MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Cost Savings and Efficiency Work Group

November 19, 2002
Mayor's Conference Room

MEMBERS : Present: Carol Brown, Jennifer Brinkman, Russ Bayer, Greg MacLean, Roger Reynolds, Rick Krueger , Duane Eitel, Jon Carlson, Greg Wood, Melinda Pearson, Mark Hunzeker, Mark Brohman, Patte Newman, Allan Abbott (non-voting). Absent: Brian Carstens, Jerry Schleich, Duane Hartman

OTHERS: Kent Morgan, Steve Masters, Roger Figard, Marvin Krout

AGENDA ITEMS DISCUSSION:

1. Welcome - Russ Bayer, Work Group & Committee TriChair

Opening the meeting at 4:00 p.m., Russ Bayer welcomed those present.

2. Meeting Summary Notes - November 12, 2002

Russ asked if there were any comments about the minutes and Jon Carlson noted that his name should be moved from "Others" to "Members" present.

3. Public Comment Period

No public comments were received, however, at this time Carol Brown indicated her desire to make some comment about the committee's charge. She pointed out that not having the impact fees approved without which left the committee in limbo. She proposed that the committee look at not having impact fees to see how much greater the impact will be on the community. Also, she felt the committee needed to look at how we are undermining the Comp Plan to avoid a frenzy of bonding the community's lives away. The other option is to take the money and spend on the existing community and whatever money left over is what we use to build. She felt the City should take care of our older neighborhoods, and not being comfortable in going ahead with this because there is no direction as far as whether there will be impact fees and may not know until June, and maybe not then. She felt like this committee was working toward nothing.

Russ asked for any other thoughts from the group and indicated he did not feel the charge had changed, but they should assume impact fees will be in place. At the time of starting this effort, even the Planning Commission had not held its reviewed impact fees at that time, but in his opinion the charge has not changed. The Infrastructure Finance committee and our committee have the charge of assuming these impact fees will be in place some day. The memo of August

26, as amended, said the impact fees would be in place some day when the committees started. The other side of that issue is this group is not involved with funding but with cost savings and efficiencies. Even if impact fees were defeated by City Council, he felt this committee should be in place to still find better ways to plan and phase in our committee's recommendations. In response to Carol's reference to simply looking for mistakes in the budget, Russ disagreed, referring to an example that would be presented by Rick Krueger with a different way of looking at it. In addition, Russ pointed to the 20 items on the Work-in-Progress Ideas Listing as ways to look at it. This could be difficult on the administrative staff because part of what we are doing is saying we may have found other ways of phasing items or saving time in doing something or perhaps costing out how a project is done. He reported he felt this subcommittee still has a mission.

4. Cost Savings & Efficiency Ideas List

Patte Newman agreed with Russ and saw this as one of the only work groups that can make things happen. If this committee felt things were not being done efficiently this committee could find ways to save money. She felt Carol's point was a good one, in that the general public needs to know if impact fees are not implemented what it's going to cost them to finance the growth that is in the Comprehensive Plan. Russ indicated the Finance Committee would take that on except for the one element, their charge is to assume $2,500 initially, potentially going to $4,500 over a time period. He thought they were supposed to try to fund the rest of it. Their role is still there and then there is a gap of $2,500 or $4,500. He said Carol's point should be brought up at the next Finance Committee but indicated he would leave it to the group to decide whether this committee was going to continue.

Jennifer Brinkman indicated appreciation for Carol's point, but agreed with Russ that this group's charge is still valid and important to pursue any cost savings and efficiency to reduce the gap and the need for impact fees, if possible. The committee is not looking for mistakes in the budget, but it is important to have an opportunity to look at things that the public brings up that staff has looked at for long time and now have a reason to bring forward and some impetus to put some new things into place that frankly aren't 'sexy' enough to get the attention of a political administration or the public at any other time. She reported she felt this committee really does need to move forward.

Melinda Pearson referred to a statement that stated that the ultimate timing prioritization, staging and phasing of options should be constructed with a minimum of disruption to the community and surrounding area there are two important things: don't disrupt our existing community and don't take any moneys out of our existing community to fund future communities. She said short term cost savings should not be solved at the expense of long term greater costs to the City. The committee needs to take care of the entire community as a whole, not just look at the new developing or existing areas. She felt the committee has a lot to do and could have a big impact.

