

**Agenda Questions/Responses
May 27, 2004**

4. How does this price compare to the previous contract? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The previous lease was for a 25-year term, with payments made annually, and with annual adjustments for inflation. The lease's final annual payment was for the amount of \$6,951.65. The new lease is a \$130,000 paid-up-front, 20-year term lease, which is equivalent to a fixed annual rate of \$6,500 current dollars.

7a. How close are other City hook-ups? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The adjacent lot to the south of this request is currently connected to the City of Austin's centralized wastewater collection system. Also, the existing homes south of this lot are currently being served through our centralized wastewater collection system. Approximately 100 feet of wastewater main is required to provide wastewater service to this request.

7b. Please provide a map. (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

A map has been provided as back-up through the Council Agenda packet.

8a. How close are other City hook-ups? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The two lots immediately to the west of this request are not currently connected to the City of Austin's water system, however the lot immediately to the north is. The applicant will have to construct approximately 278 feet of water main to receive City of Austin water service, bypassing the two lots that may also connect to the water system. This area is being served by private onsite wastewater systems.

8b. Please provide a map. (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

A map has been provided as back-up through the Council Agenda packet.

9a. What type of development is planned for this tract? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The applicant is planning to develop a Wendy's restaurant and bank building. The proposed improvements are within the allowable impervious cover limitations set by the SOS provisions of the Land Development Code.

9b. Please provide a map. (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

A map has been provided as back-up through the Council Agenda packet.

10a. What type of development is planned for this tract? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The same development is planned as Item 9. Item 9 is for wastewater service and Item 10 is for water service for the same tract.

The applicant is planning to develop a Wendy's restaurant and bank building. The proposed improvements are within the allowable impervious cover limitations set by the SOS provisions of the Land Development Code.

10b. Please provide a map. (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

A map has been provided as back-up through the Council Agenda packet.

20. How much funding is available under the Public Facilities Program currently? My understanding was that this project would be funded through a mid-year re-allocation of CDBG funds. Does this action require that council re-allocate CDBG funds or has this already been done? Is an amendment of the Action Plan required when CDBG funds are re-allocated? There were two other projects that NHCD was recommending for funding through the re-allocation of CDBG funds? Regarding this particular loan to Foundation Communities, under what conditions will the loan be forgivable? (Council Member Raul Alvarez)

This item will be postponed to June 10, 2004.

21. Will citizens not in the AMSA be able to use the fields? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

Citizens may join the Austin Men's Soccer Association (AMSA) or non-AMSA teams can schedule games by renting the fields through AMSA. In order to ensure that fields are maintained in an optimum condition, organized team sports must be scheduled through AMSA.

AMSA primarily plays on Sundays so other groups will be scheduled for play on other days. In addition, when the fields are not in use, unstructured passive recreation can occur in the park and on the fields such as kite flying, walking or other family activity.

27. Is this the road for the Circle C fire station? (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

No, this is the portion of Escarpment on the north side of Slaughter. The section of Escarpment to service the Circle C fire station was completed in February of 2004. This section will service the HEB.

28. Are the improvements being made to the trail the standards improvements for our trail system? If not, why not? (Council Member Raul Alvarez)

The Boggy Creek Trail project is in line with the City of Austin Bike Plan, and is also consistent with other hard surface (asphalt and concrete) trail systems throughout the City where they are the only choice available to provide bicycle transportation corridors. In addition, the project had to be designed to AASHTO standards (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). The AASHTO Guide also recommends "hard, all-weather pavement surfaces" (page 54) for a shared use path.

