



Legislation Text

File #: 16-185, **Version:** 1

TITLE:

Discussion of Phase 1B Bolin Creek Multi-use Path Alignment and Design and Construction Contracts

PURPOSE: The purpose of this item is to provide the Board of Aldermen an opportunity to consider the schedule and cost implications of modifying the design and/or alignment of the multi-use path and decide on further exploration of alternatives.

DEPARTMENT: Planning, Town Manager, Town Attorney

CONTACT INFORMATION: Patricia McGuire - 919-918-7327; pmcguire@townofcarrboro.org <<mailto:pmcguire@townofcarrboro.org>>; Robert Hornik - 919-929-3905; hornik@broughlawfirm.com <<mailto:hornik@broughlawfirm.com>>; David Andrews - 919-918-7315; dandrews@townofcarrboro.org <<mailto:dandrews@townofcarrboro.org>>; Christina Moon- 919-918-7325; cmoon@townofcarrboro.org

INFORMATION: On May 17, 2016, the Board of Aldermen adopted a resolution specifying next steps associated with Phase 1B of the Bolin Creek Greenway (*Attachment A*), also described as the Homestead-Chapel Hill High School Multi-use Path and State of North Carolina Transportation Improvement Project U-4726DE.

Project partners, including representatives of Fred Smith Construction, Kimley-Horn Engineering, Summit Engineering, UNC Chapel Hill, CHCCS, NCDOT, OWASA, and Town staff participated in a conference call on May 26th to discuss the Board's resolution and the status of the project. Attorneys Tom Cors, Dick Ludington, Dickson Phillips, and Nick Torrey were notified of the call, but are not known to have participated. The call focused on determining how the Board's resolution informed the initiation of work on the project and revealed that the interest in exploring the alternative surface material and alignment would alter the planned construction activities and route so that Fred Smith would need to revise its construction schedule. Additional costs associated with the potential realignment were also noted. Since the schedule is incorporated with the notice to proceed, it was evident that issuance of the notice to proceed could not occur until the Town was clear on whether it would undertake the exploration of technical feasibility of the alternative.

In considering the action options that were identified in the May 17th resolution, it may be helpful to consider a few key milestones. The October 8, 2015 bid opening yielded bids significantly higher than the engineer's estimates. Part of the Town's request for concurrence from NCDOT involved a request for \$212,000 in additional FY 17 STP-DA & TAP Funds from the DCHC-MPO. When the Town received concurrence from NCDOT in December 2015 to award the construction contract, the Town met with the Fred Smith to discuss how to schedule the project such that the approximately a third of the work would occur in or after October 2016 when the additional MPO funds would be available. The timeline for actual construction is limited by the bid documents to approximately seven months; the optimal time for construction is March through early November. Fred Smith agreed to delay the start of the project to mid-May to accommodate our funding needs, preferring to be able to complete the project start to finish rather than suspend work and then have to find other work for employees for a short window of time. A project such as this involves a number of subcontractors as

well as engineering work to design the pedestrian bridge. All of these workers have been on standby since mid-May, a cost that the Town will have to account for; estimates for some of these costs are noted in *Attachment B*. Material orders have likewise been suspended. The additional MPO funding, allocated through a competitive process to complete a project identified as “shovel ready” may also be at risk.

Attachment B summarizes the issues related to deciding to further consider the alternatives or to proceed with the existing project as designed, approved, and funded. A map showing the existing alignment and the alternate segment is provided as *Attachment C*.

FISCAL & STAFF IMPACT: The capital project ordinance for the project has a total budget of \$1,253,130 which is included as *Attachment D*. Additional costs, depending upon the option chosen, are estimated to vary from a minimum of \$50,000 to \$205,000 or more. A source of funding for these additional costs has not been identified

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends that the Board of Aldermen select one of the three action options.