



Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee

October 18, 2016

Summary and Motions

Chair Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Committee Members Stinnett, Kay, Moloney, J. Brown, Gibbs, Evans, F. Brown, Mossotti and Plomin were present. Council Member Scutchfield was also in attendance.

I. Approval of Committee Summary – September 20, 2016

A motion was made by Stinnett to approve the September 20, 2016 Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee Summary & Motions, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

II. Leaf Collection Update

Rob Allen, Deputy Director, Environmental Quality & Public Works, presented the Leaf Collection update. There are no major changes from last year. Collection this year will begin on November 9 and end on December 20, depending on the weather. The leaf collection hours will be 8 am until 6 pm Monday through Friday and Saturday from 8 am until 4 pm. Interested parties can go to <https://www.lexingtonky.gov/leaves> for additional information and to view an interactive map.

Farmer asked if the interactive map was live and Allen responded that he believes it is, but he does not know for sure.

Mossotti asked how we interface with private trash collectors. Allen stated that the educational component comes through Water Quality, Live Green Lexington, and others. They run various PSAs, but have no communication with private collectors.

F. Brown asked if the LFUCG has always completed only one leaf collection per area. Allen stated that this is what we have done for the last seven years. F. Brown stated that he does not feel that a single collection will be enough since we will have a late fall. Allen commented on the different types of trees, adding that if we did collect twice, it would not make much of a difference. F. Brown is concerned that we don't have a way to send a crew back out at a later date, and he asked how many crews we have going out. Allen said there were 4 crews. F. Brown asked about the possibility of allowing for an emergency second-pass. Allen responded that it would be an administrative decision. Hoskins-Squier added that we are trying to avoid completing a second pass. Allen stated that this program was complementary to other means of removing fallen leaves, and that it is not meant to replace all other clean up methods.

Plomin asked how the LFUCG prioritizes the order of leaf collection. Hoskins-Squier said they try to rotate the order of collection each year, and added that the neighborhoods with more mature trees are collected near the end.

Moloney commented on the history of the program, and stated that that we need to continue to provide community education on this issue.

Evans asked for information regarding the cost of leaf collection. Allen said the annual cost of the entire collection is over \$300,000; the cost to haul the leaves (one run) to Haley Pike Landfill is about \$32,000-\$40,000.

Evans asked about additional educational opportunities for the community and Allen said they are beginning to use social media, but they also try to use traditional methods such as TV and Radio.

In response to a question from Farmer, Allen stated that the outside contractors were effective and have improved each year. Farmer commented that this program exists due to the Water Quality aspect.

No further comment or action on this item.

III. Fiber Optic Technology

Aldona Valicenti, CIO, presented the update on Fiber Optic Technology. She reviewed the goals of the project, provided a timeline for completion of each step in the process, commented on the Rural Fayette County Study, and discussed the RFP as well as deployment status and next steps.

Stinnett stated that the priority should be ensuring that all persons in our community have access to the internet regardless of income, noting that some households still do not have internet access. Shapiro said that the number one goal of this project is to create competition; that is, better customer service and lower prices. Stinnett noted that service providers are requiring bundled services, which can be too costly for lower income households; he asked if there was a plan to subsidize internet access based on income level. Valicenti stated that the responses to the RFP would identify additional opportunities in this regard.

Stinnett asked if we are going to change the LFUCG policy and install fiber during road improvement projects. Valicenti stated that there is not a cohesive plan to do that. Stinnett said there the steering committee discussion this issue should include Council representation.

Kay asked if installing fiber will require digging up streets, and asked if there will be multiple service providers. Valicenti provided additional history regarding this effort, and responded that there would be some digging as well as some attachment to utility poles. Kay asked for information regarding gigabit accessibility and how it ties into the City's public-private partnership model. Valicenti said that the RFP is asking the responders to propose public-private partnerships. Kay asked about existing providers, like Windstream. Shapiro said they have asked incumbent providers to respond to the RFP.