The neighborhood requested an exception for this standard. They requested an 8-foot path. AASHTO provides for this under the following guidelines: "Under most conditions, a recommended paved width for a two-direction shared use path is 10 feet. In rare instances, a reduced width of 8 feet can be adequate. This reduced width should only be used where the following conditions prevail: (1) bicycle traffic is expected to be low, even on peak days or during peak hours, (2) pedestrian use of the facility is not expected to be more than occasional, (3) there will be good horizontal and vertical alignment providing safe and frequent passing opportunities, and (4) during normal maintenance activities the path will not be subjected to maintenance vehicle loading conditions that would cause pavement edge damage" (page 35-36)

In addition, City of Austin staff conducted a Trail Usage Report that included a level of service analysis for Boggy Creek Trail, Shoal Creek Trail and Town Lake Trail. The report indicated that the Boggy Creek Trail met the above conditions and should be granted a waiver for an 8-foot trail width. However, TxDOT is more stringent with their design criteria and did not agree that the project met the conditions for a reduced trail width and denied the waiver. The City has requested another waiver to have the trail width reduced.

37. Please describe the anticipated pending and future items mentioned in the backup. (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

The anticipated pending and future change order items include changes required in the bid documents, added work due to code requirements, and payment of claims from subcontractors.

PENDING CHANGE ORDER ISSUES: Change order issues are tracked using a Change Estimate (CE) Log, and each individual issue or item is referred to by a CE number. As of May 14, 2004 the CE Log listed 314 individual CE's. 154 CE's have been approved in previous change orders, 66 CE's have been rejected or closed at no cost after negotiation. There are currently 100 CE's pending review and approval; 55 that have been priced and are being evaluated or negotiated; and 45 that have not yet been priced and are being investigated. In order to try and predict what the cost will be for the issues that have not yet been priced, we have assigned a "Rough Order of Magnitude" (ROM) cost to each item. These CE's run the gamut from \$606 for modifying drainage pipes below the plaza fill, to \$70,000 (ROM) for additional fire alarm and fire protection devices that were required by the Fire Department when they reviewed the shop drawings. We estimate that we will need an additional \$185,854 to pay for the pending items.

FUTURE CHANGE ORDER ISSUES: The projected total change order as a percent of construction contract amount is 3.23 %. This is well below our standard performance measure of 5% for construction projects. In order to project an estimate of how much money will be needed to finish the project, we did a "trend analysis" of how many CE's have been generated each month and what the average cost per CE has been. Based on those projections and an expectation that the number of CE's generated each month should go down as we approach the end of the project, we estimated that we will need an additional \$440,000 (20 CE's/month at \$4,000/CE for 5.5 months) to pay for future CE's. This brings us to a total of \$625,854, which we have requested in this RCA.

51. How does this fee compare to previous years' dues?

Please provide a list of dues charged other members. (Council Member Daryl Slusher)

In the history of the Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition fees structure, the first year of the Coalition each community paid dues of \$250.00. Since that time the Interlocal agreement has been updated by the executive committee, and with the approval of the first strategic plan document the Annual Membership Fees are now based upon the community population from the latest U.S. Census. The City of Austin paid initial dues of \$250.00 in the first year and will now pay \$1,500.00 annually.

**Texas Colorado River Floodplain Coalition
Annual Membership Fees**

<u>Population based upon the Latest U.S. Census:</u>	<u>Fee Amt:</u>
less than or equal to:	
1,500	\$ 250.00
2,500	500.00
5,000	750.00
7,500	1,000.00
10,000	1,250.00
greater than:	
10,000	1,500.00

Z-1a. Has the staff or owner/applicant reached agreement on any alternative proposal? (Council Member Raul Alvarez)

No. The applicant has not provided any new information regarding this neighborhood plan amendment.

Z-1b. Please provide a map of the property that shows the AO-3 airport overlay zone on it. (Council Member Raul Alvarez)

A copy of the map indicating the property (currently zoned CS-CO-NP) and the AO-3 airport overlay zone line is being sent via e-mail attachment to Council. According the Aviation Department, the area between the southern boundary line of the property (CS-CO-NP & SF-6-CO-NP/MF-3-CO-NP boundary) and the AO-3 line is occupied by a City of Austin electric transmission easement that prohibits development, including residential structures.