

**CIP Supplement 4**  
**Questions received 3/13/2020**

**Utilities**

- 1. Shunga Flood Mitigation Project – This was discussed at an early Council work session in light of a 25% mitigation projected impact, and related cost-benefit and priority. There was a fair amount of opinion that this project should not be done. Has this project been reconsidered by staff? Any others?**

Utilities Response:

To clarify, the Shunga Flood Mitigation project that staff has included in the 2021-2030 Proposed CIP is comprised of two parts. The first is approximately 1.5 miles of channel modifications along the section of the Shunga from approximately Buchannan to 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The channel modifications would result in approximately 160 structures being removed from the 100-year flood plain. The second part of the project would include the construction of a levee designed to protect for a 25-year storm event from approximately MacVicar to Buchannan. While the latter part would not remove any additional structures, it would provide protection up to the 25-year storm event. Currently, those properties have no protection. The Utilities Department staff continues to recommend inclusion of this project in the CIP as these projects will provide a benefit to residents along these sections of the Shunga, will not induce damages to properties located up or downstream, and will leverage Utility funding with the Army Corps of Engineers willing to fund 65% of the project.

- 2. Priority, Approach, Equipment and Materials Options in all proposals I am not as familiar with the Utilities projects and what goes into the grouped items, but we all know they are critically important. Could staff discuss whether there are economies in choices of projects we could make, or economies in approaches to workforce, equipment and materials that staff has discussed, that we could consider to stretch our dollars farther. Even address how we are doing our street projects and neighborhood projects, if there is a discussion to be had about our overall approach in recent years.**

The Utilities grouped items, or programs, are designed to derive the most benefit to our infrastructure from the finite amount of available program funding. Utilities evaluates potential rehabilitation and replacement projects through the use of an analytical risk-based methodology that helps to determine which projects that will provide the most value and long-term financial savings to our system and customers. That being said, opportunities to save costs by lining sewers or boring water mains to avoid making open cuts are evaluated for each project. Materials selection, for instance, water main material, is already based on economic value and maximizing the useful life of assets.

Examples of recent operational efficiencies of our workforce include our utilization of contracts to reallocate employees to focus on asset preventative maintenance, specifically for our water valves and hydrants. In addition, previous capital project enhancements such as new wastewater plant centrifuges and Automated Meter Infrastructure will result in a decrease in overtime and reallocation of FTEs to work on asset preventative maintenance.

Utilities staff continually look for opportunities to leverage limited resources, working in partnership with the Public Works staff. Here are three recent examples:

2200 Block of Plass: Utilities discovered a failing storm sewer pipe in the 2200 block. The pipe was located under the pavement directly under the northbound lane. Public works has agreed to conduct a full depth pavement replacement in the area that will be excavated to replace the pipe and mill and overlay for the full width of the road. Utilities will, of course, pay for the pipe. Utilities and Public Works will jointly share the other project costs such as erosion and sediment control, signage, and traffic control. The net result is that the Utilities will be able to invest the approximately \$72,000 of pavement savings in other stormwater projects. Additionally, the residents will benefit from a full mill and overlay instead of a utility patch in the middle of the road.

2<sup>nd</sup> and Chandler: Utilities discovered a failing storm sewer pipe in the intersection of 2<sup>nd</sup> and Chandler, very near Midway Wholesale which generates extensive heavy truck traffic at this intersection for receipt and delivery of roofing and other construction materials. Public Works has agreed to conduct a full depth pavement replacement of the intersection with concrete and curb and gutter. The project will also include full ADA compliant walks at all four corners. Utilities will pay for the pipe. Utilities and Public works will jointly share the other project costs such as erosion and sediment control, signage, and traffic control. The net result is that the Utilities will not have to pay for pavement replacement and the neighborhood will benefit from the ADA upgrades and curb and gutter at the intersection. Utilities' share of the project will be \$58,000 and Public Works' will be \$96,000.