She asked about Russ' earlier comment about looking for 10% and asked if that was his number. Russ indicated it was because he wanted the committee to have measurable results to go to the Mayor or staff and say our committee thinks. Russ said he had spoken with some members of the committee earlier, and said he would like to come up with some ideas of an efficiency list and come up with dollars and cents on them. He added that others have said it is also necessary to find out what a change would mean to slowing down traffic.

Russ asked if the committee was comfortable in moving forward and Patte said on Carol's point the committee would have to see on this list if the wheel tax has to be raised in order to fix whatever the gap is. How much of that is going to be and Russ reported he did not feel that was this committee's responsibility. Russ felt that anything the group wants to put on this list, we should in the spirit of brainstorming.

Allan Abbot agreed, indicating the way he saw this committee fitting into the others is after it is through here they would say they believe they can save X% of the program by doing these things. If that is accepted by whomever, that information would go forward to the Finance Committee and say in addition to the impact fees, the gap has now been closed by a certain percent over the previous amount and all they need to come up with is X number of dollars. He acknowledged this committee was looking at six and 12 years but was not pushing six year projects into the 12-year phase and not pushing 12 year items to longer period of time.

Russ suggested the committee continue brainstorming and then begin categorizing the ideas into types and then prioritize them, even identify some that may not even be feasible. Russ asked Rick Krueger to report on some information he had on traffic lights.

Rick displayed a traffic projections map of the City that he got during the Comprehensive Plan committee work and reported he traveled 56 miles of the section line roads in Lincoln tried to categorize the present condition regarding just the signalization. Referring to his memo (copy attached), Rick explained he cited how much by percent we have of the various standards today. The design standards going forward show 3-1/2 lights per section line mile and he wanted to measure that and see where the City is now. Rick reported he tried to get a big sample in both interior and new growth areas. Referring to the map, he explained there are no lights where green is shown except for the major intersections which he did not count; the yellow indicates one light and orange is for two lights; pink is for three lights which is close to the standard that is proposed now and there was one mile that had more than three lights and that was O St. between 56th and 70th St. Rick reported he was expecting to see a pattern where there is greater density in the core there would be more lights but that did not pan out. There is no corresponding number of lights in these areas. So he divided the number of lights by the miles and felt the City is over designed on our standard going forward. Averaging it out, he came up with 1.3 lights per mile, and with a corner at each major intersection so that was a half and that would be 1.8 and there would be a savings there of nearly $212,000 per mile going forward.

Rick mentioned 13th from A to Pioneers only had one light and once it crosses the Highway 2 there are not lights in between Pine Lake and the highway. He pointed out there is only one light

on 56 between A st. and O St. which is at Cotner. He noted that six of the traffic lights are where diagonals cross. Rick said he brought this forward as a consideration. He said a number of these roads are not complete such as 84th; but 56th and 40th have 2-lanes in some sections. His report includes comments on school crossings and some assumptions for sewer and water where I suggested sewer and water adjustments on section line roads would be more properly to pay out of the sewer and water enterprise funds.

In response to the question about NETCD for warrants for lights, Allan indicated he agreed with Rick reporting they do one signal and the half mile and that is in our estimate and the developers pay 100% of the cost of any signals over those three, that's a development cost. The city provides one signal at half and mile point and anything in between is the cost of the developer. The reason the signal is there is because the development requires the signal. Allan reported Public Works is getting increasingly more signal requests.

Russ asked how many signals are anticipated over the next six years. Roger Figard estimated it would be less than 10 and Russ suggested using five and that would be $1.2 million and Allan repeated this is a good idea but it was necessary to recognize that deferring the cost until later, then the development that causes the signal should be responsible for 100% of the cost. The question is should they put the wiring in first so the pavement won't need to be ripped up when it's time to put the signal in. Allan indicated he was more than willing to have only one signal per mile on an arterial; adding that's a dream and said if the development community agreed that would be great.

Rick cited his experience at 27th & Pine Lake and indicated he would agree with that, but what's curious is where there is only one mile where there are more signals than what is designed today, noting that was basically East Park and Gateway area. Some of the others have tremendous traffic really have only the half line section.

