E., Director of Public Works, JoBeth McFadden

ITEM/SUBJECT	ACTION/BY	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS
Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda		None
Meeting Minutes	Motion made by Commissioner Richard Morton; seconded by Commissioner Donna Hawk	It was decided by the Public Works Commission to approve the April 6, 2009 meeting minutes. Motion carries unanimously.
Southwest Arterial Connection Paving Project Contract Award – Chuck Childs		<p>This item is to ask the Public Works Commission to recommend awarding the contract for the paving portion of the Southwest Arterial Connection Road Project to Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. This project will include the paving of the new road (Plum Creek Parkway) from I-25 to Auburn Drive. It will include two lanes (ultimate design is four lanes), grading, storm sewer, and installation of a 10' sidewalk on each side of the street plus curb and gutter.</p> <p>When this project was designed, staff looked at two options for paving – asphalt and concrete. With the fluctuation in prices for the asphalt, CDOT has come up with a price index. Prices are allowed to be adjusted accordingly as the index goes up or down. This way the contractors don't have to guess what is going to happen in the future. Since the concrete prices came in lower than the asphalt, staff looked at the life cycle cost for concrete vs. asphalt. Over a 30-year life cycle cost analysis, concrete was found to be more cost effective.</p> <p>The bid opening was April 16. Fourteen bids were received. The bids ranged in price from \$1,683,392 to \$2,117,516, which is substantially lower than the engineer's cost estimate of \$2,734,936 (asphalt) and \$2,791,557 (concrete). Once the contract is awarded, notice to proceed will be June 22 with</p>

	<p>Motion made by Commissioner Lou Zoghby; seconded by Commissioner Donna Hawk</p>	<p>substantial completion December 2009. Staff has put in a paving milestone of October 1 that the contractor has to meet with the exception of paving under the railroad bridge. Staff anticipates that the paving under the railroad bridge to be completed in November 2009.</p> <p>Staff recommends acceptance of the bids for this project and approval to award the contract to Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. Concrete Works of Colorado is a reputable firm based in Lafayette, Colorado and established in 1980. They have a history of successfully completing projects of similar scope and nature and they possess the necessary equipment to complete this job.</p> <p><i>What are the warranties by these companies on the concrete work?</i> All capital improvement projects have a one-year warranty.</p> <p><i>Do the defects of concrete show up within that year period?</i> If you have scaling or if they didn't pour it right, that will show up. We will have some testers out there taking samples to hopefully make sure that everything goes accordingly to plan.</p> <p><i>Where will the paving start?</i> It will start at Auburn/Coachline and end up at I-25.</p> <p><i>Were there other bidders from Castle Rock besides Castle Rock Construction?</i> Schmidt Construction is in Castle Rock but they only bid the asphalt option.</p> <p><i>Since the bid came in low for concrete, did you get the impression that this company was a "change order artist" (bid low and have a lot to change orders to bring up the price)?</i> From what we understand from CDOT and Wyoming, Concrete Works is very reputable on the work they do and made no comments that they headhunt for change orders. They were all very impressed with their work.</p> <p><i>There is no indication to you that they did not understand some part of the project?</i> When staff went through to compare the bids, there was no one item that stood out.</p> <p>It was decided by the Public Works Commission to recommend to Town Council to accept the bids and approve the contract with Concrete Works of Colorado, Inc. for the concrete paving of the Southwest Arterial Connection Paving Project in the amount of \$1,851,732.00 (which includes 10% contingency). Motion carries unanimously.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Roadway Standards for Interchange Overlay District – Kev Freeman</p>		<p>The four interchange districts outlined in the Town's comprehensive plan are – Meadows/Founders, Wolfensberger, Plum Creek, and the potential future Dawson Ridge/Crystal Valley. These were identified specifically because they are close to I-25, all being gateways into important areas of the Town and need to be used to their full potential. Kev gave a presentation about the overlay project that is going to be in the Plum Creek area. With the work that is now taking place in the Plum Creek area, it is advisable that we look at really achieving some of these goals in the quickest manner. We are looking at a combination effort from Public Works and Zoning & Planning to really generate some commercial development interest in that location. We started out this process looking at the Southwest Quadrant area, which extends from Plum Creek Parkway south to Dawson Ridge. We have talked with landowners and they felt it was premature to look at any improvements in that area at this point. We then concentrated on the Plum Creek interchange area and engaged landowners and developers in that location and have some very good feedback. The comprehensive plan outlines what we should be looking at in a base code, which is a code that sets the criteria so that a developer or landowner has full vision of what is expected at that location. This way the staff, the applicant, the public/citizens know right from the start where the negotiations lie. This cuts down the level and limit of negotiations so when Town Council approves it in the first place, everyone is aware of what Town Council wants because it is described fully in this document. We are looking at implementing new developments with this. The Express Development Standards are set up in various sections that deals with design, architecture, lay out, uses and roadway designs, etc. So we have the existing zoning or Planned Development Site Plan, which sits on the land, and floating above is the Interchange Overlay District (IOD), which for all intents and purposes is just a line on a map, nothing else. The IOD overlays what we have there already. The developer, interested party, or landowner can look at this catalog and say I can build something with this, I can promote this and I've got someone interested in building something to this design. He can then experiment and take his own time and assess whether or not that is going to be beneficial for him. He will then come in with an idea to staff, the planning commission and Town Council with an idea to zone this property to these criteria. Up until he does that, the existing zoning remains in place. Once that goes through Town Council and is formally adopted then it supersedes the existing zoning and</p>
---	--	---

