



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #: Res. 2018-005 **Version:** 1 **Name:**
Type: Resolution **Status:** Passed
File created: 12/20/2017 **In control:** City Council
On agenda: 1/2/2018 **Final action:** 1/2/2018
Title: Consider Resolution Accepting Feasibility Report and Order Preparation of Plans and Specifications for 2018 Spring Creek Road Reconstruction.

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. 1 - Res Accept Feas and Order Preparation of Plans and Specs, 2. 2 - Transportation Plan - Functional Classification, 3. 3 - Land Development Code - Street Table Major Collector, 4. 4 - mtt_proposed_options_Reduced, 5. 5 - 2018 Spring Creek Rd Annexation, 6. 6 - 2018 Spring Creek Rd ROW, 7. 7 - Typical Sections - Feasibility, 8. 8 - 20171222 Feasibility Report 2018 Spring Creek Road, 9. 9 - Project Process - Spring Creek Road Reconstruction-Current

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
1/2/2018	1	City Council	approve	Pass

City Council Meeting Date: January 2, 2018

To: Mayor and City Council
City Administrator

From: David Bennett, Public Works Director/City Engineer
Sean Simonson, Engineering Manager

Subject:

Consider Resolution Accepting Feasibility Report and Order Preparation of Plans and Specifications for 2018 Spring Creek Road Reconstruction.

Action Requested:

The Northfield City Council adopts the Resolution Accepting Feasibility Report and Order Preparation of Plans and Specifications for 2018 Spring Creek Road Reconstruction.

Summary Report:

At the August 22, 2017 City Council meeting, Council passed Resolution 2017-065 which directed staff to prepare a feasibility report for the 2018 Spring Creek Road Reconstruction. The feasibility report provides costs for three proposed segments of Spring Creek Road. The three segments are as follows: (Attachment 8)

- Segment 1 - Jefferson Parkway to the north lot line of the recently constructed Hills of Spring Creek 7th Addition (Huron Court). This segment is a Municipal State-Aid (MSA) roadway.
- Segment 2 - Superior Drive to Jefferson Parkway (Non-MSA).
- Segment 3 - just north of Huron Court to Woodley Street (MSA).

On December 12, Staff discussed with Council the costs of the projects and potential timing of Segment 3 with the Spring Creek bridge replacement project in 2022. Therefore, staff is bringing forward the recommendation to construct Segments 1 and 2 in 2018 as full urban sections.

Spring Creek Road is identified as a major collector in the current Northfield Transportation Plan (Attachment 2). The Land Development Code has a table for the types of streets within the City. The table identifies the requirements for driving lanes, shoulders, parking, sidewalk, etc. A major collector street will have a right-of-way of 80 to 90 feet as shown in Attachment 3. Spring Creek Road is proposed to have a right-of-way of 80 feet.

A trail is proposed on the west side of Spring Creek Road in-lieu of a sidewalk due to the following items:

- The Northfield Parks, Trails, Open Space, and Trail System Plan identifies a destination trail, which connects/crosses Spring Creek Road north of Huron Ct. This is where the potential realignment of Mill Towns Trail would connect at Spring Creek Road (Attachment 4 - yellow route) and head north.
- The City has a new Community Park (Meadows Park) on the south end of this project and on the west side of Spring Creek Road.
- The Mayflower neighborhood to the north of Woodley Street has requested pedestrian and bike improvements north of this project. A trail with this project would provide for north/south continuity if a trail were built to the north of Woodley Street in the future.

Annexation/Right-of-Way

It appears that the east 33 feet of Spring Creek Road was annexed per Resolution 1998-241, and the west 33 feet of 10004 Hall Ave was annexed per Resolution 2002-357; however, in reviewing the mapping from the County for the east 33 feet, the City jurisdictional boundary isn't shown 33 feet east of the centerline of Spring Creek Road. In addition, it does not appear that the City has acquired the Right-of-Way (ROW) for this property. If Council moves this project forward, we would work with the township on the remaining annexation and meet with property owners to discuss ROW acquisition (Attachments 5 and 6).

If the City and township elect to not annex the additional 7 feet for a total of 40 foot half ROW, the sidewalk on the east side of the roadway would not be installed and would be a requirement for a developer to install in the future. Due to the cost difference of \$153,000 between the full urban section and urban/half rural for Segment 1 and 2, staff is recommending installing the sidewalk with this project.

Proposed Options

Options for construction would be a full-urbanized cross-section and a half-urbanized / half-rural cross-section (Attachment 7). A full-urbanized cross-section includes two travel lanes with shoulders, curb and gutter on both sides, a boulevard and multipurpose trail on the westerly side and graded boulevard with sidewalk on the easterly side. A half-urbanized / half-rural cross-section includes two travel lanes; the westerly side will have a shoulder with curb and gutter, boulevard and shared use trail, and the easterly side will have a smaller shoulder and a typical rural drainage ditch. The easterly side would then be constructed to a fully urbanized cross-section when the adjacent property is developed. In review of the cost differences between full urban and urban/half-rural, staff is recommending that the roadway be built as a full urban section. The total cost difference for all three segments to be constructed as full urban versus urban/rural is \$327,887.