Jon Carlson, asked about platting and about what's being brought forward as far as developments, asking what will happen if all you have is the half-mile access in your development. That collector is the way in and out of that section. The response said the design standards would still show three intersections per mile but there are way more intersections in this city that are not signalized than are signalized on section line roads.

Allan said when developers come in, there will be a signal eventually and we can wire it and as the signal is required, the developer pays for the signal, otherwise all that is being accomplished is pushing it back, ignoring the cost that is there. He reported this is a stage cost that can be done one of two ways: the developer pays for it or over the next 12 years, only one signal is needed and some of the cost is deferred.

Greg MacLean said there are intersections that some day may meet the warrants and there are certain guidelines that have to be considered. When asked if the 1.8 meets that standard. Roger said that would be up to the density and whether it is commercial or residential.

Someone asked about the number of warrants and Roger said there are 11 some of which are not significant and staff tries to say they are significant and sometimes intersections meet warrants but staff doesn't think it's the right thing to do.

Russ indicated there were two ideas added to the list of 20: the roadway projection and traffic signals and sanitary sewer and water lines out of enterprise funds, which he felt was a good idea. He advised the committee this discussion is in the mode of adding ideas.

Mark Hunzeker said traveling those arterials would show that in addition to not having those two signals per mile, you also do not have two intersections with dual turn lanes and right turn lanes in every direction. He added, these are not even at the half-mile line in most of the circumstances Rick was talking about.

Russ asked if the Comprehensive Plan calls for these types of standards to which Allan said yes. He observed this has been Mark's position and suggested considering 25 years from now and not about streets that don't have left turn lanes and why they don't work, like O St., 27th St., 70th St.

Russ interrupted to ask the discussion to continue in the brainstorming mode, asking members to toss ideas out. He asked members to clearly state their ideas.

Mark pointed out the assumption built into these cost numbers is that not only will there be three traffic signals per mile other than one at each end, but there will also be three intersections per mile, each leg of which will have dual left- and right-turn lanes. This results in three turn lanes, 12 total per intersection three times per mile built into these cost assumptions. He felt that was an assumption worth examining. The statement about looking 25 years down the line is okay, but we are looking at a 6-year gap. To which Allan disagreed. At this point Russ noted that there is a 25-year Comprehensive Plan that the committee is talking about compressing the costs into 12 years. Kent clarified that this discussion is not to compress, but to look at 12 years cost of the 25-year Plan. Russ reported he did not to debate the ideas unless all ideas have been identified. Roger Figard clarified that if the task is to look at the signals, then it would make sense to look at the concrete costs that are built into these areas as well. The Comprehensive Plan indicates to try to build infrastructure or have the framework there so in the future when development is added, it wouldn't disrupt the property on both sides. Russ agreed, stating it would be less expensive later on.

Russ asked the group to guide the work before them, suggesting they come up with the ideas and review them and once the idea list is finished, the committee starts with #1 and discusses it and the City and staff will have their perspective and whomever suggested it would have their own perspective. Asking if this was acceptable and the members agreed. Are we okay with that? Russ reminded the members they spent the first 2-3 weeks getting to a common level of knowledge and if we need more brought in, we should do that. Russ restated his request to the members about their comfort level with developing ideas and then begin debating them, to which everyone indicated agreement that every idea would be included, good or bad.

Allan explained his idea is conceptual rather than specific but somewhat along the idea of Mark's comments. He suggested finding a way for the best initial cost that a project can be built that would be compatible with the future mile section. If we are not going to need a 4-lane with a turn lane, then the committee should determine what's the best initial section for phased construction?

Patte asked if r.o.w. acquisition will remain as it now is and Roger reported there is a process in place in the Interlocal Agreement between the City and County that when they go out on the mile line road they will buy the 120ft. and the City agrees to pay the additional 10 ft. on each side. This should be cheaper.

Jon asked if he was clear that the idea is to find the outside boundary so the city can develop outside of that area? Allan said that the City is working with the County to buy the r.o.w. and works with them to build their roadway so it can be used so we won't have to close the road down. Jon explained his question was based on his greater concern for what happens on the outside than the center and felt he had more personal flexibility for what we do or don't do in between those two.

Rick Krueger commented about Allan's statement about developer for the lights, one of the things he tried to do is not to take this example toward the fringe area so the sample could be reliable because there are inconsistencies. He said he felt this is a legitimate exercise.