		<p>that then goes away. The process itself is quicker because the design has been established early on.</p> <p>This has gone through planning Commission, public open houses and we have had a lot of publicity on the Website. We are incorporating a lot of what the public has requested. We have worked very closely with the landowners in the area. Now we hope to take comments from the Public Works Commission and then on to Town Council in June.</p> <p><i>Is this area already zoned for mixed use, or commercial, or residential?</i> We have a plan development on there, which incorporates most specifically mixed use, but it looks at commercial and residential. We have a template in this catalog that looks at the building situation, looks at uses, layout, again it allows mixed uses within buildings. It sets up some roadway hierarchy and street standards, looks at parking standards, landscape, design standards fixed together so they all work together. A part of that puzzle is the roadway hierarchy standards. A criteria bases around the existing Public Works Regulations but trying then to make them more flexible and put together a hierarchy of roadway systems that will fit into this area. We have looked at three roadways, the arterial, which is the Plum Creek Parkway, and feeding off that you would have collector roads and feeding off the collector roads you have local roads. So each would form the hierarchical push towards more intense traffic going to the arterial. They are designed to be as narrow as possible, they are designed to incorporate bike lanes, on street parking, large sidewalks, landscaping. Design speeds are fairly low to keep the urban area more intense and to really slow traffic down to encourage pedestrians. So we came up with roadway sections based off the Public Works Regulations.</p> <p><i>Have there been any comments from developers?</i> Yes, they feel it is a great model to hand off to investors to use as a promotional tool.</p> <p><i>Do all these roadways meet our established engineering standards – its fine to shrink the roadway width but we still have to have room for trucks and everything else to get through there?</i> The widths proposed represent a minimum. They do meet all the basic minimum criteria for roadways. Our standards within our Public Works Regulations are actually larger than what is being proposed, but we feel very comfortable that we can accommodate these street widths and still get the right traffic flow.</p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>These are mandatory standards, not guidelines correct? Once people opt in, they become mandatory.</i></p> <p><i>Does the landowner have to agree to the rezoning?</i> Yes</p> <p><i>On Page 4 of the packet information, you show a minimum setback for a principle building at zero feet? This is the setback from the sidewalk, not the roadway.</i></p> <p><i>On Page 3 of 14 of the Comprehensive Plan, it states "locating these facilities near the Plum Creek interchange and/or Douglas Lane interchange – what is the Douglas Lane interchange? That is Dawson Ridge/Crystal Valley interchange.</i></p> <p><i>It states that the Southwest Quadrant plan is slated for adoption in 2008 – that's an error, correct? This project has been placed on hold. We met with the landowners in that area and they said it was premature to talk about right now and the Town needed to back away. Understanding their concern, we have put this on hold.</i></p> <p><i>Have you looked at providing re-charging capabilities for electric and plug-in hybrid cars so people could "re-charge" while shopping? We need to strengthen our "green codes" to maybe accommodate something like that to some extent.</i></p> <p>Commissioner Washburn commented that he likes the idea of having a bike lane on the road – seems to be a better fit than having them on the sidewalks with pedestrians. We rely on the standard Town design criteria in the Public Works Regulations for trails and corridors meeting the pedestrian/non-motorized connectivity. We are going through a review of the regulations so in the future these issues should be looked at more closely. We have tried very hard to keep things as simple as we can.</p> <p><i>The intersection on Founders Pkwy at the Sonic Drive-In has a sight problem due to some pine trees. Who is responsibility for existing intersections where there might be a sight problem? Visibility sight line situations are covered under the zoning regulations and we will check that out and report back to PWC.</i></p> <p><i>Is there some regulation concerning the use of lighting that reduces light pollution? Light pollution is not particularly looked at in this code and should be covered by existing regulations. Maria commented</i></p>
--	--	--

