

CITY OF HASTINGS, NEBRASKA
MINUTES OF CITY COUNCIL WORKSESSION
Monday, May 4, 2020

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a Worksession of the City Council of the City of Hastings, Nebraska was conducted via video conference on May 4, 2020, as allowed by the executive order issued from Governor Ricketts on March 17, 2020.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. in Worksession by Council President, Paul Hamelink, with the following members present: Matt Fong, Chuck Rosenberg, Scott Snell, Butch Eley, Ted Schroeder, Ginny Skutnik, Jeniffer Beahm, Corey Stutte. Absent: None.

The following City Officials were present: City Administrator, David Ptak; City Attorney, Clint Schukei; City Clerk, Kimberly Jacobitz; Fire Chief, Brad Starling; Interim City Engineer, Lee Vrooman; Utility Manager, Kevin Johnson; IT Director, Kevin Schawang.

Moved by Matt Fong seconded by Jeniffer Beahm to adopt current agenda for May 4, 2020 Worksession. Roll Call: Ayes: Matt Fong, Paul Hamelink, Chuck Rosenberg, Scott Snell, Butch Eley, Ted Schroeder, Ginny Skutnik, Jeniffer Beahm. Nays: None. Absent: None. The motion carried.

PUBLIC NOTICE - Official Notice of the Worksession was published in the Hastings Tribune on Friday, May 1, 2020. Pursuant to Nebraska Revised Statute Section 84-1412, the public is advised that a copy of today's agenda and all reproducible written material which will be discussed at today's meeting can be found on the City of Hastings website, cityofhastings.org.

DISCUSSION ITEM

1. Discussion of forensic engineering examination of the 16th Street Viaduct.

Mayor Stutte stated the petitioners wanted a second opinion on the condition of the viaduct. We have time to seek a second opinion, if that is what we want to do, prior to the ballot language deadline of September 1st. If people are voting on raising taxes, we need to give them the full scope on issues with the structure and cost to repair. The forensic engineering examination of the 16th Street Viaduct goes deeper than Olsson Associates' report.

Dave Ptak reported that after the council rescinded its action, as far as to tear down the viaduct, he and Clint Schukei had conversations with Alton Jackson, one of the chief petitioners. The city reached out to several forensic engineering firms that might be able to help us get a true condition of the viaduct for a better idea on the cost to repair it. We interviewed three firms: two from Colorado and one from Omaha. After reviewing the firms, we asked Engineering Specialist, Inc. (ESI) of Omaha to give us a proposal to do a forensic structural analysis of the old viaduct. There were a lot of questions in regard to the contingencies that were in the Olsson estimate, as far as for the repair of the old viaduct. We talked to Anthony Siahpush (ESI) who put together an estimate. These are not services to demolish or do anything except to find out the true condition of the viaduct. We do not want to overstate or understate the estimated cost of repairs. We do not want these contingencies, if they are not founded, to be part of what we ask the citizens to vote on. We want a true assessment of the viaduct, in order to have the most accurate cost estimate.

Anthony Siahpush, Engineering Specialist, Inc. (ESI), spoke to the group. He reported this would be a condition assessment of the bridge. His firm looked at the bridge and has provided a cost for making a determination of the true condition of the bridge. The bridge is approximately 85 years old and was designed for low traffic, as a two-lane bridge. It was restored in 1985. Bridges of similar structure (concrete and steel beam support), depending on the condition of the bridge, at most have one major restoration. Not too many bridges go through two major restorations. It would be helpful to have a detailed assessment on the condition before such action would be done. We would need to look at the cost and scope of work for the restoration and cost for actual replacement or removal. His firm was asked to provide condition assessment of the bridge, so they can make a determination of what could be done and scopes for that work.

Dave Ptak stated the initial cost is approximately \$53,800 to do the condition assessment and forensic analysis. ESI also provided to us an optional instrument testing examination, which would include a comprehensive view into supporting piers and other members of the bridge.

Anthony stated his recommendation is to do a condition assessment and some examination testing for three of the piers, rather than all nine. He would suggest to select one in the worst condition, best condition, and a random choice for assessment. This would provide a very good view of the condition of the support structure. The initial assessment would take four to five weeks. If testing is involved, it would take another three weeks, so a total of eight weeks. They could begin sometime in late May or June 1, 2020. They have dealt with Union Pacific (UPRR) in prior contracts. UPRR will look at traffic and safety, and would most likely want to review plans for repair or demolition. They would not be involved with condition assessment, but we would need to acquire a permit from them anytime we are to be within so many feet of the rail, or if we are to go above the rails. That communication will be done for accessing the bridge for the assessment. In reference to repairs, they usually review our scope and approve what we can or cannot do. UPRR has certain restrictions when we are within 75 feet of the rails and will bring in a safety director to be onsite during those times. We have done minimal communication with UPRR at this time. As far as cost per day from the railroad, that is unknown. The same fee per day would be realized for repair or demolition.

Dave Ptak stated the petitioners informed him UPRR might charge \$800,000 for a half-day and \$1 million for a full day to have their personnel onsite during any type of work on the bridge.

Anthony stated it is his understanding they may need to work with UPRR for inspection and safety regulations, depending on traffic they have on the transit rail. The maximum number of days for demolition could be anywhere from three business days, up to seven. Restoration will be different depending on what needs to be done. We might be able to come up with a protective shield structure to be over the rails. The preferred method would be a demolition contractor with a larger mobilized group, to expedite the work and help keep the cost down for UPRR oversight. It will take twice as much time to repair the bridge, compared to demolition. The UPRR will want a copy of the forensic report and findings. After we know the direction we are going, we will talk to the UPRR.

Anthony has reviewed the Olsson documentation and photos taken of the bridge. Olsson's was a visual review, not testing the structure. You get a more thorough answer from testing. There are unknown levels of deterioration at this time.

Contractors would need a scope of work and specifications in order to bid repairs or demolition, especially when over the rails.

The total cost of the bridge repair, including UPRR cost, would include any assessments to get an accurate cost of bridge repairs. These expenses would be paid with tax money through bonds.

Discussions took place on the cost of bridge assessments versus the responsibility we have to provide the actual cost of repairs to the voters. Citizens have asked for a second opinion, not just the petitioners. The forensics would also help to determine the lifespan of the bridge. Concern was raised over the UPRR cost having detrimental effects on the cost of the project.

Direction was given to staff to add the forensic engineering examination proposal for the 16th Street Viaduct to the May 11th City Council meeting.

Moved by Matt Fong seconded by Chuck Rosenberg there being no further business to adjourn at 6:24 P.M. Roll Call: Ayes: Matt Fong, Paul Hamelink, Chuck Rosenberg, Scott Snell, Butch Eley, Ted Schroeder, Ginny Skutnik, Jeniffer Beahm. Nays: None. Absent: None. The motion carried.