



Environmental Quality & Public Works Committee

April 19, 2016

Summary and Motions

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

I. Approval of Committee Summary

A motion was made by Stinnett to approve the February 16, 2016 Environmental Quality and Public Works Committee Summary, seconded by Kay. The motion passed without dissent.

II. Neighborhood Traffic Management Program

Roger Mulvaney provided an update to previous questions from the Committee, and provided a summary of proposed process amendments. These amendments include: requiring residents or owners to sign initial petitions; changing the approval threshold for property owner petitions to 51 percent; and including an "at a glance" guide to provide a program summary.

In response to a question from Mossotti, Mulvaney reviewed the approval process and confirmed approval thresholds.

Kay asked for clarification regarding the changes proposed to the initial petition requirements, as well as property owner approval. Mulvaney responded that language would be further clarified. Andrea Brown with the Department of Law referred to the memorandum in the committee packet, and stated that Law advises against counting nonresponses as positive votes, as the outcome may result in assessed costs to property owners.

Evans stated that she is in favor of the proposed amendments, and asked for further clarification regarding nonresponses from owners. Andrea Brown stated that the process has historically required an affirmative vote from owners.

A motion was made by Evans to approve the proposed revisions and Resolution as presented, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

III. Financial Performance of Materials Recycling Facility

Tracey Thurman, Director of Waste Management, reviewed proposed action items related to the operation of the Materials Recycling Facility (“MRF”), which include: increasing affiliate processing fees from \$35 per ton to \$50 per ton, increasing annual revenue by an estimated \$220,000; making no changes to the existing policy regarding accepting glass for recycling, but conducting a pilot program for additional plastic recycling; working with the Division of Purchasing as the “marketing manager” to develop a pilot program for commodity sales; and reviewing proposed capital improvements to the facility.

In response to a question from Farmer, Thurman confirmed that affiliates did not object to the proposed increase in affiliate processing fees.

Mossotti asked for clarification regarding processing fees for glass, and Thurman stated that the processing fees cover the cost of processing. Barry Prater, Manager of the Materials Recycling Facility, provided additional information regarding the costs and challenges associated with recycling glass.

Gibbs spoke in favor of increasing affiliate fees, and asked for clarification regarding the pilot program for additional plastic recycling. Prater responded that a number of plastic items that the MRF receives are not typically accepted for recycling; the pilot program will expand the types of plastics that are accepted.

Henson asked if removal of glass recycling would improve the financial position of the MRF, and asked how the recycled glass is reused. Thurman stated that significant public education would be required to remove glass from the recycling stream, and Prater stated that glass items would continue to be received if the program was discontinued, but would require disposal rather than recycling. He provided information regarding uses of recycled glass.

A motion was made by Gibbs to approve increasing affiliate processing fees from \$35 per ton to \$50 per ton as presented, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

IV. Stormwater Improvement Plan – Project Efficiencies

Charles Martin, Director of the Division of Water Quality, reviewed the history of the stormwater priority list, and stated that the 2015 updated list includes over \$117 million in active, pending, or deferred projects. Martin explained that continuing to follow the project list in numeric order may create challenges in meeting the January 3, 2021 Consent Decree spending deadline. He recommended merging projects with defined common drainage points into a single project for efficiency, which essentially groups the project list according to watershed.

Kay stated his support for the proposal, and asked how the proposal will affect projects currently on the list. Martin stated that the commitment remains to address all projects that will mitigate stormwater issues.

There was discussion regarding water quality project priorities, and if the capacity exists to complete the Town Branch project concurrent with Consent Decree projects. In response to a question from Stinnett, Commissioner O'Mara explained the use of the Water Quality Fee and debt service for stormwater improvement projects. Stinnett stated that the priority should remain on completion of Consent Decree projects.

Evans stated the importance of addressing stormwater issues that affect residents but may not be mitigated by Consent Decree projects, and stated concern that the proposed process amendments may result in significant redirection of project priorities.

Bledsoe spoke in favor of the proposal, and stated that these changes will result in improved efficiencies.