		<p>that the Town does have a “dark skies” ordinance, which limits the amount of luminescence that goes up. All our IREA lights meet this standard.</p> <p><i>Is there an interchange overlay plan for N. Meadows Extension Project?</i> Yes but we don't have that formally outlined at the time. It will probably be coming out after this overlay plan is adopted and we look at the success of this. We have already been talking to the Meadows and they are interested in this sort of code.</p> <p><i>What about a plan for congestion in Town if we have a backup on I-25?</i> We often have the situation where people get off at Plum Creek Pkwy and make their way north using either Wilcox or Perry and then get back on the highway again. It's hard to regulate that through a code. Basically what we are trying to do is work with CDOT to upgrade the I-25 corridor so that people will remain on the highway and won't feel the need to pull off. It would be helpful to get CDOT to use the VMS boards more proactively to give people more advance warning and get people to alternate routes.</p>
<p>Public Works Update – Maria Hagen</p>		<p>Summaries of the projects were included with the packet for the Commission (taken from the monthly report).</p> <p>Instead of going forward with the Transportation Master Plan update at this time, staff would like to wait a year. The reason for doing this is 1) due to the economic climate and the budget restrictions we are under right now and 2) at the end of 2009, both the Southeast Arterial Connection Road and the Southwest Arterial Connection Road will be open and it will dramatically change the traffic patterns around Town. So staff would rather wait, take some traffic counts after the two roadways are open and then evaluate and see what the most important projects are.</p> <p>The Quiet Zone meeting will be held tomorrow. We will be talking with Union Pacific about the three crossings in the downtown area and looking at the possibility of establishing a quiet zone there. We will be finding out what exactly their criteria will be. The Federal Railroad Administration does have standards that we have to adhere to but Union Pacific also has some standards and would like to look at the crossings with us to see if there are any particular items that need to be taken into account. <i>What are the odds that the Quiet Zone will happen?</i> The odds are pretty good. The railroad is starting to get a track record around the country and other communities</p>