In review of the MSA fund balance projection, the City can advance up to 5 times its MSA construction allotment or roughly \$3,000,000. Currently, with the programed MSA projects, Segment 3 fits for funding in 2022. The only caveat to that is it could come sooner but \$1.5M is identified for use at Jefferson Parkway and TH 246.

Funding for Segment 2, since it is not a state aid route, cannot use the general street bonding option due to the properties on the east side being outside the Jurisdictional Boundary of the City. Therefore, funding is recommended to come from a combination of capital reserves and tax abatement improvement process.

Since the last presentation, staff has also completed a high-level comparison to determine the costs of extending Spring Creek Road from Superior Drive to County Road 81. This cost would be around \$2,000,000 and would have a debt levy impact of 14% and an overall levy impact of 2.7% for the construction of this segment.

Recommended Improvement

Staff recommends proceeding with Segment 1 - Jefferson Parkway to the North lot line of the recently constructed Hills of Spring Creek 7th Addition (Huron Court) and Segment 2 - Superior Drive to Jefferson Parkway as a full urban section.

Alternative Options:

Alternative Options Supported by Staff

- a. Consider Segment 1 only as a Full Urban design.
- b. Consider Segment 1 and Segment 2 without sidewalk on east side (to be completed at a future date).

Alternative Options Not Recommended by Staff

- c. Consider Segment 1 and Segment 2 as a “Urban/Half Rural” design without sidewalk on east side (to be completed at a future date).
- d. Consider Segment 1 and Segment 2 both as a “Full Urban” or “Urban/Half Rural” design and Segment 3 added.

Other Alternative Option

- e. Council could make a motion to postpone the item until January 16 to allow for more research or information that Council may request related to alternatives, design and financing.

Financial Impacts:

Segment 1

Full Urban	\$1,343,025
Urban/Half Rural	\$1,231,100

Segment 2

Full Urban	\$483,659
Urban/Half Rural	\$442,210

Segment 3

Full Urban	\$1,717,874
Urban/Half Rural	\$1,543,361

Within the Hills of Spring Creek 7th Addition development agreement, the developer provided the City with \$30,368 for improving Spring Creek Road. This obligated the City to improve the road when Hills of Spring Creek 8th/9th are final platted and no longer than 5 years from the agreement or October 6, 2020.

In the Hills of Spring Creek 4th Addition, the developer provided the City with \$44,375 for upgrading Spring Creek Road to an Urban Roadway.

Financing Segments 1 and 2

The table below provides for a summary of initial preliminary financing options for the project. For segment 2,

it is proposed to use a combination of an abatement bond and cash reserves from the Capital Reserve for the non-utility cost for this segment. Staff reviewed two options below:

Option 1 - Finance all the \$379,588 using an Abatement Bond. This would have a 2.9% debt levy impact and 0.6% total levy impact.

Option 2 - Finance \$189,588 using an abatement bond (in addition to the amount planned for the 2018 parking lot improvements) and use cash reserves of \$190,000. This has a 1.5% debt levy impact and 0.3% total levy impact.

Staff is recommending Option 2 for financing segment 2. Staff will continue to review in greater detail financing options including potential additional use of reserves for the additional cost of Segment 2.

For the utility costs, the water fund will fund the water infrastructure installed with the project and the sanitary fund will fund the sanitary sewer infrastructure installed with the project. There are \$271,388 costs associated with storm drainage; roughly, \$150,000 is eligible for State-Aid and the remaining \$120,000 will come from the storm fund. However, the storm fund does not have enough reserves to fund the \$120,000, therefore, financing for the \$120,000 would come from an interfund loan from the water fund or could be included in the abatement bond and paid back from the storm fund.

Spring Creek Road - Superior Drive to County 81

Staff did a high-level comparison to determine the costs of extending Spring Creek Road from Superior Drive to County Road 81. This cost would be around \$2,000,000 and would have a debt levy impact of 14% and an overall levy impact of 2.7% for the construction of this segment.

Table 7 – Recommended Project Full Urban Section – Segments 1 and 2

	STREETS	SANITARY SEWER	WATER SYSTEM	STORM DRAINAGE	ESTIMATED TOTAL
ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES					
Estimated Construction Cost	\$1,017,834	\$89,538	\$122,111	\$214,536	\$1,444,018
Contingencies (10%)	\$101,783	\$8,954	\$12,211	\$21,454	\$144,402
Administration, Engineering, Legal (15%)	\$167,943	\$14,774	\$20,148	\$35,398	\$238,263
Total Estimated Project Costs (Feasibility)	\$1,287,560	\$113,265	\$154,470	\$271,388	\$1,826,683
ESTIMATED REVENUE					
Bonding / Cash Reserves	\$379,588				\$379,588
MSA Fund	\$907,973			\$150,933	\$1,058,906
Sanitary Sewer Utility Fund		\$113,265			\$113,265
Water Utility Fund			\$154,470		\$154,470
Storm Drainage Utility Fund				\$120,455	\$120,455
Total Estimated Revenue (Feasibility)	\$1,287,560	\$113,265	\$154,470	\$271,388	\$1,826,683

Tentative Timelines:

See attached Project Process (Attachment #9).