Russ pointed out while this was a good example, he did not feel they should be moving into debate now. He noted that the group has added four ideas to the list: traffic signaling, trail/pedestrian signaling; the sanitary sewer, water line cost out of the enterprise funds; the assumption built into these cost numbers about the number of traffic signals per mile and the phasing of the sections.

Russ observed that three of the four are about roads and reminded the group that they also have infrastructure costs in parks and have not yet had a presentation from Parks yet and one on stormwater and water and sewer.

Although unsure how it fit into the whole, Mark suggested developing neighborhood parks more efficiently and less expensively by using park districts. He noted that on this idea, the City actually has statutory authority for that. Adding, acquisition funds can be used to buy land while it was still farm land, create the districts, assess the benefits to within whatever radius the Council ultimately decided, but probably on a per square mile basis. This could save a lot of money.

Someone indicated while watching the water presentation there were many water projects and asked if there would be any advantage in letting multiple projects to get some economy of scale. Another member suggested that would apply to streets projects. Russ summarized items to be added would be bidding process and size of projects to the list.

Jon suggested for discussion the cost savings in the street design standards that allow narrower local streets and four-way intersections. Russ asked if he was talking arterials or interior but it was pointed out that interior streets are not included in this review.

Russ suggested categorizing the five categories: roads, water, sewer, stormwater and parks and trails with any new ideas added to the bottom of the list and the group could categorize them later.

Melinda suggested a category of Policy to which Russ agreed and reiterated the categories: Parks and Trails, Roads, Sewer, Water, Stormwater and Policy and Procedures. He noted they may run into another that won't fit into these six categories and may have to add a seventh category.

Russ asked the group to move forward and categorize the ideas shown on the Work-In-Progress Ideas List with the additional six ideas included and asked the person who suggested it give some background.

#1. Design-Build Approach - Policy/procedures Jennifer asked if this might be moved to another committee and Russ suggested it might be after the group qualifies it. Kent noted this one, because it has legislative impacts and because of the timeline, if the group was interested in this one moved to the Legislative Committee because of their meeting yet this week. It can be in both but most felt it should belong to the Legislative Committee.

Roger suggested before sending it to the Legislative Committee, this group should figure out how money might be saved. Russ said the committee may not get to that point by the time that committee is dissolved. Kent indicated he will take this idea to them.

#2. Costs for Sidewalks and Street Trees Along Arterials - Roads
#3. Costs for Retaining Walls - Roads
#4 Prioritize CIP relative to Comp Plan - Policy and Procedures
#5 Width of Driving and Turning Lanes - Roads
#6 Formalize Pro rata Ordinance Approach - Policy and Procedures
#7 City Policy Governing Life Stations/Force Main vs. Gravity Flow Sanitary Sewer - Policy and Procedures and if policy changed, decide if it is Sewer
#8 Utility Policies Regarding Materials and Line Size - Water & Sewer
#9 Materials for Street Construction - Roads
#10 City Inspection Policy - Policy and Procedures
#11 Platting Procedures - Policy and Procedures
#12 Costs Associates with Relaying and Burying LES Lines - Policy and Procedures
#13 Reimbursement of Costs for LES Lines - Policy and Procedures
#14 Policy concerning Developer Contributions to Arterial projects - Policy and Procedures
#15 Phasing of Development in Comprehensive Plan - Policy and Procedures

#16 Use "Indefinite Delivery Contracts" for Public Works & Utility Projects - while discussion indicated this could be in any of the categories, Policy and Procedures and once it is discussed it could go across the board
#17 City Street Standards - Roads
#18 Right of Way Acquisition - Roads
#19 Policies Concerning Potential Projects Not in the CIP and Not in Conformance with the Comprehensive Plan - Policy and Procedures
#20 District Approach - indicating a need for more information on this one, Kent Morgan reported this idea came up at the last meeting. Someone suggested adding "and Executive Orders. Allan explained the district approach which is used now such as sidewalk districts, repaving districts where someone petitions and goes before Council and is required to secure signatures and s assess it back against the property. Mark thought Duane Hartman meant using the assessment districts more but addressing the disincentives for using the districts because of the costs involved. Doing it through a district costs about 25% more than through an Executive Order - Policy and Procedures
#21 Traffic Signaling and Trail/Pedestrian Signaling - Roads
#22 Sanitary Sewer and Water Lines out of Enterprise Funds - Water/Sewer
#23 Street dual left turn lanes - Roads
#24 Phasing of Sections - Roads
#25 Park Districts - Parks and Trails
#26 Bidding Process - Policy and Procedures

Patte asked if #9 was only about concrete material or would cost of striping and all materials for street construction be included. Russ suggested having subcategories.

