

Emphasis on Quality Rochester's City Owner Contract Process

Presentation to the Rochester Area Builders

August 11, 2015

City Council Charge

- ▶ Investigate opportunities to improve the overall quality of the privately constructed infrastructure built and then turned over to the City through the City Owner Contract process
 - ▶ City Goal: Improve the overall quality of public infrastructure to achieve expected life cycles
 - ▶ Objective - Determine what are the contributing factors
 - ▶ Objective - Involve developers, engineers, contractors, and city staff to work together to identify opportunities and responsibilities
 - ▶ Objective - Evaluate different deliver methods
 - ▶ Objective - Evaluate different payment options

Contributing Factors

- ▶ TIME IS MONEY
- ▶ Poor soils and lack of proper subgrade preparation
- ▶ Poor compaction
 - ▶ Around structures
 - ▶ Utility trenches
- ▶ Lack of adequate pavement design
- ▶ Lack of inspection
- ▶ Weather
- ▶ Budget
- ▶ Schedule
- ▶ Shortage of skilled trades
- ▶ Others

Common Problems

- ▶ Poor Soils
 - ▶ Clays, silts, poor limestone, perched water, wetlands, karst and fens
- ▶ Minimal subgrade preparation
 - ▶ Limited pre-development investigation
 - ▶ Minimal field testing when placed
 - ▶ Subgrade corrections not always effective
- ▶ Compaction around features/manholes
- ▶ Water & Sewer service trench settlements
 - ▶ Effects street, curb & gutter, sidewalks, front yards
- ▶ Sanitary Sewer mains with sags / bellies
- ▶ Variation in thickness of bituminous lifts
 - ▶ Quality of aggregate base preparedness

Pavement Failure



Pavement Failure



Pavement Failure



Street Depression



Pavement Settlement



Depression in Street



Settlement at Sidewalk & Curb



Defective Manhole Bottom



© Rochester Public Works 07/08/2015

Storm Pipe Installed Incorrectly



Contractor Challenges

- ▶ Inexperienced Work Force
- ▶ Experience and Qualifications of key field staff
- ▶ Lack of familiarity with City engineering standards and detail plates
- ▶ Asked to quote on development without benefit of fully developed plans
- ▶ Under time constraints to complete work
 - ▶ Pressure to cut corners

Consulting Engineer Challenges

- ▶ Level of staff effort tied to compensation
- ▶ Level of staff experience preparing design plans tied to compensation
- ▶ Level of staff experience conducting field inspection tied to compensation
- ▶ Not compensated to do detailed pre-development investigation
- ▶ Under time constraints to get plans prepared, approved, and bid
- ▶ Not adequately compensated to perform needed level of construction oversight

Other Cities

- ▶ St Cloud - two options available
 - ▶ Developer can petition City for infrastructure; City designs, bids, inspects; costs assessed to developer over 20 years; or
 - ▶ Developer can design, select contractor, select inspector; City reviews plans, and provides oversight of developer's inspector, all at City cost
- ▶ Rosemount - two options available
 - ▶ Developer petitions City for infrastructure; City designs, bids, inspects; costs assessed to developer over 5 years; or
 - ▶ Developer petitions City for infrastructure; City responsible for design, developer selects contractor, city inspects; city's costs assessed to developer over 5 years
 - ▶ In both cases the City also assesses Development Charges (WAC, SAC, etc.) for 5 years instead of requiring upfront payment

RAB Task Force

- ▶ Task Force Membership
 - ▶ Developers
 - ▶ Engineers
 - ▶ Contractors
 - ▶ City Public Works staff
 - ▶ Richard Freese, Doug Nelson, John Wellner
- ▶ Task Force Schedule
 - ▶ Meet every two (2) weeks beginning in September 2015
 - ▶ Report to RAB Membership in November 2015
 - ▶ Report to City Council in December 2015

Questions

- ▶ Q 1: Is the current City Owner Contract process really broke?
- ▶ A 1: It's not broke, but after 25 years it's time to evaluate alternatives as the desired life cycle outcomes for the constructed infrastructure are not being achieved

- ▶ Q 2: Won't any change in the current process just increase the cost?
- ▶ A 2: You get what you pay for and if you expect more it's likely to cost more!

- ▶ Q 3: Who pays for the higher cost?
- ▶ A 3: That's the challenge to all parties. All options are on the table!