Quincy between 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup>: The water lines under this pavement were constructed in 1905 and have experienced 12 breaks since 2007 with a total cost of repair of approximately \$101,000. The lines are located in the outside southbound lane. When Utilities learned that Public Works was contemplating a mill and overlay of this two-block section of road, staff proposed a partnership to replace the waterline. Public Works will pay for the full depth replacement in the area of the new line and then mill and overlay for full pavement width. The project is in early design stages so estimates on the pavement cost savings for the utilities are unavailable at this time.

## IT

- 3. Per comments from prior work sessions, please describe any deliberations at the staff level or otherwise regarding reducing or stretching the time frames of some of these expenses, thereby releasing operating budget funds back to the contributing departments.**

IT eliminated an FTE at the end for FY2019 and is now at the same staffing levels as in FY2010. The IT Fund budget has not experienced any significant operating budget increases since FY2014 and is approximately \$419,000 less than it was in FY2014. Staff is doing everything possible to ensure that IT costs and support services across the departments are at a minimum necessary to sustain efficient business operations free of Cybersecurity incidents.

The current Covid-19 crisis has clearly shown the need for a robust IT infrastructure network, including more staff support and more hardware for remote work.

## Fire

- 4. With the 18-apparatus rotation as described in the CIP book (10 years front-line, hold and use in less high-demand stations for an additional 15), and the fact that we have brought on 12(?) new apparatus in the past 10 years and have (4?) pending....is an annual replacement really needed at this time? Could this rotation be slowed a little? I'll stick with my preference to**

**switch this to cash, but I understand that the modelling would need to wait until after answers to the above question and others.**

The goal of the Topeka Fire Department is to replace frontline apparatus after ten years of service. This CIP budget will bring the department closer to that goal. In response to delayed purchases from prior years, the department made a one-time purchase of nine (9) apparatus in 2011 and the last of those apparatus are scheduled to be replaced in 2025 after serving fourteen (14) years as frontline equipment.

The Fire Department and the Fleet Division currently evaluate the condition, mileage and call load on all apparatus when replacements are made available and units are moved to a different location to extend the life of the apparatus. The last three (3) units that the department removed from the reserve pool were taken out of service due to mechanical failure, months prior to their replacements arriving.

### **Facilities**

- 5. Concerned that many (most?) items in the detail list are maintenance and arguably do not meet our capital project or bonding criteria. Concerned further that last year the proposal asked for bonding and a high number only through 2024, and that this proposal asks to extend another year.**

City facilities are in poor condition, similar to the streets and utilities infrastructure, due to years of deferred maintenance that has resulted in significant needs across all buildings. Without revenue increases or expenditure cuts, the General Fund does not have the capacity to support the needed maintenance and repairs of building infrastructure systems.

In 2019, staff presented the Facilities Improvement Maintenance & Repair Program as an ongoing annual program to provide consistent program level funding to address a backlog of building infrastructure needs and future maintenance needs. This program meets the capital project and bonding criteria as it is a combined program; both the City's bond counsel and Financial Advisor are comfortable with the approach. Similar to a street project or the infill sidewalk program, there are many smaller project components that would not individually meet bonding dollar thresholds, but do meet criteria when combined as part a larger project.

- 6. Could someone explain whether the detail list is expected to be just a list, or a plan?**

The detail list is considered a plan of the projects that are forecasted that they will need to be addressed while also providing flexibility to adjust the plan as critical repair need arise.

- 7. Concerned also that the City approved bonding for over \$1 million in improvements to Fire Stations 1, 6, 7, 3, 9, 11 and 5 in 2008 and 2009 and this proposal recommends bonding further improvements to those stations before the old bonds are paid off.**

Although the previously approved funding helped address immediate improvements at various fire stations additional facility improvements are required. For example, fire station #6 needs the clay tile roof replaced.

- 8. Concerned also that the Zoo, which in the past has typically had only an average of about \$225,000 per year in GO bonded projects now is in the detail list for an average of \$625,000 per year.**

The Zoo has several buildings in need of repairs to mechanical systems, animal holding areas, and building systems. The increase in spending is driven by the current infrastructure methodology which accounts for maintenance and preservation of the infrastructure that we have, whereas, in prior years it focused on responding to system failure or regulatory challenges to move an item into the CIP.

