



Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee

October 22, 2019

Summary and Motions

Chair Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Committee Members Steve Kay, Richard Moloney, Josh McCurn, Jake Gibbs, Angela Evans, Preston Worley, F. Brown, Jennifer Mossotti, and Amanda Bledsoe were present. Council Members Jennifer Reynolds and Kathy Plomin were also in attendance as non-voting members.

I. Approval of September 17, 2019 Committee Summary

A motion was made by Kay to approve the September 17, 2019 Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee Summary, seconded by Evans. The motion passed without dissent.

II. KU/LED Streetlight Collaborative

Andrea Schroeder, Manager of Civic Affairs with Kentucky Utilities (KU), reviewed the LED Collaborative. She provided a history of the partnership between KU and Lexington for LED Streetlights. She outlined the stipulations and recommendations of the 2016 rate review and the participants in the collaborative. She provided an update on the progress towards LED lights in Lexington.

F. Brown asked about projects such as City Center and if KU has conversations regarding those larger projects coming in. Schroeder explained that there are certain offerings in place, but she said KU does work with new construction and there are conversations with those companies. F. Brown asked about the energy savings between LED and electrical lights and Schroeder explained there is an energy savings on comparable fixtures and a longer life expectancy for LED bulbs.

Mossotti asked if there is specific legislation that requires us to do LED lighting. David Freibert, Vice President of External Affairs, responded that he does not think there is anything on the books right now that would require LED lighting.

Farmer asked if they are still replacing bulbs in the same fixture and Schroeder said not for the mercury vapor and incandescent lights. Farmer commented on the option to replace functioning non-LED lights at customer's request and he asked what kind of customers this is referring to. Schroeder said it would be any customer who can have lighting and our lighting offerings are available to any customer.

Evans commented on street light replacement and asked when a streetlight has burnt out and someone calls for the replacement if it is being replaced with an LED light. Schroeder said if the bulb fails, the bulb is replaced with the existing bulb, but if the fixture itself fails then the fixture is replaced with an LED fixture. Evans asked if there is a reason why we are not replacing bulbs. Schroeder said lights are a working asset with a life expectancy. She said if it is expected to last 15 years and it is taken out of service before it has reached its useful life, you have taken it out of service before you have recovered its costs.

Bledsoe commented on a community project that took place in her district. Robby Trimble, Director of Distribution Operations for KU, spoke about the porch light program. He said last year, they went through the Community Action Center and worked with the Sheriff's Office to buy \$5,000 worth of LED bulbs and went around the city replacing porch light bulbs with LED bulbs. He said a typical incandescent

porch light would be a couple of cents a night to burn, but the LED is about 1/10 of a cent a night to burn; he said it was a security issue for the Sheriff. Bledsoe explained that a number of people in her district talk about how to improve security in neighborhoods where there was not enough lighting and this was an easy way to do this for people who may not do it themselves.

Farmer commented on the the progress update regarding working together to identify opportunities to expedite conversion to LED streetlights and asked how that works. Shroeder said a lot of it is Lexington identifies focused areas, and it is an initiative to decide where to focus and where to do the work. Farmer asked if we are expressing those priorities in terms of arterials or main roads. Shroeder said it is preliminary conversations at this point and we haven't gotten to the details yet.

Evans asked how we foster that conversation on when and where we make this change. Shroeder said there is an economic component to the discussion and looking at different prices because many different things play a factor. Evans asked how long the discussion will be before information is brought to Council to make a decision. Warren said he believes employees such as James Bush are working on a plan for the city for the best way to go about it. Shroeder said teams are working on this to bring forth recommendations. She said KU wants to be part of the of the conversation but as we decide what needs to be converted and in what timeline, we are partnering with you.

Kay commented on the cost-benefit for conversion and the timing and asked James Bush with Environmental Services to provide an explanation. Bush explained that this is complex and said across all light types there are 30 or 40 types on the books, each one has a different cost and there is a new cost with the LED equivalent. He said when a customer requests a retrofit, there is a fee for the remaining value of that asset that KU is losing so there is a five year fee applied to that conversion. He added that he does not have a timeline for LFUCG but they are working on a pilot scale conversion project. He talked about the broad picture in looking at 32,000 lights across Lexington and what that is relative to our overall budget impacts. Kay asked if changes will be recommended in the near future. Bush said he thinks we can reach an agreement in the next quarter on our pilot areas. Kay asked what the extent of a pilot area would be and Bush said that is yet to be determined, but we can negotiate some pilot areas. Jeff Neal with Traffic Engineering said we are installing new LED lights and with any new light going in, it is going to be LED.

No further comment or action was taken on this item.

III. Pavement Management Plan

Nancy Albright, Commissioner of Environmental Quality & Public Works provided an update on the 2019 Pavement Management Plan. She reviewed resolutions adopted in 2016 which address funding and acceptance of the pavement management plan. She reviewed the chart describing the budget versus expenditures over the last few years and how those have evened out. She reviewed the fiscal year 2020 Local Road Budget allocation and explained the allocations for the local road lane miles with Overall Condition Index (OCI) less than 60. Lastly, she reviewed the additional items for consideration including work on major routes such as Man O war and Tates Creek Road that will take a majority of the budget in a given year.

