



URBAN COUNTY COUNCIL

Planning & Public Works Committee Summary/Table of Motions March 13, 2012 1:00 p.m.

Committee Chair, CM Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m. Committee members Vice Mayor Gorton, CMs Ellinger, Lawless, Kay, Blues, Martin, Henson and Ford were all present. CM Beard was absent.

1. Re-Paving Program—Martin (1-11)

Kevin Wentz gave a general update regarding repaving across districts. He stated that due to a mild winter, Streets & Roads (S&R) has been able to accomplish most of the paving requests that have been submitted by each Council district. Paving assessments should soon begin for the western half of the county. The City's resurfacing contract has been reviewed and revised to account for certain cost saving measures. The Department of Environmental Quality and Public Works (EQ&PW) will present these revisions to the City's administration for review and approval before going to bid in April.

Sam Williams gave the committee an update on paving thus far across the county. He stated that 10 of the 12 districts have been completed, for a total of approximately 23 miles. He stated that costs broke down to approximately \$175,000 per mile or \$33.63 per foot.

CM Martin asked for the status of paving specification revisions. Williams responded that S&R is in the process of meeting with consultants now. Plans are in the works to price asphalt volume according to needs. Martin requested that Williams along with Administration create policy that dictates the standards for fixing base failures, crack-and-seal work and other applications related to resurfacing. Williams stated that a written policy plan would probably not be "documented as such" due to unique submissions per each Council district.

Martin again requested that a list of standards and criteria be developed and submitted to the committee. COA Richard Maloney responded that if Martin would submit a list of questions regarding the paving process, Administration would answer them.

CM Stinnett stated that when the paving contracts are created, they should reflect location demand. He also stated that LFUCG has accepted and/or adopted inferior roads in the past. CM Stinnett asked at what point LFUCG “takes on” inferior roads. Williams responded that the specifications for doing so were “probably not as stringent as needed” and that the decision is left to the Commissioner of Environmental Quality and Public Works.

CM Lawless told the committee that funds allocated per district should equal the usage of roadways in each. She stated that the 3rd District is the “center of the city” and should therefore receive more infrastructure support. She also made mention that the roads in the 3rd District that are rated 75-100 are actually in far more disrepair than the assessment ratings show.

CM Ford agreed with CM Lawless and stated that distribution of resurfacing funds should be equal across the 13 districts. Wentz responded that percentage allocation allows for better fund distribution. CM Stinnett explained that the allocation system was changed several years ago to allow for higher fund distribution to districts that had the poorest roads so that they could “catch up” with the rest of the county. Wentz added that it is the intention of EQ&PW to see allocations even out.

CM Lawless asked that failures “mid-city” be addressed down to the base level. CM Ford stated that focus should be placed on roads that have a rating of 65 or lower. He added that allocation should be determined by the percentage of roads under the rating of 65, per district.

VM Gorton asked Wentz if roads rated 65 or lower and that had been on repaving lists for long periods of time were looked at before others as they deteriorated from assessment to assessment. Wentz replied that generally streets are expected to have a 10-15 year lifespan and that it is left up to each Council district to determine which roads are paved first.

2. Addressing Ordinance—Lawless (12-19)

Director of Enhanced 9-11 (E-911) Clay Mason spoke to the division’s position of address change contention stating that sequencing has a “verifiable importance in the community.” Mason said that out of 168,000 addresses within Lexington-Fayette County, only 163 are fractional. He stated that emergency response delays are difficult to prove, response time is based on problem-solving and that if the committee is to accept the exception to the address changes in question, the committee should be prepared to accept the slight chance that delay can occur as well.

CM Farmer asked Mason if E-911 currently used the best system for the process. Mason responded that the system is “moderate” and to recreate it would prove to be an issue.

CM Blues expressed concerns that other neighborhoods that have previously complied with address changes could request that their addresses be changed back based on the assumption that their neighborhoods are “special” too. CM Blues asked Mason if he thought accepting changes to the ordinance would set a precedent for such retroactive changes. Mason responded that it is E-911’s position that it is “ultimately the committee’s call.”

CM Lawless asked Assistant Chief Robert Stack whether police officers had Global Navigation Systems (GPS) in their cars to assist in navigating to emergency scenes. Stack responded that it is up to individual officers to purchase that equipment. CM Lawless asked Stack if it made a difference in response time if an officer had a GPS. Stack said that delays have been insignificant and that staff is trained to know that these discrepancies exist.

Battalion Chief Harold Hoskins added that delays stem from random numbering, but added that he could not cite specific cases where this had been an issue.

There was further discussion about the appeals process for address changes and equity among neighborhoods deemed “historically or culturally significant.” CM Kay said that exceptions have been made at both Council and committee levels. He stated that having language in the ordinance that requires that safety is not an issue strengthens the ordinance. CM Kay further stated that as a government, exceptions to rules should be able to be examined by either Council or the committee during the appeals process. VM Gorton stated that inconsistency and the proper display of house numbers need to be addressed.

A Motion by CM Farmer to Approve accepting the changes as outlined on page 12 of the committee packet. Seconded by CM Lawless. Motion passed 5-4.

Aye: CMs Ford, Lawless, Kay, Ellinger and Farmer
Nay: CMs Henson, Martin, Blues and VM Gorton

3. Valley View Ferry—Environmental Quality Link (20-23)

CAO Maloney provided a brief update about the status of LFUCG’s relationship with the Valley View Ferry Commission (see attached). Maloney said Administration will continue to support the Valley View Ferry in FY13.

4. Items Referred to Committee (24)

CM Ford requested that the committee look into a Zone Ordinance Text Amendment for the creation of a definition for adult day care centers.

Motion by VM Gorton to remove Department of Planning Commissioner Position: Seconded by CM Ellinger. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion by CM Ellinger to remove Addressing Ordinance: Seconded by VM Gorton. Motion passed without dissent.

Motion to Adjourn by CM Blues: Seconded by CM Kay. Motion passed without dissent. Meeting adjourned at 2:52 p.m.

Valley View Ferry

FY 2012 Budget

- \$14,000 via contract for cash
- \$29,420 in vehicle repairs/maintenance for work performed by General Services

Valley View Ferry

FY 2012 Ridership Information

	Vehicles	Passengers
Daily Average	307	497
Monthly Average	8,710	14,076

Figures from July 2011 through December 2011

Ferry was closed 13 days during time period

Valley View Ferry

Future Support

- **Grant awarded for \$600,000 for new boat**
 - **Should lower maintenance costs**
- **Administration will continue to support**