Greg MacLean suggested adding Professional Services Procurement Procedures and this was placed under - Policy and Procedures as #27.

Russ asked members to continue to add idea and then talked about the next week's meeting. Reminding members this process is all open and noted they have had discussions on a 6-year and last week we had discussion on the Water portion which was on the old CIP and Comp Plan. Departments have been tasked to come up with 12 year costs and asked if the 12 year numbers would be ready in one week. Kent said no but staff may want to present to the committee where the 12 year costs were going. We need to have some agreement before reporting on them.

Russ explained the 12-year numbers were critical but not as important as the assumptions that were made based on the 12 year numbers. We think that maybe the workshop will add more ideas and as the committee moves along in their work they are going to stop and talk about the 12 year numbers and the assumptions which he felt would take a whole meeting.

Allan said it was very difficult to come up with the numbers without assumptions and staff would qualify the assumptions. He offered guesstimates, but if we are looking at a different concept than what the group feels the 12-year period should be, then staff is not using their time

well. Staff needs to at least get buy-in. When asked if this could be presented next week, Kent said they could do a presentation the next week based on that group's meeting the day following this meeting.

Russ noted that will take a lot of a meeting and don't want to stop the cost savings work this committee is going through. There are two items that are water and sewer related and felt staff should know when the committee wants to discuss those topics and be prepared to talk about the pros and cons.

Summarizing, Russ reported that at their next week's meeting, they will have the assumptions and talk about water and sewer and any that are added. Melinda inquired if the committee has asked staff to present ideas and Kent indicated this was something staff could do, but they have not yet brainstormed it yet. Russ suggested staff could talk about some ideas that staff may have but that have not been approved by the Administration.

Mark asked to add one idea that may be both water/sewer and policy and procedure on more special assessment district financing for the extension of water and sewer lines. Russ added it to the list. Mark thought the Special Assessment Revolving Fund has been static for years and felt this tool could provide the opportunity to save money.

Allan said they are doing everything they can to get numbers together, but would appreciate anyone on the committee sharing with staff their views. Russ said he would adjust the agenda to see where the ideas fit in. This would be #28.

He expressed hope that list continues to grow and one of the ways is through the workshop process. Russ said he saw the charge of this group to continually have the list grow, continue to categorize them, qualify them, put some sort of number value to them so in March, after they have completed their work our recommendations are these ideas that we as a group have said are the ones we want to send to the main committee. Asking the group if this was okay, no objections were voiced. He pointed out there may be some ideas that members may present that this group may say no, but doesn't mean it shouldn't be forwarded to the Finance group. Then at each meeting he thought it will, be appropriate for the committee to continue to add ideas, but not to detail and individuals need to take ownership of ideas and be prepared to present their case to convince the group to include them. If the group indicates that next week they will talk about certain ideas on the list and no one is a proponent, they may go away. He indicated his openness to the ideas and suggested if someone is uncomfortable to speak to the idea, then they can go to Kent to find someone to present it and if anonymity is desired, Kent will keep it that way.

Russ reported this list will always be a part of each meeting agenda. If we decide, after we have a workshop, then restating our ideas, putting some value to them and putting them into recommendations. Asking for any input on this recommendation, there was no dissent.

Russ announced that next week he would ask Allan and/or Steve discuss Nos. 8 and 22 and the last paragraph of Rick's memo. He suggested that anything else that staff comes up with they should get them to Kent to distribute.

5. Workshop Approach (January, 2003)

Russ said there is no preconceived notion that there will be a workshop, but earlier there was a lot of positive feedback about having one and now the committee needs to determine what would they hope to have at the end of a series of workshops? What is the purpose of them--educate the public, validate ideas we have and generate more? Noting references to the public, Greg asked if the Association of General Contractors involved, and Russ said once the committee decides to have workshops, they then have to determine who the workshop participants are and what will the staffing needs be.