Farmer commented on the allocations for 2017-18 and 2019-20 asked if they are proposing any changes at this time and Albright said not yet, but it is something we will revisit and bring back over the winter

that we will want to identify based on the needs of the community. Farmer if asked they were planning to add a 4th category and Albright said it is being considered, but we want to discuss this further. Bledsoe commented on road paving and expressed concern with having \$508,000 to fix a \$10.6 million problem. She said we should add commercial roads to this list and find a way to do those differently. She said it is hard to justify those roads when there are a number of neighborhoods and side roads who need this kind of paving.

F. Brown said there was a consultant this past year who came up with new numbers and that is what this new information is based on and Albright confirmed. F Brown said we are falling way behind on our paving issue and we need to take a serious look at our funding for this. He referred to page 7 and asked if the funds (in blue) were what the Council budgeted for. Albright said it includes what Council approved for the budget as well as POs that rolled over. F. Brown said he would like to see the budget and expenditures related to actual. He also asked about the allocations based on the new rating plan and what we can do on the local level. He talked about an annual commitment of \$1 million per year that we are not upholding and this is a problem.

Kay asked if we are falling behind or if we are making progress at all. Rob Allen, Director of Streets and Roads, talked about preservation practices and highlighted the shift in 2014 to utilize a scientific method using a laser to evaluate the roads. He said he realizes there are budget constraints and we can't pave every road in Fayette Co. so we have to prioritize. Allen said it is important to understand the classification of the road and with more traffic, the life cycle of the road may be shorter. Kay asked when this was first done using the scientific method and Allen said 2014 and reassessed in 2018. Kay asked if we compared these two numbers would we be making progress or falling behind. Albright said the backlog is higher now and part of that is the cost of asphalt and higher labor costs. Kay asked if the number in 2014 would be lower than it is now and Albright said it was presented differently so it would be hard to compare. Kay questioned if the longer we delay the repairs, the more it will cost in the long run. He said we need a significant amount of money for the repairs and we don't have it.

Worley asked about the degradation model, particularly if it is done only every three years and the need for a formula to calculate the degradation. Allen said there is a degradation formula but it does not account for weather. Worley talked about the more we refine our science for the way we are doing this the better informed the decisions that are being made. He spoke about strategically stretching dollars and suggested the division work with council offices.

Bledsoe commented on ATS being the only paving provider we have used and asked for an explanation about ATS serving the state as well as the city. Albright explained ATS is the only asphalt provider in the region and they do work for the transportation cabinet, city work, as well as private developments. Allen said with them being the only provider in the state, they can decide whether they work for the state or the city.

Plomin asked what the relationship is with the fiscal court and the 12th District's funding allocation for paving. Allen explained that the rural county roads are funded by state MAP funds and that constitutionally runs through the county judge executive. He said we give the County Judge Executive a recommendation based on the county roads that were surveyed. He said they set a resolution and in effect, the County Judge Executive turns the money over to LFUCG. He said they have made a lot of progress on county roads that are not in the Urban Service Area He said the county roads are also eligible for the pavement preservation which tends to go fast in the counties. Plomin asked if there was

impact on the paving allowance in the 12th District because of the work being done on county roads and Allen confirmed that the rural roads are separately funded.

Mossotti asked what fund was used to pay for the salaries that did not come out of the MAP funds. Albright said typically General Fund. Mossotti asked about ATS being the only provider in Lexington and whether that has been the case for a long time. Albright said in Fayette County, they have been the only ones for a while. Mossotti asked about backlog and the challenges to catch up. Albright said she describes the solution as a long slow climb. Mossotti expressed concern with our ability to catch up.

F. Brown said when we did the pavement management plan in 2015-16, we took into consideration our needs and the capacity of ATS. He said we implemented a resolution in 2016 stating that we need \$15 million to maintain and move forward. He said the problem is that we are not funding a plan that we endorsed and if we don't start funding this at \$15 million we are going to be behind for years. He said we should stand behind our commitment and our resolution and make this a priority in the budget going forward.

Kay referenced the special committee that the Mayor appointed to look at revenue, budgeting and projections for the city. They are supposed to come back with recommendations that will help us understand better how we take money in and how we spend it. He said with paving, we are falling behind and in the long term it costs more than if we were catching up. He said it is not just about \$3 million for paving; it is about the whole way in which we think about the budget and whether we are willing to go to the community and say this is what you want us to do. He said we need adequate funds to be able to do this.

Moloney agreed that we should wait for the Mayor's recommendations from the special committee. He commented that bond projects should be for things that will be around for hundreds of years. He also suggested reaching out to ATS to discuss their staffing capacity. Albright said that the biggest asset we can provide to our contracting partners is consistency year to year so they know what to expect.

