

Environmental Quality Committee
May 14 2013
Summary

Stinnett called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM. All committee members were in attendance. Kay also attended.

1. April 23, 2013 Committee Summary

On a motion by Scutchfield, second by Clarke the April 23, 2013 Committee summary was approved unanimously.

2. Drainage Ditch

Henson introduced the subject. Martin provided applicable State legislation and local ordinances that control and regulate maintenance of stormwater control devices. He stated that according to LFUCG Code of Ordinances Sec. 16-87 the private property owner is responsible for non structural maintenance in residential areas. He stated that the ordinance further stated that LFUCG was responsible for structural repairs when a public easement for a stormwater device exists.

Martin stated that UCG Sec. 16-88 also provides some guidance for commercial and industrial areas. He stated that in those cases the property owner was responsible for maintenance and repair of retention and detention basins and other stormwater control devices.

In response to a question from Clarke, Martin stated that the ordinance was not clear regarding non paved ditches.

In response to a question from Henson, Miller stated that Streets & Roads would like to ordinance be made clearer regarding drainage ways.

Katy Stites discussed the maintenance issue at her property on Waller.

Stinnett suggested that the issue remain in Committee to allow the Administration to re draft the ordinance with input from Henson. Martin and staff will also work on mapping the stormwater control devices in the County.

3 Easement Construction Issues

Myers introduced the subject and stated that a few citizens wanted to address the Committee after Martin made his presentation.

Martin discussed the draft Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). He stated that citizens need to be informed when LFUCG is working on or adjacent to their property. He stated that the SOP is a 13 point standard.

1. Crew Foreman will review GIS data to determine if any specific address is impacted;
2. Foreman or designee will make all reason efforts to inform impacted property owners;
3. Direct contact with impacted property owners must occur before any non emergency work begins;

4. Property owners will be provided an updated construction and restoration schedule;
5. All "Before You Dig" procedures must be completed in advance of dig;
6. Foreman must complete an assessment of equipment/manpower needed for dig;
7. Prior to dig foreman is responsible for photos of the work site;
8. Foreman or designee must knock on door of impacted property to give a final overview of work;
9. After work is completed, after site photos must be taken to document condition of site;
10. Foreman is responsible for submitting a Site Restoration Work Order within 3 calendar days after completion; and
11. Supervisor Senior should conduct a weekly review of all outstanding restoration work orders.
12. Supervisor Senior is responsible for conducting site visits every 10 working days until site is restored; and
13. Supervisor must take all steps necessary to ensure that property owner is inconvenienced the minimum amount possible in cases where weather is delaying restoration.

Myers thanked Martin for his and division's work on the SOP.

In response to a question from Clarke, Martin stated that the SOP would apply to outside contractors performing work for LFUCG as well as LFUCG staff.

In response to a question from Farmer, Martin stated that the benchmark was high because citizens should come to expect quality work in a timely manner.

In response to a question from Stinnett, Martin thought that the SOP may be transferrable to other construction/maintenance activities undertaken by LFUCG.

Donald Schoffner, Kim Schroeder and Louis Proctor discussed issues with construction projects in their neighborhoods.

On a motion by Myers, second by Clarke the draft SOP was approved unanimously. Myers requested that the SOP be reviewed after 6 months.

4. Zero Waste Vision for Lexington

Feese discussed the Leadership Lexington Zero Waste presentation and how Waste Management was responding to each recommendation. He discussed community education and marketing of services; expanding organics collection and processing; expanding the Materials Recovery Facility; creating a Construction, Demolition & Debris recycling facility; expanding partnerships for hard to recycle items including electronics; establish a uniform baseline waste collection, recycling and organics services throughout the County; revising the rate structure; and encouraging policy changes to align with the Zero Waste Lexington program. He stated that the Division of Waste Management would start work on a strategic plan which would give direction to future decisions.

West discussed the Operations Efficiency Boost (OEB) project. She stated that the project has already resulted in increased revenue because of more accurate commercial billing; and increased efficiencies

by fewer missed customers. She stated that operational costs for fuel, vehicle maintenance and personnel have started to decrease because of the efficiencies. She stated that the routes will be more balanced in the future. West stated that customer satisfaction and employee safety will be improved. She stated that driver participation has increased substantially.

Lane asked about the cost of the software and implementation. In response West will provide those figures as well as prepare a cost benefit analysis.

5. Monthly Financials

Stinnett noted that the monthly financial reports were in the Committee packet.

In response to a question from Gorton, Martin stated that the Water Quality Fund has more long term obligations than the Fund can absorb at this time. O'Mara discussed the planned management audit of the Water Quality Fund.

In response to a question from Gorton, Stone discussed operating expenditures within the Landfill Fund, Stone stated that the expenses include monitoring of the closed landfills and disposal expenses at the privately operated out of County landfill. By the next meeting those expenditures will be further identified in greater detail.

6. Project Report

Martin highlighted several projects including the Capacity Assurance Program; the Bob O Link trunk sewer design; the Century Hills trunk sewer design; the East Lake trunk sewer design; the Town Branch Waste Water Treatment Plant wet weather storage tank design; the Idle Hour stormwater improvements.

In response to a question from Mossotti, Martin stated that most of the Stormwater Quality Incentive Grants were located on private property.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 PM.