



One University Place Construction Update 1
10/22/15

One University Place construction has begun on the front building. This building is expected to be completed in approximately one year. The rear building construction will not start until next summer. St. Andrew Church is expected to remain in operation on site until June, 2016.

Excavation of the bottom floor of the front building has been completed and 200 Geopiers have been installed to stabilize the earth. Concrete footings will be poured in the next two weeks.

Utilities work (storm sewer, electrical transformer) has begun. Attached is a portion of the [October 2015 City Engineer's Report](#). Section 7 has a detailed explanation of the east ravine changes that occurred in the storm sewer and utility location due to incorrect elevations in the initial mapping and underground debris found in the west side of that ravine. The report notes that the City Engineer considers these changes minor and not unusual in a project of this type. There will be an updated landscape plan for this area that reflects these changes. Sections 6 and 8 of the report, which also refer to the project, are included as well.

At the October City Council meeting Jim Lane was selected as the city councilor to work with the City Engineer to review issues that could be considered major and require attention from the full council. As specified in the PUD (Planned Unit Development) agreement minor changes can be approved by the City Engineer.

On October 20, City Engineer sent a [memo regarding the west ravine storm sewer](#) to City Councilor Jim Lane.

St. Andrew Church did harvest three walnut trees from the property that they have had milled. Once dried they intend to use the lumber for chancel furnishings--communion table, baptismal font stand, pulpit, etc. in their new building.

MEMORANDUM

TO: University Heights, Mayor, Council, and Staff
FROM: Josiah Bilskemper, P.E.
DATE: October 12, 2015
RE: City Engineer's Report

(6) One University Place

- a. Since the council last met, the on-site construction work for this development has started. Below I have a summary of a couple items that I have been involved with during this first month of construction.
- b. Moving forward, I'd like to get some direction on what expectations council has for updates from the City Engineer with regards to progress at the One University Place site development. I anticipate providing a summary in the monthly engineer report of any development related items we are involved with, but would like to confirm this direction with the council.
- c. Having talked to Jeff Maxwell, I understand he is planning to attend the October 13th meeting to provide an update on the site work that has occurred, and to discuss at what intervals the council would like updates. Section 13.1 of the PUD Development Agreement requires the developer to keep the City informed of the status of the project by responding to inquiries from representatives of the City and furnishing progress reports as reasonably requested, but not less than quarterly during construction.

(7) One University Place – East Ravine

- a. The contractor identified an unknown underground condition across a portion of the west side of the east ravine that has required additional work within the east ravine beyond the original construction limits. There is always the possibility with underground utilities and construction that an unknown condition may be encountered, and once identified, it's not uncommon that this necessitates some type of change in the construction plan to allow construction of the project as designed.
- b. In this case, pieces of broken concrete, asphalt rubble and poor quality embankment materials were found throughout the west slope of the ravine, deposited there over the years as they were pushed over the side of the ravine. These materials are not suitable to provide a stable base for the paving and utility equipment that will be located near the top of the slope in accordance with the development plans previously approved by the city, and need to be removed and replaced with compacted material.
- c. Below is a summary of our involvement with this issue:
 - i. We were notified Friday, September 25th by MMS Consultants that the embankment soils on a portion of the west side of the east ravine were found to be poor condition material that had been pushed over the edge of the church parking lot over the years, and included chunks of concrete and asphalt rubble. This portion of the ravine was identified as being outside the original construction limits, and was also an area of steep slopes. An on-site meeting was requested and arranged for Monday morning.

