



---

TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator  
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator  
Brett Lenart, Planning Manager  
Cresson Slotten, Systems Planning Manager  
Robyn Wilkerson, HR Director

CC: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: 10/17/16

---

**CA-2 – Resolution to Approve an Increase to the Ellsworth Industries, Inc. Purchase Order for Aggregate Materials (\$35,000)**

**Question:** Can you please briefly remind me what “aggregate materials and haul out spoils” is? (I know we’ve seen this before, but I can’t recall what services/materials the PO/contract actually covers.) (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Aggregate materials include sand and other materials to backfill excavation sites created when repairing water main or sanitary sewer mains. Spoils are the materials, such as dirt and asphalt that are removed as part of the water or sewer main repair.

**CA-5 – Resolution to Adopt Revised Investment Policy**

**Question:** In reading the Policy, while I would expect the pension fund to have its own investment policy (and advisors), I was a bit surprised to see that a couple of the other affiliated entities (DDA, Housing Commission, 15<sup>th</sup> District Court) were excluded from this policy. Do they have their own policies (and advisors) and assuming they do, what is the reason for that? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The Housing Commission & DDA are component units of the City and have separate boards with fiduciary responsibility, so they are responsible for their own investment policies. The Housing Commission has investment restrictions from HUD but does not have an official policy. They have recently been able to generate funds and are contemplating a policy. The DDA utilizes a policy substantially similar to the City's. They presently only invest with bank accounts. The 15<sup>th</sup> District Court has several accounts they maintain balances for. The larger account (i.e. approx. \$300k) has restrictions based on State (or SCAO) requirements.

### **CA-8 – Resolution to Approve New Streetlight Installations and Smart Lighting System Preparation**

**Question:** The cover memo indicates the “lifetime” costs of a streetlight including initial equipment installation, equipment replacement, maintenance and anticipated increases in energy costs is \$40,000. How many years (and how many replacements) are included in that “lifetime” cost estimate? Also, can you please provide a high level reconciliation between that \$40,000 “lifetime” cost per streetlight and the \$40 per year operating cost per streetlight number also in the cover memo? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The 40 years is based on the pole foundation's expected life. There would be no fewer than two light fixture/luminaire replacements expected during that timeframe, even based on best performance LEDs. The \$40 annual operating cost is based on today's maintenance staff hours, truck and equipment charges by Public Works, and per light energy costs. It does not include upfront capital costs (conduit, trenching, foundations, luminaires, etc.) or replacement costs; these costs and factoring for inflation on the maintenance, energy and replacement costs over the 40 year timeframe are included in the \$40,000 overall life costs.

**Question:** If this passes, it would seem the next step would be to provide the notifications to the adjacent neighbors to allow them to raise any objections. When do we think the notifications will be made and when could we expect to see the first new streetlight? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Notifications in areas where nearby residences could be affected from their home by new streetlights are anticipated to go out the first quarter of calendar year 2017, with installation occurring in the second quarter of calendar year 2017 and into the 2017 construction season. The portion of planned streetlight requests that would not affect residences could be on a slightly accelerated timeframe, and may be installed in the first quarter of calendar year 2017.

**CA-9 – Resolution to Approve Amendment to the Member Services Agreement into the Keenan Pharmacy Purchasing Coalition and Authorize the City Administrator to Execute the Necessary Documentation (\$90,000)**

**Question:** Does the \$90K cost included in the title of the resolution represent the fees paid to participate in the purchasing coalition (or something else)? Also, what level of drug cost savings (roughly) are expected to be realized through participation? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** Yes. The expected cost reduction is (\$553,769) for the year, with an offsetting of this fee.

**C-1 – An Ordinance to Amend Chapter 55 (Zoning), Rezoning of 7.7 Acres from R1C (Single-Family Dwelling District) to R1E (Single-Family Dwelling District), Weber Rezoning, 2857 Packard Road (CPC Recommendation: Approval – 6 Years and 1 Nays)**

**Question:** The rezoning from R1C to R1E would allow for the development of up to 83 units. The current area plan calls for 56. If we approve the rezoning, are there any barriers in place to limit the number of units? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** With such a rezoning, there is no overall barrier to limit the number of units beyond site design. Accounting for circulation, storm water detention, and natural features protection can all have a limiting effect on the number of units. The maximum 83 units is based on the site size (7.7 acres) divided by the minimum lot size in the R1E district (4,000 sq. ft.). This proposal shows 56 residential units which could change during the site plan review process.

**Question:** Based on the area plan, it is difficult to ascertain if there will be any variation in unit size and design. Do we have any indication from the developer regarding the potential for homes to vary in size? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** The developer has not submitted housing product type in writing at the Area Plan stage, but has indicated verbally that he's open to differing housing styles and sizes. The R1E zoning limits the maximum size of the home to 2,000 sq. ft.

**Question:** The neighbors have expressed concerns regarding setbacks, in particular those adjacent to existing homes. Will rezoning exacerbate this concern? Will the smaller setbacks required from R1E limit potential options for screening? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** R1E zoning has reduced setbacks in comparison to R1C. For example, the minimum rear yard setback in R1E is 10 feet smaller than R1C. Accordingly, the building footprints can be closer to adjacent homes by up to 10 feet. Screening can be accommodated in the R1E, but larger areas of open space provide more space for a variety of use, including screening.

**Question:** Staff has clearly indicated a concern regarding the disturbance of natural features in the proposed area plan. Does rezoning from R1C to R1E increase or decrease the potential for disturbance of natural features? What, if any, modifications have been discussed with the developer? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** The developer has shown the location of natural features on site and shown a grid pattern of development over some of these landmark trees and woodlands. Because the Area Plan does not require an alternatives analysis, which shows different site layouts saving natural features, staff has not determined what is the best plan to protect natural features. Discussion with the petitioner have included options for ensuring that any future landscape mitigation measures are maintained, minimizing disturbance of the dense woodlands nearest Packard Road, and maintenance of existing trees along the perimeter of the site.

**Question:** The current area plan consists of a private road with zero connections to the surrounding neighborhood. Understanding that there are real barriers (private property), have vehicular and/or pedestrian connections been considered? (Councilmember Grand)

**Response:** Staff asked the developer to consider both external connections to adjacent sites and internal connections throughout the site. The petitioner indicated while meeting with neighbors, there wasn't support for connections. Such connections will be explored further at the site plan stage, however external connections will likely be limited based on adjacent property configuration.

**Question:** The Area Plan proposal that accompanies this re-zoning request proposes density of 7 units an acre. Given that R1D allows up to 8 units an acre, what is the rationale to re-zone to R1E rather than R1D? (Councilmember Lumm)

**Response:** The petitioner has sought R1E zoning as the smaller lot sizes provide some flexibility in laying out the site. Additionally, larger lots and correspondingly larger homes, might have the impact of being further out of scale with the surrounding neighborhood than what could be achieved by R1E zoning. Presuming that a comparable amount of the property is dedicated to circulation, open space, and stormwater systems as the current Area Plan; R1D might support approximately 45 lots.