	<p>that have installed quiet zones. Staff feels that all three of the crossings set up themselves for a quiet zone because basically all you have to do is install the necessary infrastructure to not allow people to bypass the gates, which might mean medians and/or four quadrant gates. Also, the signals themselves have to be interconnected. Just the proximity and the way they are located on grade makes it pretty easy to accommodate that. The one concern that has been raised from both the Fire and Police perspective is how they might get through there but they can't get through there when a train is there anyway. It does take awhile to go through the process and get it approved. The Town would install the gates, but anything on the tracks the railroad would handle. We will be working within 25' of the railroad so we would have to pay for flagging. Right now we have budgeted \$1.6M, which should be enough.</p> <p>We received notice last week that Congressman Mike Coffman was soliciting requests for high priority projects for stimulus grant money so the Town put in an application through his office in D.C. for the N. Meadows Project.</p> <p><i>Have you heard anything back from the railroad? We are having a follow-up meeting with them on May 27. We have provided all the information that they have requested so hopefully we will get some more direction from them at that time.</i></p> <p><i>Have you heard back from the consultant company of the comments that were made at the Open House? Yes, we have received a summary and will send them out to the Commission.</i></p> <p><i>What seemed to be the trend? We had 230 responses between the meeting and mail. The majority responses were from Castle Pines and overall the comments favored the Atrium alignment. But the people in the Meadows favored the Castlegate alignment but there were fewer comments from the Meadows area.</i></p> <p><i>What are the next steps? We did an update with the Council on April 21 and requested direction from them to evaluate all three alternatives because they are so close in terms of impacts and basically all three can be cleared environmentally. If the railroad does not allow us to relocate, then we are back to just two alignments but at least we're still progressing and not having to wait and write the EA based on the answer from the railroad. If the railroad says that they will work with us, then we will continue to</i></p>
--	--

		<p>evaluate all three alignments. That will help us set out our options for our funding plan. We are meeting with Douglas County next week to talk to them about their participation level and to bring them up to speed. No one is willing to say that they are a part of this yet until there are some more answers.</p> <p><i>How much are we intimidated by the threat of a lawsuit from Castle Pines?</i> We don't know the threat level but they have always commented that they would file a lawsuit.</p> <p><i>Since Castle Pines Village is not a part of the Town of Castle Rock, how much of an impact do their comments have?</i> The EA process takes all comments into consideration. Its not a vote by any means but all the comments are taken into account.</p> <p><i>How many comments were there about closing Happy Canyon?</i> That was part of Douglas County's booth. We had a deadline of April 17 for all comments and the County was collecting them through the end of the month so I think they are just now starting to summarize their comments.</p> <p><i>In the projects update it mentions that the Ridge Road detention pond it not functioning. Is the cost to fix that going to be on the Town or the consultant who designed it?</i> The original plan was to put the pond out by Ridge Road in front of Faith Lutheran Church and in working with the church and also the developer just to the west behind Faith Lutheran, we worked out a solution to get a regional pond for that area. So the pond was relocated and redesigned. Basically the bottom of the pond is too flat so that needs to be modified and the consultant is picking up the cost for that.</p> <p><i>Bus procurement – we have two different options. Do we know which way we are going?</i> Bob Watts found the Houston-Galveston Area Coalition (HGAC) and it is the same supplier locally for both those options so we will get a price from both and go with the lowest price.</p> <p><i>Regarding the transit service for the Town getting Federal Funding applications. Are we still trying to stay within the Town limits on this or trying to work with the Senior Center to take some of the trips?</i> Colorado Springs has to cut their service even further and so it is highly unlikely that FREX will last throughout the year. What we are trying to do is put in place a plan that if that happens, we can have a grant application for 2010 to at least run a bus</p>
--	--	--

		<p>service up to the Lincoln light rail station. We would have to have agreements with RTD and modify our insurance provisions because now our buses would be traveling out of the Town limits. So this is kind of a back up in case FREX goes away. Or if it becomes cheaper since it is being subsidized by grants, Council might look at it and say why are we funding FREX if we can get people up to Lincoln light rail for a cheaper cost.</p> <p><i>Are we looking at doing the route around Douglas County that we talked about before?</i> Under the same grant application, Douglas County is applying for one coordinator position for two years to actually oversee this aspect. But that is as far as it has gone.</p> <p><i>On the policy for using buses for after hour's events, typically when you get FTA funds to purchase the buses, you have to make a determination that you have to have a private fleet to do this job. I don't see that in here?</i> That has been a question. The trolley wasn't purchased with FTA funds so that is clear. Regarding the buses themselves, we have gotten direction from FTA that on a "limited basis" we could provide this type of service. So far we only have two or three events a year that we use the buses. We have had a request for a wedding event to use the trolley and that doesn't have the restrictions with the FTA.</p> <p><i>As far as being reimbursed, what are we using for a cost factor?</i> We are working on that right now and trying to determine what the cost would be. We are trying to make it not so expensive that people can't afford it i.e. similar to a park pavilion or renting out a piece of infrastructure or equipment. So we are trying to find that right dollar amount that fines that balance. We will come back to the Commission once we figure it out.</p> <p><i>If FREX might be going away sometime this year, is there something that we will be able to pick up between that time and 2010?</i> We have researched that. It would have to be where we would rent a service to have a charter bus run people back and forth but the costs are high.</p> <p><i>Could we rent a bus from Colorado Springs?</i> Because those buses were purchased in 2007 they are actually on a six-year depreciation schedule so technically they are partially owned by CDOT up until 2013. It is our understanding that these buses would go back to CDOT.</p>
--	--	--

