



# LONG MEADOW/ OCAB



## # 6.2 - APPROVE PROJECT MEMORANDUM

City of Bloomington  
City Council Meeting  
September 9, 2013

# PROJECT OBJECTIVES

- Restore bike/pedestrian link across Long Meadow Lake
- Construct a cost effective project – utilize scarce transportation resources wisely
- Minimize future maintenance and replacement costs
- If possible, find a new State/Regional owner



# OLD CEDAR BRIDGE BACKGROUND

- Bridge constructed in 1920 by Hennepin County
- Carried vehicle traffic until 1993
- Closed to all pedestrian/vehicle traffic in 2002
  
- *The City has been looking for a solution for over 20 years*
  - *Berm Alternative – 1997*
  - *Transportation Enhancements Grant -- 2005*



# CURRENT CITY LEGISLATIVE POLICY

## (JANUARY 28, 2013)

- Bloomington supports additional pedestrian and bike crossings of the Minnesota River Valley including one in the vicinity of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge.
- Such crossings of the Minnesota River Valley are regional assets and are most appropriately owned and operated by a State or Regional Agency. The City of Bloomington supports transferring ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency
- The City of Bloomington is willing to transfer ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a new owner and will work cooperatively with the new owner to re-establish a non-motorized connection at its location. Such cooperation includes using funds, as allowed, assembled by Bloomington for this project.
- The City of Bloomington is only willing to develop and construct a replacement/renovation of the existing 1920s bridge under one of the following scenarios:
  - The City is willing to construct a replacement project that provides the desired non-motorized access plus wildlife observation opportunities (\$3.8M construction cost, 4.3M life cycle cost). It is appropriate, given the regional nature of the facility, that ownership be transferred to a new regional owner prior to or within a reasonable time following construction.
  - The City is willing to construct a renovation project (\$10M construction cost, \$12M life cycle cost) if additional non-city funds are available to cover the higher construction cost (including cost overruns encountered during renovation) associated with historic preservation and adequate funding is available to cover the higher cost of maintenance anticipated with a renovated structure. The total life cycle cost of a renovation project is approximately \$8M more than the life cycle cost of a bridge replacement project and is required solely for historic preservation purposes. Under this scenario, the City expects that there be a new regional owner of the renovated structure either prior to or within a short period of time following construction.
- If no project is funded the City of Bloomington, as owner, will remove the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge if and when it becomes a safety hazard.

# CURRENT CITY LEGISLATIVE POLICY (JANUARY 28, 2013)

- Bloomington supports additional pedestrian and bike crossings of the Minnesota River Valley including one in the vicinity of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge.
- **City is willing to construct a Replacement Bridge**
- The City of Bloomington is willing to transfer ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency. The City of Bloomington supports transferring ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency.
- **City is willing to Rehab the bridge if outside funding is provided**
- The City of Bloomington is willing to transfer ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency. The City of Bloomington supports transferring ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency.
- **The City expects (does not require) a new owner**
- The City of Bloomington is willing to transfer ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency. The City of Bloomington supports transferring ownership of the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge to a State or Regional Agency.
- If no project is funded the City of Bloomington, as owner, will remove the Old Cedar Avenue Bridge if and when it becomes a safety hazard.

# 2013 UPDATED BRIDGE COSTS

## ○ Bridge Replacement

- Construction Cost = \$6,800,000
- 50 Year Maintenance Costs = \$531,400
- **Total 50 Year Cost = \$7,331,400**

## ○ Bridge Rehabilitation (Full-Scope)

- Construction Cost = \$12,700,000
- 50 Year Maintenance Costs = \$1,967,000
- **Total 50 Year Cost: \$14,667,000**

# FUNDING AVAILABLE (2013)

	<u>Amount</u>
State Bonding	\$3,300,000
Federal Sarbanes Transit in the Parks Grant	\$2,000,000
Fiscal Disparities (TIF) – 2013 Legislation	\$9,000,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$14,300,000</b>

*Note* – This funding can only be used for capital costs. Approximately \$1.3 million of local funds (City, Hennepin County, Eagan) been pledged to this project. If still available, they are proposed to be used for future maintenance and replacement

# CURRENT STATUS

- Adequate funds for either Replacement or Rehab!
- Council approved an agreement with Met Council to complete the project by 2017 – Required by the 2013 Legislation
- Needed environmental document is near completion
  - Project Memorandum
  - Summary of current alternatives
  - Review of environmental impacts of each
  - Preferred Local Alternative must be selected
- August 19<sup>th</sup> Joint City Council/Port Authority Meeting



# AUGUST 26, 2013 FHWA LETTER

- FHWA will not support “Replacement”
- “Rehabilitation”, including full-scope rehab, is feasible and prudent
- Expressed concern that full-scope rehab may cause more historical impact than necessary
- Recommended re-starting project development with extensive additional engineering work



# COMMENTS TO FHWA LETTER

- A strong argument can be made that “Replacement” is feasible and prudent
- The full-scope rehab follows the approach used in recent similar rehab projects
- The full-scope is, hopefully, the “worst case”
- Final project scope will be determined during final design and construction – with FHWA/Agency involvement
- No need to re-start the project development process



# REPLACE OR REHAB?

## ○ Staff recommends “Replace”

- Analysis of other current guidelines (ONE Engineering Report)
- Meets all City objectives and is a prudent use of public funds
- Has a smaller visual impact on the River Valley/Refuge
- Has a better chance of being transferred to a State/Regional agency

## ○ If the Council selects “Rehab”

- Full-scope rehab project should be anticipated
- Consider reductions/changes to the scope during final design/construction with FHWA/Agency involvement

# STAFF RECOMMENDATION

- Approve the Project Memorandum for submission to the FHWA with “Replacement” as the locally preferred alternative

## ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION

- Approve the Project Memorandum for submission to the FHWA with “Full-Scope Rehabilitation” as the locally preferred alternative

