



Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee

February 16, 2016
Summary and Motions

Chair Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. Committee Members Stinnett, J. Brown, Kay, Moloney, Gibbs, Evans, F. Brown, Evans were present. Members Mossotti and Hensley were absent. Committee Members Scutchfield, Akers, Bledsoe and Henson were in attendance as non-voting members.

I. Approval of Committee Summary

A motion was made by F. Brown to approve the January 19, 2016 Environmental Quality and Public Works Committee Summary, seconded by Kay. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by F. Brown to change the order to hear item 5 first, seconded by Kay. The motion passed without dissent.

II. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program

Roger Mulvaney provided an update to previous questions from the Committee. In response to the Committee's comments, Traffic Engineering has proposed a secondary ballot petition notice that will be provided to both tenants and property owners. Traffic Engineering does not recommend amending the 65% approval threshold from all owners in a petition area. Finally, Traffic Engineering recommends petitions for future "No Through Truck" sign requests as indicated in the NTMP.

Kay stated he feels the process is weighted in favor of a "no" response, and that he is concerned that tenants do not get a voice in the process.

Bledsoe inquired how the process can be more citizen-friendly in the future and suggested using the website or an app for these applications and requests. Mulvaney stated that Traffic Engineering is in discussions about this for the website. Bledsoe noted they may receive a greater response if they include an option for email responses.

Moloney feels that a 65% positive response is effective, and noted that the City can address traffic calming needs without a petition. Andrea Brown, Department of Law, stated that the current practice respects the property owner's interests.

Gibbs stated he would like to reduce the required "yes" response percentage, and asked if an emergency provision could be added if there is a demonstrable problem on the street.

Mulvaney stated those instances may not fall under the NTMP. Hoskins-Squier stated they

could consider safety concerns separately from the NTMP program. Gibbs stated he would like to see a larger budget request for this program in the coming year.

F. Brown inquired about the 65% rule as it relates to apartment complexes. Mulvaney stated that, historically, there have not been requests for traffic calming devices on streets with predominantly multi-family housing.

Evans stated she would like to identify both property owners and tenants in the survey process.

J. Brown noted that property owners have an interest in property value and tenants have an interest in the safety of the street, and stated he would like to see a mechanism (survey) for including the input of tenants.

Akers stated she feels that petitions initiate the process for Traffic Engineering to begin a traffic study. Akers stated she feels they should not count a lack of response as a “no” vote, and that it is important to listen to all tenants. In response to Akers, Mulvaney stated a petition for “no through trucks” signs is initiated if the initial recommendation from Traffic Engineering does not recommend restriction. Mulvaney informed that “no through trucks” signs are recommended for local streets with excessive commercial truck traffic.

Kay stated he would like to see the issues presented come back to Committee, including the 65% response and rental tenant voting.

Moloney stated his support for the updates, noting neighborhoods still have the option for Council to take up traffic issues as needed.

Mulvaney stated the only change from last month’s document was a clarification about sending notification letters to both tenants and owners.

Stinnett asked Kay to clarify his concerns and Kay noted that his concerns are primarily regarding the input of tenants in the process.

Stinnett inquired of Law if they can legally consider non-responses as a “no”. Brown stated she believes if the notice is sent to a correct address and given a certain amount of time, that should be sufficient. She will research this issue and return to Committee with an answer.

In response to Henson, Mulvaney stated that the surveys note that a non-response will be considered as a “no” vote. Henson stated she feels this needs further clarification.

J. Brown stated he would like to see this item remain in Committee to see ideas on how to include input from tenants in the process.

Moloney stated that, in his experience, Traffic Engineering is very responsive to tenant concerns.

A motion was made by F. Brown to accept the NTMP as presented, seconded by Moloney. The motion failed with a 4 – 4 vote. (Yay: Farmer, Stinnett, Moloney, Brown Nay: J. Brown, Gibbs, Kay, Evans)

A motion was made by Evans that the NTMP discontinue the practice of a non-response equaling a “no” vote, seconded by Kay. The motion failed with a 4 – 4 vote. (Yay: J. Brown, Kay, Gibbs, Evans Nay: Farmer, Stinnett, Moloney, F. Brown)

III. Richmond Road Speed Limit Reduction

Scutchfield introduced the item, and stated that the proposed Resolution requests State consideration of reducing the speed limit on Richmond Road to 45 mph from Man O’War Boulevard to a point east of Hays Boulevard.

J. Brown stated he would like further clarification on the identified roadway segment, noting that it states from “Man O’War Blvd. to a point east of Hays Blvd” and he suggested Old Richmond Road as a point to consider. Scutchfield provided clarification regarding the language.