		<p><i>Why do we have an age limit of 18 without adult supervision?</i> We are anticipating that these events are going to be the type of event like a birthday party or group thing so there is always going to be an adult there. We just don't want to have a bunch of kids with no adult supervision on board.</p> <p>Tomorrow we have interviews for Public Works Commission applicants. Donna Hawk has reapplied but we are saying goodbye to Ken Perry. We want to thank Ken for his service. His background and experience has been a real asset to the Commission.</p> <p>CATCO numbers are up. No word on leaving anyone behind since the purchase of the larger buses. We have had an increase in the number of wheelchair rides because Douglas County School District has a program for wheelchair bound students and they use CATCO to get out and learn how to shop and get around the Town.</p> <p>There is a possibility that the June 1 Commission meeting could be cancelled. We are planning for the July meeting to do our tour of the TAP projects.</p>
<p>Council Comments – Joe Procopio</p>		<p>Joe wanted to thank the staff for keeping the Council updated on the N. Meadows Extension project.</p> <p><i>Two residents from Castlewood Ranch have approached Joe regarding why there is a stop sign at Wagon Wheel and Enderud and not at Mikelson and Enderud?</i> The Wagon Wheel and Enderud intersection is not as traveled as the Mikelson and Enderud intersection. Maria will have Dan Sailer contact Councilman Procopio regarding this.</p> <p><i>Is there a bike path associated with the Southeast Arterial Connection road?</i> Yes, the ultimate design will have two bike paths on each side. Initially, there will just be one multiuse path on the south side so bikes will have to use the sidewalk or pathway.</p> <p><i>There are rumors that there are State funds for the N. Meadows Extension Project?</i> No, they have talked about maybe contributing something but they have nothing in their budget right now. The only thing is the stimulus grant money through Congressman Coffman's office.</p>
<p>Commission Comments/Questions</p>		<p>Richard Morton gave the Commission an update on the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority. We finally had the Rocky Mountain Rail Authority meeting that was delayed by snowstorms. The discussion was in regards to the feasibility study that was conducted to determine if a commuter rail system can be</p>

		<p>sustained. They looked at number of people that would ride it, what it would cost (including operating and capital costs), and what they came up with is that they could go from Pueblo to Fort Collins and out to Eagle Airport. The original study had them going all the way from Trinidad to Cheyenne. At the moment they don't feel that there is enough traffic to sustain operations to those locations. Same thing if you go west of the Eagle Airport. They also presented several different types of trains and the one that has the best return to meet the criteria was the 220 mph train. It can technically do 220 mph but you are never going to reach that kind of speed. The trains need to have the capability to operate along the I-25 and the I-70 corridor. If we run on the existing railroad track, the cars have to be compliant with the Federal Railway Safety Standards. The piece to try to complete the puzzle is moving the freight railroads out east. One option is that it could operate like they do in San Diego where the commuter train runs during the day and freight runs during the night. The next step would be for them to develop an implementation plan and present it to the public. The next meeting is a steering committee meeting on May 22.</p>
<p>Adjournment</p>		<p>Being no other business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58p.m.</p>