Farmer stated concern that some of the identified neighborhood stormwater projects may need to be reevaluated to ensure that they are still providing the best solutions. Martin agreed, and provided examples of projects requiring reevaluation.

Kay asked if the Town Branch project removes resources necessary to move forward with other stormwater projects in the community. Martin stated that Water Quality is not managing that project, so capacity to complete other projects is unaffected.

There was additional discussion regarding the Water Quality fee and other funding mechanisms.

A motion was made by Kay to extend the time allocation for the presentation by five minutes, seconded by Mossotti. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Hensley to accept the recommendation to group Consent Decree projects by watershed to minimize risks and maximize the overall impact to a common watershed area, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed 8-1 (aye: Farmer, Stinnett, J. Brown, Kay, Gibbs, F. Brown, Mossotti, Hensley; nay: Evans).

V. Division of Water Quality Projects Report

Martin reviewed the Water Quality projects report.

Stinnett requested that a list of projects supported by the Water Quality fee be provided during the next meeting.

VI. Items Referred to Committee

A motion was made by F. Brown to remove the Neighborhood Traffic Management Plan item from the list of committee referrals, seconded by Kay. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Stinnett to remove the Downtown Speed Limits item from the list of committee referrals, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Stinnett to remove the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer item from the list of committee referrals, seconded by Kay. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Kay to remove the Presentation Regarding the Financial Performance of the Materials Recycling Facility item from the list of committee referrals, seconded by Stinnett. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Stinnett to remove the Reduction of Speed Limit on Richmond Road item from the list of committee referrals, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Stinnett to remove the Stormwater Improvement Plan and Project Efficiencies item from the list of committee referrals, seconded by F. Brown. The motion passed without dissent.

A motion was made by Mossotti to remove Comprehensive Trails Plan from the list of committee referrals, seconded by Gibbs. The motion passed without dissent.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

C.B. 5/4/2016

RESOLUTION NO. _____-2016

A RESOLUTION APPROVING AND ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (NTMP) TO INCLUDE TENANTS IN THE PETITION PROCESS FOR TYPE 2 TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES, LOWER THE PERCENTAGE OF PROPERTY OWNERS REQUIRED TO PARTNER WITH THE URBAN COUNTY GOVERNMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES TO FIFTY-ONE PERCENT (51%), ESTABLISH ADDITIONAL DEADLINES RELATED TO THE PETITION PROCESS, ESTABLISH A GENERAL ONE-YEAR MORATORIUM ON REQUESTS FOR REEXAMINATION OF LOCATIONS PREVIOUSLY STUDIED, CLARIFY COST-SHARING RESPONSIBILITIES, REPLACE SPEED HUMPS WITH SPEED TABLES, AND INCLUDE SPECIALTY SIGNS AND FLASHING BEACONS IN THE PROGRAM.

WHEREAS, growth in population and traffic volumes in Lexington-Fayette County have caused increases in congestion on major roadways; and

WHEREAS, increases in traffic on major roadways have resulted in greater use of local streets and residential neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, in Resolution No. 164-2000, the Council of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government adopted the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), proposed by the Division of Traffic Engineering, to provide a process to identify and address neighborhood issues related to increased traffic volumes on local residential streets; and

WHEREAS, increased traffic on local and collector streets in residential areas may adversely affect the safety and livability of neighborhoods for all residents, including tenants and property owners.

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

Section 1 – That the recitals set forth in the Preamble of this Resolution are hereby incorporated by reference.

Section 2 – That the Council of the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government hereby approves and adopts the amended Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference, to govern neighborhood quality of life issues related to speeding motorists, excessive traffic volumes and safety on local residential streets to expressly include tenants in the petition process for Type 2 traffic calming

measures, require an affirmative vote of fifty-one (51%) percent of property owners in the defined petition area for the implementation of Type 2 traffic calming measures, establish additional deadlines related to the petition process, establish a general one-year moratorium on requests for reexamination of locations previously studied, clarify cost-sharing responsibilities, replace speed humps with speed tables, and include specialty signs and flashing beacons in the Program.

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

X:\Cases\TRAFFIC\16-LE0001\LEG\00525925.DOCX