



Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee

June 21, 2016

Partial Summary and Motions

Chair Farmer called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m. Committee Members Stinnett, Kay, Moloney, J. Brown, Gibbs, Evans, F. Brown, Mossotti, and Hensley were present. Council Members Scutchfield, Bledsoe, and Lamb attended as non-voting members.

II. Pavement Management Plan

Farmer introduced the item and stated that a memo was included in the packet with a potential expedited report out schedule for this item.

F. Brown stated that the subcommittee working on the Pavement Management Plan began meeting in January, and that the Plan assumes a budget of \$12.8 million consistent with the proposed FY17 budget. He introduced Commissioner Hoskins Squier to present the Plan components to the Committee.

Squier provided a summary of FY16 paving activities, reviewed the Subcommittee's planning process, presented the Plan elements, and provided a budget comparison of benchmark cities. She stated that 116.3 lane miles were resurfaced in FY16, and there is a \$1.8 million balance which will be redistributed to Council districts for expenditure.

Squier stated that the Subcommittee has met seven times since January 2016, and she reviewed the resulting Plan components and objectives. A five-year CIP has been developed for major/minor arterials and collectors, and pavement condition data will be collected every three years for Plan updates. Fiscal Year budget allocations as a percentage of the total paving budget were proposed as follows: 33% toward major/minor arterials; 25% for collectors; and 42% of the total allocation toward local streets. Squier explained that Average Annual Daily Traffic ("AADT") was used to allocate budget percentages, which ensures that priority is placed on improvements to roadways carrying higher traffic volumes.

Squier presented the proposed budget by Council district, and recommended that 25% of the budget be used for pavement maintenance projects. The remaining 75% of the budget would be used to move forward with repaving projects on roadways with the lowest Overall Condition Index ("OCI").

Committee member questions and discussion is summarized as follows:

- Moloney asked for clarification regarding benchmark cities;
- Stinnett asked how maintenance would be addressed under the Plan, and Squier responded that more money (25%) would be allocated toward maintenance than in the

past. Stinnett asked if thin overlay has been used in Fayette County, and Squier stated that this has been used on Short Street;

- Stinnett asked for clarification regarding the budget for ADA compliance;
- F. Brown explained that a threshold OCI of 60 was used for maintenance v. repaving, and clarified that the 75%/25% paving/maintenance budgets apply to collectors and arterials, but local streets are not addressed in this way in the Plan;
- Stinnett expressed concern that Council districts that continue to have roadways in poor condition will receive higher funding amounts each year;
- Kay stated that analysis and logic should drive the process, and was concerned that the budget allocations by roadway classification are inflexible;
- Lamb asked for a comparison of the current FY paving budget v. the proposed FY17 budget presented in the Plan, and asked for clarification regarding the OCI, which will be updated every three years;
- Scutchfield stated concern that there is not parity in proposed funding levels between Council districts. Squier responded that funding was allocated based on District lane miles and related data;
- In response to a question from J. Brown, Squier stated that the LFUCG does not own the equipment to determine roadway OCI, and discussed potentially collecting partial data (e.g. certain districts) on a more frequent basis;
- J. Brown asked for clarification regarding OCI thresholds and the consultant's recommendations;
- Evans spoke in favor of the Plan as presented, and asked for information regarding how other cities allocate funding for roadway maintenance;
- Bledsoe noted the efficiency and appropriate timing of maintaining local roads adjacent to arterial and collector improvements, and stated the importance of committing funding for the Plan horizon;
- Gibbs asked for clarification regarding the 75%/25% allocation and confirmed that the 25% is intended for preventative maintenance. Squier stated that staff would work with Council Members to identify projects appropriate for preventative maintenance (identified by benefit/cost ratio) and repair (identified by OCI);
- In response to a question from Farmer, F. Brown confirmed that the Plan recommendations are supported unanimously by the Council Members that served on the Subcommittee;
- Hensley stated that Plan implementation is dependent on time, weather, and funding. He confirmed that the Subcommittee was unanimous in moving forward with the proposed Plan;
- Mossotti stated that the Subcommittee emphasized creating a Plan that is realistic and equitable for all Council Districts;
- In response to a question from Farmer, Squier stated that the Plan will be reviewed annually to accommodate changing budgets. Farmer stated that coordination with the State is required to move State road improvements forward;
- Moloney asked for information regarding the budget for ADA improvements, and Squier stated that she would provide that information to Council.

- Stinnett asked if the total capacity for road resurfacing was considered during the planning process. Squier responded that the consultant would increase capacity if necessary;
- Stinnett asked how unallocated funds would be used at the end of the Fiscal Year. Squier responded that FY16 unallocated funds go back to the Council Districts; FY17 unallocated funds would be reallocated within the major/minor arterial, collector, and local categories; and rollover funds from previous (FY15 and earlier) budgets will need to be reallocated using the prioritized project list;
- In response to a question from Stinnett, Squier stated that contingency is built into unit pricing in the Plan to address emergency repairs;
- Lamb asked for a timeline for implementation of the Plan. Squier stated that major/minor arterial and collector projects will begin after the start of the Fiscal Year, with adjacent local roads being addressed during these projects (as feasible), and the majority of local road paving being completed in the spring. Lamb asked for clarification regarding projects repairing base failures;
- Farmer asked if the Committee would like to approve annually the Administration's proposed list of arterial and collector paving. F. Brown responded that the approval structure for paving projects is included in the Plan;
- Stinnett asked for an annual summary of maintenance and paving by Council District; and
- Lamb noted that the study will not address recent base failures until the roads are reevaluated in three years.

A motion was made by F. Brown to move the proposed Pavement Management Plan forward for the Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee's consideration, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Stinnett to approve the Pavement Management Plan as presented and forward it to the Council for consideration, seconded by Kay. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Moloney to amend the motion to provide for allocation of the 25% maintenance budget by the Administration rather than by District Council Members, seconded by Stinnett. The motion failed 9-1 (Yay: Moloney).

A motion was made by F. Brown to direct the Administration to utilize a \$15 million budget in the Pavement Management Plan annually, beginning in FY 2017-2018, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by F. Brown for the Committee Chair to report this item out to the Council during the June 28, 2016 Work Session meeting, seconded by Evans. The motion passed without dissent.

C.B. 6/22/2016