Gibbs asked about Google's efforts and increased costs. Shapiro said this initiative started in 2014, and every city as well as Google Fiber is trying to identify solutions. He said that implementation is being held back in most cities by lack of access to utility poles and negotiating the agreements to have the work done in a timely manner. Valicenti added that there are two components to consider: physically digging and installing the fiber; and the service work.

Moloney asked who would own the franchise. Shapiro stated that there are 3 models: smaller cities that are doing it themselves; the city builds the infrastructure and leases it out, creating competition; and construction of the network with financing through various entities with a for-profit component where access is provided through lease. Moloney asked if we can provide service to surrounding counties if we franchise. Shapiro said the feasibility of fiber installation is based on density the number of people or houses per mile. Valicenti said density drives the cost, and that we need to think about this as two components: one that builds the structure, and one that operates it.

J. Brown asked about remaining issues that are preventing the release of the RFP. Valicenti stated that we currently have a study of the city we can include in the RFP, and we would like to have a study of the county available for the potential responders of the RFP. J. Brown asked if the RFP would ask responders for a cost of both physical labor and service. Valicenti said that a responder would likely want to complete their own study before responding to cost.

Kay commented that it is Council's interest that everyone who responds to the RFP understands that our interest is in having accessibility in all places. We want to give an opportunity for people who respond to the RFP to separate out urban and rural service so we can see the cost differential and make determinations about which way to go. Shapiro said that the companies they are talking to do differentiate between the two.

Farmer commented that the Council is interested in this initiative, and they need be included in the discussion. He asked if companies are already installing fiber in the City. Shapiro said there are companies that are laying fiber in certain areas, but not the City as a whole. Farmer said there is tremendous interest in this project, but we should not move too quickly.

No further comment or action on this item.

IV. Sidewalk – Priority List and Funding Update

Derek Paulsen, Planning Commissioner, provided an update regarding the implementation of the sidewalk program. He reviewed sidewalk project types, discussed ranking criteria for missing sidewalks, and presented proposed sidewalk projects as well as next steps in the process.

Mossotti asked for a list of the 53 sidewalk projects that have been identified, and Paulsen said he would send the list, noting that there are 47 current capital projects in addition to the list

provided in the presentation. Mossotti asked about the process involved in making the streets from South Point to the new shopping center more walkable. Paulsen said it will be in the priority list, but noted that the list is dynamic and can change; he noted the Summit Development as an example, as it is required by regulation for the developer to install sidewalks adjacent to the site.

Stinnett asked why we are installing sidewalks on Winchester Road. Paulsen stated that it's a small sidewalk segment, and was added due to its location near the Community Inn. Stinnett asked about sidewalks around new bus stops that are unpaved. Paulsen said some of those locations are on the project list.

F. Brown asked if Todd's Road and Elizabeth Street would be in next year's budget for sidewalk improvements. Paulsen replied that this is uncertain until we begin the FY18 budget process.

Scutchfield asked who is responsible for the sidewalks on Winchester Road and the Summit developments. Paulsen said the developers are responsible for all costs associated with sidewalk installation. Scutchfield stated concern that Fayette County Public Schools builds schools without coordinating with the City regarding sidewalk connectivity and associated costs.

Farmer asked Paulsen to send the rest of the list. He also asked Paulsen if he anticipated a larger budget allocation next year than he did this budget year. Paulsen said that would depend on what they receive in TAP applications. He said at this point it is too early to project TAP funding. Farmer asked Paulsen if his Division has the capacity to complete the projects on the list. Paulsen replied that they are doing the best they can, and discussed challenges in the process.

No further comment or action on this item.

V. Private Streets

Presentation and discussion of this item was postponed to the next meeting due to time constraints.

VI. Items Referred to Committee

No comment or action on this item.

A motion was made by F. Brown to adjourn, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

K.T. 10.19.2016