



CITY OF WASILLA

290 E. HERNING AVE.
WASILLA, ALASKA 99654-7091
PHONE: (907) 373-9050
FAX: (907) 373-0788

COUNCIL MEMORANDUM NO. 92-49

FROM:

Deputy Administrator

DATE:

May 4, 1992

RE:

Lakeshore Drive Paving Project

Council was informed on April 27, 1992 of Administration's discussions and proposals to close out the Lakeshore Drive paving project.

The proposal included withholding \$6,000 from the contractor because of sub-standard workmanship. Councilman Cottle asked that the super elevation of the intersection be increased as a condition of releasing the contractor. The project engineer was asked to review the situation and his response is attached.

Without further objection, Administration plans to install stop signs at the intersection and close out the project as previously discussed.

Robert E. Harris

Deputy Administrator

Council objected 5/11/92

Alaska Rim

Engineering

Phone (907) 745-0222 Fax (907) 746-3299



P.O. Box 2749 Palmer, Alaska 99645

RECEIVED

MAY 4 - 1992

City of Wasilla, Alaska

May 1, 1992

Bob Harris Deputy Administrator City of Wasilla 290 E. Herning Avenue Wasilla, Alaska 99687

Re: Lakeshore Drive/Peck Street Intersection

Dear Bob:

At your request, I reviewed the above referenced intersection and my correspondence of October 29, 1991. Basically, you requested that I review the super elevation in this area and recommend a design grade for the intersection.

I did review this intersection and find that it does not meet minimum design standards for a through curve on a residential road. Locally, accepted design standards would require a minimum center line radius of 195 feet. To accomplish this, the City would have to acquire an additional 130 feet of right-of-way. This would allow for the proper design of a through curve with a super elevation that would support twenty-five mile per hour traffic.

I have discussed the option of alternate signing with Attorney Deuser. We agree that it would be in the City's best interest to install stop signs at this intersection. One would be required for traffic moving south on Peck Street and one for traffic moving east on Lakeshore Drive. At the present time, the City has no way of enforcing a speed limit at this intersection. If the speed limit/curve signs proved to be ineffective or if the City received complaints that they were not being obeyed, you would be in a position where you would have to install the stop signs or reconstruct the curve with the larger turning radius. Therefore, it would be more cost effective to install the stop signs initially, rather than spend the extra money to first install the curve/speed signs and then have to remove them. If you do nothing, you could be liable for any accidents occurring in this area.

I stated, in October, that this intersection had limited sight distances and that the existing roadbed was not altered. At that time, all that was being considered was that the street was being surfaced to reduce maintenance and dust problems. The signing, suggested then, was a stop gap type measure until the City decided on the final disposition of this intersection. It is my professional opinion that a through curve, meeting all design standards for a twenty-five mile per hour roadway, cannot be placed within the present right-of-way.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

John T. Felton, P.E. Partner

JTF/lmj

cc: Attorney Deuser

Alaska Rim

Engineering

Phone (907) 745-0222 Fax (907) 746-3299

P.O. Box 2749 Palmer, Alaska 99645

May 1, 1992

Bob Harris Deputy Administrator City of Wasilla 290 E. Herning Avenue Wasilla, Alaska 99687 RECEIVED MAY 4 - 1992

City of Wasilla, Alaska

Re: Lakeshore Drive Paving Project Request for Change Order

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am writing you per our meeting of Monday, April 27th. Present at this meeting were Jim and Les Hermon of Hermon Brothers Construction Company, Mayor Stein, you, representing the City, and myself. As a result of that meeting, I am of the understanding that the City is accepting an offer of a Change Order to decrease the construction project bid item for pavement by \$ 6,000.00. This represents the amount of labor in all of the paving portions of the contract. Basically, the City is paying for the materials as they lie; but not paying for the workmanship that went into the finished product.

In support of this action, I would offer the following arguments:

The City has enjoyed beneficial use of the pavement since it was placed;

The street is maintainable and in service today. The public works department did not have difficulties maintaining the road this past winter season;

It will serve no useful purpose to rip up the existing pavement to lay another surface. There could be subsiquent damage to the base course that has been accepted by the City;

The surface is slightly better than it was last fall and will continue to improve with use;

The roadway is posted at 25 MPH and is not meant to be a high speed thoroughfare;

The Contractor has had to finance the costs of construction through the winter season and will receive no additional monies for this added cost;

The total due for the pavement is \$ 27,918.60, the \$ 6,000.00 adjustment amounts to a 21% penalty; this is a substantial amount.

I believe that the combination of having to have financed the paving to this date, plus the overage delivered to the City and the \$6,000.00 reduction are both a reasonable penalty to the Contractor and adequate compensation to the City.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at any time.

Sincerely,

John T. Felton, P.E.

Partner

JTF/lmj

cc: Hermon Brothers Construction Company