- ii. We met on-site the following Monday morning with the developer (Jeff Maxwell), general contractor (McComas-Lacina), and the developer's civil engineer (MMS). This portion of the east ravine had been cleared of vegetation such that the miscellaneous pieces of concrete rubble and other debris could be seen throughout the slope. MMS had staked out the location of the electrical transformer and retaining walls near the top of the slope, which was located on the top of this embankment material; the electrical transformer and retaining walls are part of the development plans approved by the city, and they're necessary elements for the overall project to be constructed. The developer identified their findings and proposed course of action to remove and replace the existing embankment material with new material, compacted and tested to an appropriate density to support the approved electrical transformer, retaining walls, sidewalk and roadway paving that will occur on this side of the ravine. The proposal also included shifting the storm sewer manhole in the ravine further south to allow more vertical difference between the inlet and outlet pipe, thereby providing greater energy dissipation of the water before it flows out into the ravine, limiting potential for downstream erosion.
- iii. We received a draft of updated drawings from MMS on Tuesday showing additional impacted area in the east ravine, and proposed grading and storm sewer changes as considered on Monday morning. These documents were reviewed, and comments were provided at the end of the day to MMS requesting clarification and specific details on the embankment reconstruction process, as well as a narrative of the development team's findings and intentions moving forward.
- iv. We received a narrative with additional detailed information on the proposed embankment reconstruction and restoration plan Wednesday evening.
- v. We reviewed the developer's submittals for this area of the east ravine with city staff on Thursday, evaluating to make a determination if the situation and the proposed plan of action should be characterized as a minor adjustment to the project construction plans, or a material change, as identified in the PUD Development Agreement.
 1. Given the miscellaneous fill material and concrete pieces uncovered along the slope, staff agreed the embankment would need to be replaced with suitable fill material, and reconstructed with properly compacted density in order to construct the site plan features that will be supported by this embankment (electrical transformer, retaining walls, sidewalk and road paving). Our opinion was that this was an adjustment to the plans to be addressed administratively.
 2. The removal of trees and brush on this portion of the east ravine will require additional landscaping plans to restore the area. Our opinion is that this necessary additional landscaping design should be submitted to the city council for review and approval. The developer has indicated a commitment to proceed in this manner for the design and implementation of landscaping.
- vi. City staff analysis and recommendations were provided to the Mayor and Council Thursday evening, along with the development team narrative. We received notification Friday morning from the city attorney that a special meeting for this matter would not be held because no Council members asked the Mayor to hold one, and to proceed with notifying the developer of the city staff recommendations. We notified the developer and his engineer Friday morning to proceed with the embankment reconstruction, beginning with fencing the limits of the disturbed area before further work occurs in the ravine and coordination with their geotechnical engineer to provide analysis, recommendations and testing of the reconstruction work.
 1. We have requested to be copied on the geotechnical reports for this embankment work, as well as confirmation of MidAmerican compaction requirements for the electrical transformer.
 2. The developer will provide to the city council a timeline for submitting a revised landscaping plan for review.
 3. MMS has provided a revised drawing and area measurements of the additional area impacted, and is attached to this report.
- vii. Work began Thursday and Friday of last week (10/8 and 10/9) to install the adjusted storm sewer layout and remove the existing poor quality material from the west side of the east ravine.

(8) One University Place – Melrose Entrance

- a. We observed that the site construction fence installed adjacent to the main church entrance on Melrose did not provide any sight distance between vehicles leaving the site and pedestrians or bicyclists proceeding west on the wide sidewalk. We notified the developer and the general contractor with ideas to improve this situation, which they have implemented. The fencing is pulled back and angled into the site, a temporary STOP sign and bicycle/pedestrian crossing sign have been installed, and a painted stop bar and crosswalk markings have been placed to draw attention to this crossing.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Lane, University Heights City Councilor
FROM: Josiah Bilskemper, P.E. (Shive-Hattery, Inc.)
DATE: October 20, 2015
RE: One University Place – Construction Issue
West Side Storm Sewer Outlet

We received a call from Ron Amelon with MMS on Wednesday, October 14th requesting review of a proposed shift in the alignment of the storm sewer pipe that is designed to outlet at the northwest corner of the site, onto property owned by the University of Iowa.

The proposal was to shift the storm sewer manhole that was planned near the outlet about 5 to 10 feet to the south. This would allow the outlet pipe to be aligned to miss some existing trees that could then be saved. The pipe would then come out of that manhole and be angled back to the northwest so the water would flow out into the west ravine in approximately the same location.

I indicated to Ron that this seemed to be a reasonable change to avoid cutting down trees that could be saved, and does not change the ultimate location or quantity of storm water as indicated in the approved plan. However, I told Ron this portion of the project is outside the boundary of the City of University Heights, is located on University of Iowa property, and he would need to take this proposed change to the University of Iowa for ultimate approval, as it would require revising their storm sewer easement with the University of Iowa.

Ron indicated he would follow-up with their University of Iowa contact for this project prior to proceeding.

I viewed this as a minor adjustment that could be handled administratively in accordance with Section 2 of the PUD Development Agreement. In this particular instance, the adjustment was not within the City of University Heights, and therefore we directed the matter be taken to the adjacent property owner.

Please let me know if you have any questions, thanks.

JDB/bad