Kent distributed copies of a list of Workshop Content Approach Options. Russ pointed out this is taking the ideas from the first meeting that listed the approach that would be taken. The question is how will they be set up and who would be involved?

Jon said they could be set up as brainstorming sessions and then have a narrowing process afterwards. There could be some sort of critiquing involved as well. This could then be sifted against what we already have and discussed against the list. Russ agreed, but asked how the committee will get there?

Russ reminded the group they talked about having three different workshops and asked if they should be divided based on this meeting's discussion to qualify them, or maybe how they are listed in #2 on the Option sheet. The idea was to have all three of them on the same night and Jon suggested dividing them up into three separate groups. Jon agreed that education is a part of it, but thought that part of the assumption has to be that someone has to have a particular item they are particularly strong about or have a basic background.

Patte pointed out that some ideas mesh into other things. Some people may not know where they are supposed to be. Russ asked if the AGC needs to come on the night they are talking about parks and asked if the group should divide these up and how. He asked for a consensus on whether the committee was going to have workshops and the indication from the group indicated they did. Russ then asked what the primary purpose of the workshop was. Referring to the AGC, Greg said the purpose would be constructability reviews and to solicit ideas from them that would save money and time and have added efficiencies.

Russ asked then if the major purpose is to get ideas from the professionals out there doing things on a regular basis, asking if anyone was opposed to workshops? Duane Eitel asked if the idea was to invite the general public or what Greg was talking about and Russ said it is to bring in professional facilitators who can generate some brainstorming thoughts and then bring in engineers and construction people and get public input . He said they initially looked at 3 3-hour workshops, and maybe in the evenings. Duane asked if the goal is to get ideas generated. Allan

asked if the workshops were for the committee to gain information or for those who attend to gain information. Russ responded the idea is to add to this list, even though he initially said it was to educate the public. This is an efficiency group on how to.

Carol indicated she thought the group needs to stress that the workshop is to look at efficiencies and that should be the title of our workshop so people don't come to lobby. Rick said he liked Jon's idea of a meeting with the general public but he felt a meeting with more professional folks should be a separate where those people meet with staff on technical items. Jennifer suggested having an invitation only that is separate and do a general public and then there may need to only be two

Mark indicated he thought the main purpose of this is to get the committee a little more on the same page as to what the concerns and problems are and get the group more educated and maybe when members of the general public can come have a time when someone can add to our ideas. He envisioned a road workshop that would take the whole 3 hours with the options laid out on roads as to design, timing, materials and all the thing this group has talked about. Maybe someone could listen to that and come up with an idea the committee hasn't put on the list yet. He saw the primary purpose was to get the committee educated as to the alternatives. Someone suggested bringing the professionals in to this group whether a workshop or not, getting their ideas out and carry them forward to the general public workshop.

Russ asked the purpose for the general public workshop and it was suggested to get more ideas. Jon indicated there should be no worry about separating them, because if they are advertised properly you will get the professionals anyway. No one goes to those meeting, unless they are interested in it.

Greg suggested the second meeting might be more general to validate and more informative to the public and Jon suggested it may be broken up by topics. Russ cautioned about politicizing this and said he would be nervous if this group's recommendations became the focus of lobbying efforts. It was suggested that whoever facilitates it needs to keep on task on the topic at hand.

Russ if the group has these workshops they need to have people to invite and then let everyone else know who is coming. He felt it would be an educational opportunity for the committee and suggested they might invite other people of the same discipline. Russ noted the discussion was moving into the format of the workshops and suggested there may be different ways to approach all of the topics. He said they will have invited people to make formal presentations and the workshops would be open to the public but not for comments.

Duane asked if some of this could be determined by the professional facilitators and Russ indicated this is to give some kind of direction to Kent for staff to set these up. He advised they should always make sure they have public comments and asked who then should take it to the next step to decide if we have one or three. Kent suggested the committee needed someone on board to help you understand the best way to do this.

During the following comments, Greg asked if the committee was going to have a discussion on how to break out the workshops and Russ did not feel they would have time to do that. Allan indicated he and Kent had explored getting someone on board to do that and suggested Karen Jensen of Olson Associates. There being no objections, Allan indicated they would proceed to contact her.