A motion was made by Gibbs to request that the State reduce the speed limit on Richmond Road from Man O’War Boulevard to a point east of Hays Boulevard, seconded by J. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

IV. Financial Performance of Materials Recycling Facility

Henson introduced the item and provided a brief history. Tracey Thurman, Director of Waste Management, provided additional background information, and Commissioner Bill O’Mara provided an overview of the findings as well as a cost analysis of existing operations. Several potential action points were presented for the Committee’s consideration, including: raising fees to affiliates; reviewing the commodity mix; and investing additional capital in the facility.

Moloney inquired about the cost for personnel. Thurman stated that 42 temp laborers are under contract through an agency; in addition, the LFUCG employs an onsite manager.

Stinnett inquired what percentage of the operating costs is day labor. Thurman stated that the annual budget for day labor is less than \$1M. Stinnett inquired if the laborers are dedicated to the facility only, and Thurman stated that they are.

In response to a question from Moloney, Thurman stated that there are 7 employees in total.

Henson noted there would be monetary and environmental costs to send items to the landfill.

F. Brown asked for additional information regarding affiliates, and O'Mara stated that Republic Services, Rumpke, the City of Frankfort, Franklin County and Winchester Municipal are currently affiliates.

Stinnett inquired about the previous RFP and the cost of a private company managing the MRF's operations and O'Mara noted the RFP was for a private company managing the hourly labor, location, machinery and management, and not the entirety of operations. Todd Slatin, Director of Purchasing, stated that the RFP was limited in scope to the manufacturing line and that it was a very costly option. Stinnett inquired if the \$1M would add more capacity for recycling and if they are at capacity. Thurman stated that it would not increase capacity and that they have not yet reached capacity. She further stated that the threshold for additional capital investment has not been determined, noting that the focus has been on identifying efficiencies.

Moloney thanked staff for their work and stated he feels there is room for growth. Moloney inquired what the effect would be if they stop receiving materials from other affiliates. O'Mara stated they are reviewing increasing the cost to affiliates.

Evans inquired about glass recycling, and O'Mara stated that what used to be a revenue stream is now a cost stream, but recycling glass is still less than the cost to throw it away.

Stinnett noted that, if glass is not accepted from Lexington's affiliates, it would be a loss of a revenue stream.

Farmer stated his desire to keep the item in Committee for further discussion.

V. Keep Lexington Beautiful Annual Report

Jim Pendergest provided information on Keep Lexington Beautiful ("KLB") to the committee. He stated that LFUCG Ordinance 22-2010 set the following priorities for KLB: litter prevention; beautification; waste reduction; and community involvement. The 2015 program priorities included the community appearance index, the Cigarette Litter Prevention Program, improvements to the community for the Breeders' Cup, the Great American Cleanup, and other related efforts.

Farmer stated the Green Up for Breeders Cup was one of the best cross-promotional ventures the City undertook and he hopes there will be more partnerships in the future.

Gibbs stated his support for the program and inquired if the program uses only volunteer workers, which Pendergest confirmed.

In response to a question from Akers, Pendergest identified the section of the Legacy Trail that will be worked on. Akers thanked KLB and Environmental Services.

VI. Referral Items – Potential Budget Items

Farmer asked Committee Members to identify any referral items that may have FY17 budgetary impacts and provide that information by email to him or committee staff.

VII. Items Referred to Committee

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.

D.S. 2.17.2016

RESOLUTION NO. _____-2016

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING AND ENCOURAGING THE KENTUCKY TRANSPORTATION CABINET (KYTC) TO DESIGNATE THE SPEED LIMIT ON THE STATE ROUTE SYSTEM ALONG THE RICHMOND ROAD CORRIDOR, FROM MAN O' WAR BOULEVARD TO A POINT EAST OF HAYS BOULEVARD, AS 45 MILES PER HOUR.

WHEREAS, high volumes of traffic during peak travel times coupled with the character of the state route system along the Richmond Road Corridor, from Man O'War Boulevard to a point east of Hays Boulevard, present a danger to motorists on this roadway; and

WHEREAS, the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) has demonstrated a willingness to coordinate with local governments to ensure safer roads and to improve traffic flow across the Commonwealth; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Code of Ordinances Section 18-66, the state traffic laws regulating the speed of vehicles shall be applicable upon all streets within the urban county, except as the council, as authorized by state law, declares and determines otherwise.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE LEXINGTON-FAYETTE URBAN COUNTY GOVERNMENT:

Section 1 – That the Council of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government hereby requests and encourages the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) to designate the speed limit on the state route system along the Richmond Road Corridor, from Man O'War Boulevard to a point east of Hays Boulevard, as 45 miles per hour.

Section 2 – That the Clerk of the Urban County Council is hereby authorized and directed to send a copy of this Resolution to the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC).

Section 3 - That this Resolution shall become effective on the date of its passage.

PASSED URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL:

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CLERK OF URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL