



**PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION  
STAFF REPORT**

**Item 4  
July 7, 2022  
Regular Business**

**AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION**

<b>TITLE:</b>	Aubrey Davis Park Trail Safety Improvement Project 30% Design Revisions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discussion Only <input type="checkbox"/> Action Needed: <input type="checkbox"/> Motion <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinance <input type="checkbox"/> Resolution
<b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b>	Review revised 30% design and refine the design for recommendation to City Council	

<b>STAFF:</b>	Paul West, CIP Project Manager Liz Gibson, KPG Psomas Principal Coreen Schmidt, KPG Psomas Bryce Corrigan, KPG Psomas
<b>COUNCIL LIAISON:</b>	Craig Reynolds
<b>EXHIBITS:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ADTS Email input from commissioners</li> <li>2. ADTS 30% Design Revisions Overview</li> <li>3. ADTS Revised 30% Design Plan Restroom and Roundabout</li> <li>4. ADTS Revised 30% Roundabout Design</li> <li>5. ADTS Revised 30% Cost Estimate Schedules A&amp;B</li> </ol>

**SUMMARY**

At its June 2, 2022 meeting, the Parks and Recreation Commission reviewed the 30% design presented by KPG Psomas. The focus of the discussion was on the restroom and 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave overpass area. The PRC agreed with the consultant’s recommendation that the West Mercer Way improvements aside from Schedule A wayfinding and regulatory traffic control was a lower priority of the project design. Several commissioners asked that the roundabout at the 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave overpass be included in Schedule A. Other questions raised were the extent of additional impervious surfacing, the effect of concrete versus asphalt paving in changing user behavior, and the effectiveness of placemaking elements in reducing trail user conflicts. Some of these issues were explored further in follow-up emails from commissioners to City staff. See Exhibit 1.

Subsequently, the design team developed responses to this input. See Exhibit 2. The team produced a revised 30% design (Exhibits 3 and 4) and a revised cost estimate for the new Schedules A and B. See Exhibit 5.

**REMAINING DESIGN ISSUES**

The design team addresses much of the feedback from the PRC in Exhibit 2. However, three areas need additional discussion to clarify the PRC’s interests:

**1. Impervious Paving and Pervious Paving**

Several commissioners expressed concern about an increase in impervious paving. In response, **the design team reduced the total amount of paved surface in the revised design.** Additional clarification is requested from the Commission as to whether these concerns pertain to the loss of infiltration capacity or the loss of “greenspace” – lawn, shrubs, trees, etc.

From a design perspective, the concern about infiltration capacity could be addressed in some locations with pervious pavement. However, pervious pavement would not function to recharge groundwater in this situation as most of the project is on the lid structure over the freeway. Stormwater infiltration is picked up by a massive drainage grid and delivered to Lake Washington underground.

To assist in the design, the project team would like clarification if the concern in this situation is primarily about the loss of greenspace and whether the revised area of pavement which the team recommends is acceptable. Further design refinements will be made with Commissioner feedback.

## **2. Art/placemaking and traffic calming**

The PRC's discussion of project elements such as colorful striping and concrete pavement led to questions about the effectiveness of these types of treatments. Commissioners requested examples of other situations where these had been implemented and reports from those jurisdictions about the perceived results. The design team will share its findings in its presentation which should help to inform the PRC's deliberations about inclusion of these elements.

At the last meeting, the idea of "beta testing" some of these traffic calming elements came up. This could be informative if done well, but it would require a scope of work that is not currently budgeted. Staff do not recommend this course of action, but if the PRC recommends this scope change, staff could pursue an appropriation request from the City Council.

## **3. Budget**

Exhibit 5 shows the updated total cost of Schedule A is estimated at \$373,636. Although this Engineer's Estimate slightly exceeds the available budget of \$350,000, staff recommends that this Scope of work be recommended to the City Council. . There are several reasons for this:

- The estimate includes a 15% contingency of \$44,800. Fifteen percent is typical at this stage of design when there is some uncertainty. It is likely that less contingency will be needed as the design gets refined.
- The budget does not include any 1% for the Arts funding that the Arts Council could decide to recommend for the art/placemaking elements of this project. That could cover part or all of the line item for "colored surface pavement treatment" in Schedule A.
- City Council's charge to the Parks and Recreation Commission was to develop a 30% design recommendation. Cost is a factor in the design and has been addressed by creating separate schedules of work based on the importance of the improvement to the project's goals. The PRC should ultimately recommend a design that it is confident will meet the goals of the project. There are other steps in the project where the cost will change, such as in final design and bidding. Ultimately, staff and City Council will work out the funding for this project.
- Engineer Estimates are planning level estimates. Costs for the project will change once the project is publicly bid for construction. This is customary for Public Work projects. Given the current market, prices are fluctuating for materials and construction costs and is anticipated to be uncertain for the immediate future.

## **RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL**

Staff has moved the PRC's 30% design recommendation to City Council for the September 20 meeting. This allows the PRC an opportunity to finalize the design and the recommendation memo at its September 1 meeting. Staff will continue to develop input from Arts Council on placemaking and 1% funding to include in the final design this fall with review from Parks and Recreation Commission.

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Discuss the revised 30% design and schedules of work.