Russ concluded that the group had focused on the format of the workshops but while not sure how many there would be, he noted that they have planned for three. He summarized the workshops would include some like discipline input and some general public comment.

Russ then asked members to look at list of workshop content options and how they would like to address the items on the list.

Someone suggested bringing somebody from the AGC and relay to him what the committee is thinking about so he would understand what the group is looking for and can go back to the contractors to see if they want to do this. Russ asked if they should get Karen involved to help with the approach and Kent suggested the earlier she is involved the better. Russ suggested they invite her to the next appropriate meeting, based on how long the discussions on the assumptions will take.

Russ clarified that the group would talk on the assumptions next and that could take all of the next meeting. He noted the committee has meetings scheduled every week until the week before Christmas. He asked the committee to allow him and staff to massage the agenda to get Karen in as soon as possible but confirmed he didn't want to put off the assumption discussion which he felt was the next most critical subject they have.

Jon suggested that if policy and process was added to the first Option on the list, everything else on the list would fall into those top categories. He felt this would help people to start thinking before they come to the workshop. Russ suggested this could be mentioned to Karen to get her input.

Rick observed the discussions at the last two meetings have revolved around the new areas in the City and asked if there was anything the group needed to consider in the built environment. Russ said the numbers the group had been given had numbers for maintenance of existing infrastructure and suggested the group should discuss ideas related to existing infrastructure. Rick said the group needs background data on how those numbers were generated and what projects are included. Russ responded said that was what the 12 year assumption was about; it was to take the next 12 years including maintenance and day-to-day operations and identify that over the next 12 years it would take $72,000,000 for roads based on $6,000,000 per year. Then the question is how are you spending that money.

Rick said if there was an issue regarding the built environment, he didn't want to leave it behind in the discussions. Russ agreed and indicated it should go on the list.

Jennifer suggested a good homework assignment would be to think of people to be participants in the workshop, identifying what type of professionals should be invited.

Duane asked staff signals are needed that aren't constructed in these areas, suggesting this might change the assumptions on Item #21. Allan indicated that for clarification on maintenance, staff is not able to provide a list of what they are going to maintain over the next 12 years. He said he could tell the committee how much money was spent on maintenance but not a specific maintenance activity on a specific site because they can't search records in that detail to produce such a list. Allan said they can report on how much money we spent filling potholes, how much was spent on plowing snow, but not how much was spent on Street X for potholes or other maintenance activity. Russ indicated that he would want to know that X% was spent on pothole filling.

Roger pointed out that in the built environment, the 25 year plan shows projects that need added capacity and there aren't many of them. But ff they are not on the 25 year plan there won't necessarily be any pressure to come back in and widen 56th St. Roger said the point was that most of the maintenance is in the built environment but the question is whether we have set aside enough or too much. He said they never intended to impose a 120 ft. r.o.w. and some of the City's current standards in the built environment. Those were intended for the fringe.

Mark said he did not suggest that that standard was going to be imposed on the built environment, but the question was what are the projects that constitute rehab as opposed to the capacity enhancements, some of which may be a little bit of both and how are those paid for.

Russ indicated that would come out of the assumption discussion next week. He pointed out that at the next week's meeting, the committee would get to assumptions but not anything else. Kent said those discussions would not get to that level of detail. Mark said it should be pretty easy to break out the cost of the rehab, repaving-type projects over a period of time. Mark said those numbers should be able to be provided on some of the major reconstruction projects. Russ interjected this was not the time to debate it and Mark agreed but, for example, felt it should be pretty easy to tell the committee how much it cost to rebuild 33rd St. from South of Sheridan. That kind of example ought to be pretty easy to break out.

Allan reported there is a difference between maintenance and what Mark's talking about. Russ said that was staff's role to tell the committee. Allan said to come up with how much was spent on 33rd St. in the last ten years to stripe it, etc.

6. <u>Other Business</u>

Russ reminded the group their homework assignment was to come up with professionals for the workshop and asked if there was anything else the committee should discuss. Mark indicated one more item on Policy and Procedures was the general category of use of street construction fund for other than street construction.

7. Future Agenda Topics

No additional comments were made on this item.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

I:\MIFC\cost savings work group\Mtg_Sum_Notes_Efficiency_Nov_19_2002.wpd
November 26, 2002 (6:50AM)