- 9. Puzzling that Phases 2 and 3 of the City Hall project are not mentioned at all, even in the out-years.**

Given other building needs, staff has not proposed a separate future project for City Hall at this time. The initial funding for Phase 1 of the project is not enough to complete Phase 1. The Governing Body was clear that there is no interest in fully funding Phase 1 or subsequent phases at this time.

- 10. Note also that there is now a multidepartmental Facilities Fund that went through \$1.6 million in 2019.**

The Facilities fund is an operating budget that pays for facilities operations. These services include janitorial, building preventative maintenance, facilities capital project management, and other operation services.

- 11. Pleased to see that the FIRM program is proposed to drop from bonded \$2.3 million per year to \$1.5 million per year cash starting in 2026. See that there is also another line item for Facilities maintenance in the amount of \$300,000 per year throughout the proposed plan. Note also that there is now a multidepartmental Facilities Fund that went through \$1.6 million in 2019. Could someone explain whether the detail list is expected to be just a list, or a plan?**

The list is considered a plan as it helps City staff prioritize and prepare to address the included items.

- 12. Which projects would use the bonding authority, which the cash line item and which the Facilities Fund? Then explain what staff expects our funding and project system to be in 2026 and on?**

Cash funding in CIP is only available if the general fund has sufficient funds at year-end. Staff works with finance to discuss what cash funding is available and develops projects accordingly. Staff has requested that the full list of cash projects be included in the authorization to issue bonds so that the City has the ability to access interim financing that would ultimately be paid off with cash. This is consistent with our normal approach that allows funding to occur in the most appropriate method.

- 13. Does the staff have recommendations for what the Council can do to make sure the proposed transition from bonding to cash can happen smoothly?**

As discussed previously, the current operating budget does not have the capacity to support a transition to utilizing cash rather than borrowing to fund essential capital infrastructure needs. If the Governing Body wants to make this transition to cash, revenues will need to be increased and/or expenditure

reductions will need to be approved. The climate continues to be favorable for debt issuance, particularly as it relates to long-term borrowing costs and maintaining inter-generational equity.

### **Fleet**

#### **14. Fleet Fund Can I ask which departments are partnering in this fund now, and whether it is expected to meet the needs of this departments?**

The Fleet Replacement Fund is still in the beginning stages of being able to fully fund fleet needs. Additional financial resources from the Operating Funds will need to be appropriated for this purpose for a full conversion to occur. The current operating budget does not have the capacity to fully fund the Fleet Fund. If the Governing Body wants to make this transition, operating revenues will need to be increased and/or operating expenditure reductions will need to be approved.

The following departments are currently participating with 100% of their fleet assets:

- City Manager Office
- Development Services
- Communications
- Facility Operations
- TSG
- IT
- Fleet Services

Two other departments are participating with a portion of their assets:

- Fire Department\* (27 fleet assets)
- Public Works ( 4 fleet assets)

Four departments not currently participating with any assets:

- Zoo
- Neighborhood Relations
- Utilities\*
- Police Department\*

*\*Fire Apparatuses, Utilities, and Police Department Fleet Replacement are separate items within the CIP (801020.01, 501072.00, 291101.00 & 801057.00)*

#### **15. Can I ask why participation in the Fleet Fund is voluntary, and where City Manager or staff expect to go with that?**

The initial funding for the Fleet Replacement Fund was limited to a one-year transfer of \$600,000 from the year-end general operating surplus in December of 2016 and \$300,000 from the Fleet Operating Reserve. This funding was used for initial purchases for departments that agreed to contribute annual operating funds to repay the replacement cost over the life of the asset. With the funding limitation, the involvement was optional and is intended as a proof of concept to support the CIP funding to take the replacement fund city-wide, excluding fire apparatuses, utilities, and PD, in 2024. Because of the funding limitations in 2018, the City Manager in chose to make participation optional.

