

Monroe Street Budget Amendment FAQ

1/5/2018

1. Why are we doing this project?

- a. To repair the pavement which is in poor condition.
 - i. A three rating for the pavement is considered very poor for an arterial street. (A rating of 10 is an excellent street and a rating of 1 is an extremely poor street)
 - ii. Poor drainage has accelerated deterioration of pavement
- b. To enhance the walkability of the street.
- c. To replace early 1900's infrastructure and upgrade where needed.
 - i. Sanitary sewer mains as old as 1905 (newest main from 1932).
 - ii. Water mains from 1911-1918.
 - iii. Existing storm sewer system is limited and/or undersized in areas, and aging (circa 1950 or earlier).
 - iv. flooding in some locations, especially in areas near West Lawn Ave. and Spooner.
 - v. Stormwater treatment elements including a screen treatment structure to aid in phosphorus and sediment removal, raingardens/bio-retention, and a pilot project involving a rock infiltration trench will be installed.
 - vi. Overall, project is roughly 2 miles in length, with about 7 miles of pipe (excluding electrical conduits).

2. What was the cost of the bids received?

- a. Speedway Sand and Gravel \$18.7 million.
- b. R.G. Huston Company, Inc \$23.9 million.
- c. Parisi Construction Co, Inc \$25.0 million.

3. What costs in addition to the cost of the bid are required for the project?

- a. Construction contingency and construction oversight estimated at \$2.7 million are added to the cost of the bids.
- b. Undergrounding, estimated at \$1.4 M was planned.
- c. City supplied labor and materials for construction estimated at \$1.0 M is required for street lights, traffic signals and parking equipment.

4. How does the budget compare to the current estimate based on the bids received?

- a. The budget was \$17.7 million, the new estimated cost is \$22.4 million.

5. If awarded, how will the \$4.7 million of additional funding required for the project be paid for?

- a. \$2.4 million will be reallocated from existing sewer utility and water utility funds.
- b. \$1.5 million of new appropriation will need to be provided from the Storm Water Utility.
- c. Budget authority for special assessments will be increased by \$0.8 million. No new special assessments will be levied. This simply provides the

authority needed based on the schedule of assessments that was approved by the Common Council in October of 2017.

- d. The undergrounding of above ground electrical and cable lines will be deleted from the project saving \$1.4 million (\$125,000 as unallocated contingency remains which could be used to partially fund the installation of conduit for future undergrounding if additional savings can be achieved after award)
- e. No additional general fund supported GO borrowing will be required.

6. What are we not doing as a result of the fund transfers?

- a. Storm Water Utility funds are an additional appropriation. There will be no impact on other planned projects.
- b. Sanitary Sewer Utility unused funds will come from 2017 unused funds from Rural to Urban projects. There will be no impact on other planned projects.
- c. Water Utility funds will use 2018 budgeted funds. As a result, the following projects will be reduced in scope or delayed:
 - i. The proposed Booster Station 129 design will be delayed to 2019.
 - ii. Some proposed pipeline improvements in Pressure Zone 10 will be delayed to 2019.
 - iii. Water main replacement scope will be reduced on some 2018 Pavement Management projects.
 - iv. The scope of the 2018 water main lining project will be reduced.
 - v. Far east side interstate crossing projects will be delayed to 2019.

7. Why is the project over estimate?

- a. Budgets are prepared without the benefit of detailed design. The budgets, especially for the utilities, were significantly underestimated.
- b. Contractors are currently busy which tends to increase costs.
- c. The project is viewed as difficult from the standpoint of traffic control and limited work space which tends to increase cost.
- d. The need to coordinate with other private utilities doing work introduces risk and tends to increase cost.
- e. Completing this amount of work in a single year will be difficult, and, with financial penalties in place, involves contractor risk which tends to increase cost.

8. What elements were included in this project that are not typical of a commercial arterial street?

- a. The majority of the cost for this project is for the construction of the basic infrastructure, curb and gutter, pavement, sidewalk, utilities, street lights and traffic signals.
- b. Pedestrian scale lighting was included in commercial areas. In accordance with City policy, this cost is 100% assessable.
- c. Street reconstruction projects generally have improvements to help pedestrians cross the busy street. This project has 4 raised intersections at a cost of \$0.2 million.

- d. This project has a new public plaza bordered by Breese Terrace, Regent St and Monroe St (Monroe-Regent Plaza) and some entrance features at the Wingra Park entrance with a cost of \$0.5 million.

9. How was the public involved during the development of the project?

- a. Extensive public outreach and input process in preparation for 2018 Reconstruction
- b. Numerous (12+) public informational meetings on various aspects of the project, including pedestrian, bike & transit concerns, meetings with focus groups on the cross section, green infrastructure, and business involvement. Meetings were held as early as 2014, and regularly through 2016.
- c. A community survey was conducted with about 2,800 respondents
- d. An Engagement Resource Team met regularly with representatives from the various stakeholders to help provide input regarding the focus of the public meetings and communicate information to the groups.

10. What was learned from the public input?

- a. There was a desire to have improved pedestrian safety, and this is addressed with addition of raised intersections & colored crossings, additional islands, and narrower street between Edgewood & Regent.
- b. There was a desire to have better public spaces at the Monroe-Regent area and at the Wingra Park entrance.
- c. Interest in improved storm water treatment & green infrastructure
- d. A strong preference from the business community to complete the project in a single year

11. What are the possible options if the project is not awarded?

- a. Rebid the project as is. This is not recommended.
 - i. \$5.2 million separate the low bidder to the next bidder. We expect a rebid to end up someplace between the low bidder and the second bidder resulting in increased costs.
 - ii. Late fall was an optimal time to bid, bidding a project this large in the spring is not recommended because contractor schedules are filling up and the project must start early to complete in a year. It would need to be bid in the fall of 2018 for 2019 construction.
- b. Remove raised intersections and plaza areas and rebid. This is not recommended.
 - i. Bids are expected to increase with a rebid due to the discrepancy between the low and second low bidder and these increases will likely offset the savings achieved by deleting \$0.7 million in work from the project.
- c. Rebid with Monroe St closed to through traffic, leaving it open to residents and those patronizing businesses only. This is not recommended.
 - i. Closing the street will be detrimental to the businesses on the street.
 - ii. Closing the street typically yields lower costs however it is not clear that a savings would be realized in this case. If the street is

closed, there isn't a designated space for traffic. This could be problematic because it will make it harder to keep the work zone safe and the contractor may view it as a worse condition to the current traffic control plan which keeps one lane open inbound.

- d. Do not build the project. This is not recommended.
 - i. The existing poor pavement and utilities from the early 1900's would remain.