Farmer commented on the bar graph in the packet and said we have repeatedly talked about our budget being \$8 million. And he asked why the blue bar in 2020 goes up to almost \$15 million. Albright said that is the rolled POs that did not get applied until after July 1 so that is a reflection of funds that were not set up to be spent before FY20. She said the additional funding of about \$7 million was a collection of three years' worth of funds that had not been identified as needed by council district or functional classification that had not been encumbered and spent yet.

No further comment or action was taken on this item.

IV. Radar Speed Feedback Signs

Roger Mulvaney with Traffic Engineering, presented an update to information previously presented to committee a couple of years ago. He explained that radar speed feedback signs are less dramatic/high impact approaches compared to speed bumps. He highlighted locations of speed feedback signs in Lexington and that there are a total of about 30 signs in Lexington. He showed a comparison of speed before and after the signs were installed. He said 11 of the 18 signs they tracked before and after data showed improved speeds. He explained that with any traffic calming device, it will lose effectiveness without consistent enforcement.

F. Brown commented on the placement of these speed feedback signs and said his objective was that these could be placed on collector streets, but not in neighborhoods or on short streets. He said this type of sign works great in 35 mph zones, but information delivered today regarding the mileage that is showing on these signs isn't showing the effect. He said typically, it is after they see the flashing lights and their speed on the sign that they slow down. He said these do make a difference and he hears a lot of positive comments.

Bledsoe said three of these are in her district, 2 of which are on neighborhood streets and the other on an arterial. She said the reason they are in 25 mph zones is if they are near a school or in a high-density area, but they are a collector road and they want traffic calming so there isn't much we can do outside of putting up a notification that reminds people to slow down. She said \$3,500 is a lot of money for this sign, but it is a small investment considering the benefit. She commented on options and asked if this is not the best option, do we have other options that are not on collectors or arterials that would be effective as an alternative to this one. Mulvaney explained curb extensions to narrow the roads typically don't raise an alarm with Public Safety but it narrows the road so the driver has the visual effect of narrow road so they might take their foot off the gas. Bledsoe asked, relative to cost, what that difference is. Mulvaney said they recently did price estimates for moderate-sized ones and they were about \$5,000. He said these are significantly more expensive than the feedback signs. Bledsoe commented on the data and asked if there is or could be a mechanism to trigger an alert to law enforcement for more enforcement in that area. Mulvaney said this could be done, but at a cost. He said they do not have the immediate communication from the sign to elsewhere. He said if there is a specific street, they have the ability to go out, but not quite as instant. Bledsoe said by pulling the data, we can justify the need for more enforcement or increased traffic calming mechanisms in addition to what is already in place.

Gibbs asked if there is systematic communication with Public Safety regarding consistent enforcement. Mulvaney said they are in constant contact so anytime there is a request or need we can highlight an area if necessary. Gibbs commented on the ban on these impediments on collector roads and asked if that is a universal law. Mulvaney said not having speed tables on collector roads goes back to how the Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan (NTMP) is set up and said there is no way through the NTMP to set up these traffic calming devices on a collector or arterial route. He said division of fire is also opposed to vertical traffic calming devices so this is something to address with them if we look at arterials, but it is outside NTMP.

Evans commented on the data which she said reflects that people are still speeding. She said there was only one that had a significant reduction. She asked if this is consistent with national results. She said this is supposed to calm traffic and it has but speeds are still above the posted limit. She asked if there is a different message we should be sending to address this aside from implementing devices. She said people are still going above the speed limit and they are not going to stop speeding and she asked if there is a different alternative. Mulvaney said, with most traffic calming devices if you get a reduction in 85th percentile speeds from 1-5 mph it is considered a success. He said when you have a positive result, it is showing that it is more than just a couple of cars slowing down. He said to get true traffic calming requires strict enforcement with more officers on the streets. He said another way to calm traffic is to physically change the road with vertical devices, speed tables or narrowing the road, but these tend to be more costly.

Reynolds commented that one of the biggest complaints she hears is from speeding in residential areas. She said police officers have suggested signs like these to minimize speeding. She asked if there is a possibility of placing these in those neighborhoods. Mulvaney said generally they like to put them on collectors and arterials and he would be happy to discuss these types of roads in the district and where these might be more appropriate to use. He commented on Bledsoe's remarks and said on a local road, we steer people toward speed tables and going through the NTMP process, but these might be more appropriate on a collector road.

Moloney asked if something is in place to track every vehicle that passes through. Mulvaney said as the sign collects data it will measure the speed and the number of cars passing by. Moloney asked how often the division has the ability to check the signs and compare data. Mulvaney explained they download the data and send out an engineer with a laptop to communicate to the sign and collect the data. He added that this can be labor intensive to do continuously, but every quarter or annually is feasible. Moloney said constituents are counting on us and when drivers start seeing officers show up, it will slow people down.

Chair Farmer commented on the messaging on the signage and if that could be modified. Mulvaney said we can but he would have to look into what it could be changed to.

No further comment or action was taken on this item.

V. 2019 Snow Removal Plan

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed to the next Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee meeting on November 19, 2019

VI. Items Referred to Committee

No comment or action was taken on this item.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

KT 11.12.2019