**16. What is the vision of how the Fleet system will be working by, say, 2026?**

Ideally, the funding for Fleet Replacement would be provided through operating funds on an annual basis for all fleet assets except fire apparatus, Utilities, and PD. The initial total city-wide contribution was estimated at \$4.5 million annually (general fund & enterprise funds – excluding fire apparatus, Utilities, and PD). Departments would contribute their annualized share of replacement costs from their operating budget into the Fleet Replacement Fund. The Fleet Replacement Fund would be used to make purchases earlier in the asset replacement cycle, reducing repairs and increasing trade-in value.

**17. Public Works Fleet I mentioned at the 3-3 Council meeting that I hoped we could go back to the system Public Works (that could, to some extent, include some Utilities too) used to have whereby the department budgeted each year for snow removal events and on bad years spent it all on snow removal and on good years spent it on fleet replacement. Could staff react as to whether that system could work again to cover some of our needs?**

Staff is requesting the proposed funding program to better serve the community by having a reliable and available fleet. Pothole Patching, snow removal, tree trimming, and street repairs all require vehicles and equipment to perform the work. The department's ability to provide the expected City services is reduced when we have non-operational equipment.

Best practice for fleet replacement is to regularly budget and plan for replacement of vehicles and equipment needed to provide services. Similar to Fire and Police, Public Works is requesting a stable annual funding source to regularly replace the fleet. Current operating budgets are insufficient for initial capital purchases and ongoing replacement costs. The department has reduced non-personnel operating expenses each year for the past several years to maintain a balanced budget.

Public Works has requested General Obligation Funding to pay for the replacement of Public Works fleets assets which have a replacement cost greater than \$125,000 and support the services provided by the Forestry, Traffic, and Street Operations Divisions (TransOps).

**18. SORT/Neighborhood Initiatives No need to react to this one now. I have been wondering if it's not a good time to review and reinvent some of our approaches here, both to better deploy our funds as well as to enhance our results. I am floating some thoughts with individuals now, and will report more broadly if it seems appropriate.**

Staff will be reviewing SORT once the Housing Study is completed, and in conjunction with the update to DNR's 5 Year Consolidated Action Plan update to HUD. Staff will take suggestions provided by CCM Hiller to DNR on 3/10/2020 under advisement. Planning, Public Works and DNR will work together to consider any needed updates, revisions etc. to the program.

Any suggested revisions, etc., will be presented to the City Manager. Upon his approval that recommended changes be included in the proposed budget and 5 Year Consolidated Action Plan, they will be presented to the Governing Body.

## **Follow-up Questions on Previously Answered Questions re: Facilities 2020-2024 detail list (from CIP Supp #2) 3-12-2020 KAH**

**19. Understand conversation about backlog. Nonetheless, have an overall concern that most items in the detail list are maintenance and should NEVER be bonded. Concerned a bit further that last year staff asked for bonding for Facilities (new FIRM program) for catch-up only until 2024, then conversion to all cash at a substantially lesser amount, now staff is asking for the higher amount and bonding through 2025. Questions below have to do with specific line items and groups in the list.**

- a. Detail sheet vs. proposed CIP/CIB, Two line items – The proposed CIP/CIB totals \$1.65M/year for 2021-2023 and then \$2.3M/year for 2024 and 2025 in the GO Bond section. An additional \$300,000 per year each year is proposed in a later section for cash facilities expenses.**
- b. Detail Sheet Is this the staff's actual internal budget for the GO Bond line item? Or is it a wish list from which projects would be chosen by staff?**

Staff always intended to establish an ongoing program to deal with the decades of facility neglect and always intended to recommend that this program be funded with a combination of funding sources, including the issuance of bonds.

Appendix B of Supplemental 2 was previously provided and includes the detail plan of projects to be addressed through this funding source. The City maintains numerous buildings and facilities which require that the City use a mix of funding sources. Although the list of projects layout the priority projects, the program also provides flexibility to adjust projects, as critical repair needs arise.

**20. Facilities Cash line What was staff expecting the additional \$300,000 per year in the cash line would be used for?**

Cash funding in CIP is only available if the general fund has sufficient funds at year-end; this seems unlikely in 2020. Staff works with the Finance department to discuss what cash funding is available and develops projects accordingly. These funds would be used for maintenance and repair items for facilities if available.

**21. Zoo The detail sheet totals roughly \$1.65M all 5 years for various departments, then shows roughly \$625,000 per year additional for the Zoo. When staff was asked early on whether, if the Zoo privatization was to occur, if the Zoo items would be assumed by the Zoo separately, the answer was something like "quite possibly." Is the CIB being set up the first three years (the CIB) at only \$1.65M based on the assumption the Zoo will NOT be in?**

The CIP was developed with the possibility that the zoo would not be funded through this program in the first three years. However the last two years of the CIP were note reduced as the outcome of the zoo governance negotiations are unknown at this time and the out years are likely to change as 2024 & 2025 facility needs are developed.

**22. Zoo** It is interesting to note that over the past 10 years, with the exception of the major redo of the Tropical Rain Forest, capital projects for the Zoo have been regular, but have generally not totalled more than an average of \$200,000 per year. Did the average \$625,000 per year come from the Zoo's pencilling possible future independent budgets?

Please see page 12 of the CIP Second Supplemental for the itemized list of projects scheduled to occur at the zoo.

**23. Did Zoo staff or Finance staff really expect to fund this much to the Zoo vs. other needs at this time?**

Yes.

**24. Zoo** Are the \$615,500 in projects in the 2020 column of the detail sheet all under way now? Is there an expectation that all will be GO bonded?

These projects are in the planning phase, meaning project scope and specifications are underway for procurement this summer.

**25. Other 2020** Is everything else in the 2020 column actually happening in 2020?

Yes, staff is working on and planning for the listed items to address long standing building needs. However, if emergency repair or replacement needs were to occur, staff will need to evaluate the emergency needs against the existing plan.

**26. Is there an expectation that all will be GO bonded?**

The projects currently included under the bond funding category are expected to be funded with bonds. If other funding sources are located, City staff will utilize those funds over issuing bonds.. Actual bonding amount may be less, depending on project progress and actual bids. Staff works with the Finance Department to bond only what is needed for a given period within the authority granted by the Governing Body.

**27. Parking Garages** Roughly \$500,000 of the items on the detail list are for Parking garages. Aren't those supposed to be funded out of the Parking fund instead of General Fund?

Yes, these items will be funded from the Parking Fund.

**28. Water/Utility Buildings** \$200,000 for roof(s) at Water Production Building A are included in the detail list. Wouldn't these be paid for by the Water Utility?

Water Production Building A's roof is being paid for by the Water Utility Operating Budget for 2020.

**29. B Building, C Building, T Building and U Building** I have my City of Topeka Building Booklet that TSG prepared for Council in 12/17. What are these buildings? I don't find them.

These buildings are located in the Oakland WWTP.

**30. TPAC** \$458,000 in repairs for "TPAC" are budgeted for 2024, with an additional \$15,000 in 2021 and basement emergency light (replacement?) in 2020. TPAC is part of our City Hall building, and the part that it is in also houses our Municipal Court and Council Chambers.



**Functionally for TPAC and for the integrity of our structure, can items like the exterior waterproofing, roofing, capstone repair and roofing really wait until 2024?**

Yes.

- 31. LEC Over \$1M in repairs to the LEC are itemized in the detail sheet. Substantial amounts are in 2020, but an additional \$100,000 per year is budgeted thereafter. Since the Downtown TIF and Downtown Plan are now advancing, and the LEC site is one that is being identified for redevelopment, should we really be planning to invest this much in the building? Or...is this now being used as sort of a placeholder for relocation costs?**

This plan is not a placeholder but a list of needs that the LEC facility requires if we choose to remain in this building.

- 32. Impound Lot Pavement I see this is in an “out” year, which makes sense if the Impound Lot is relocated. Even so, isn’t this an expense that we sometimes do from the Law Enforcement Fund?**

The Law Enforcement Fund is intended to subsidize crime prevention activities including training, canine, and officer equipment and prevention programs. There are statutory restrictions on how the funds can be used.

- 33. Fire Station Remodels Should we really be doing any of these until the Fire Plan is done? Even aside from whether a station would be retained or closed, wouldn’t there be issues of what number and kind of vehicles and equipment and personnel need to be accommodated?**

These are active Facilities in need of repair, maintenance, and improvement. Staff is working with the Fire Department to ensure renovations are coordinated with future needs and responsive to current community planning efforts. For example, Station #11 is a priority for station renovation. Staff will replace roof, but hold off on any renovation of station pending outcome of current fire planning committee.

- 34. LED lighting changeouts These have been pending for 10 years. Good we have made progress on a number of buildings. There are lines for \$80,000 each at Holliday and LEC and some other smaller ones in the detail sheet. Can’t the new fixtures and/or bulbs simply be purchased in bulk and installed by our maintenance people? Either way, is it really appropriate to bond them? And, should we wait? The payback on these starts immediately.**

There is often design considerations due to the layout of the office or shop areas, and because of the quality of the output from the LED, i.e., the color, efficiency, and wavelength. Also, the voltage is a consideration and it is often too high for anyone other than a qualified electrician to safely work on.

- 35. Generators It looks like there are new emergency generators at \$40,000 apiece budgeted for each fire station. Do we really need them? Or, if we already have them, are these just replacements? Do they really cost \$40,000 each, or does this include installation too? Can’t we have our staff install them, especially if they are replacements? If there is installation involved, wouldn’t we be better off to buy them all at once, have them all the same, and have them all installed at once?**

These locations are for emergency personnel who need to have their facility operational 24/7/365. We do not have a sufficient number of staff to complete projects and maintain facilities. The current facilities staff work to keep buildings operational and we contract for most project work. Two replacements are generators that were used equipment and were retrofitted to serve the building. Not all locations will require the same size generator. Load requirements vary at each location and all this is engineered to size the generator to the building. Staff have estimated the cost at \$40,000 each, but actual cost will vary by station needs and location.

**36. Emergency Lights \$3500-4000 for each building? Really? Same questions as Generators above. Can't imagine bonding them. These arguably don't meet our capital project or bonding thresholds.**

Where reasonable, this work is expected to be included with other building work such as LEDs, emergency generators or other electrical work. Combining these small projects help reduce overall expense, because work requires similar trades. Costs are estimate and reflect the need for new circuits from the service panel to the various locations and some of these are through block walls.

**37. Smoke Detectors \$3500 a building? Assume these are hard-wired? Don't we already have them? Same questions and comments as above.**

Building maintenance, including safety enhancements like smoke detector replacement and/or installation, continue to be a priority. Cost estimates reflect the need for new circuits being pulled from the panel at the various locations and some of these are through block walls. These detectors must also be connected to a monitoring system once they are installed.

**38. Hot Water Tank \$3500-4000 each? Really?? Same questions and comments as above.**

Cost are estimates and reflect size and plumbing needed in an institutional building. This work would likely be included with other building work.

**39. Holliday \$600,000 is needed for carpeting and flooring replacement for Holliday? Why flooring replacement??**

- a. **Carpet** In addition to somewhere between \$200-400,000 in carpet for Holliday (above), LEC is also budgeted for over \$100,000 in carpeting. We do not allow carpet to be considered a permanent fixture in any of the programs we manage for others. We would really bond? For 15 years?

All of the carpet is at least 15 years old and needs to be replaced. Since our typical GO bonding period is 15 years, the estimated cost of this project is consistent with the City's Debt and Capital policies

**40. City Court Steps This shows for \$15,000 in 2020. Weren't these finished last year? What is this?**

These steps are the interior steps. Last year, only repairs to the stair treads were made.

**41. City Hall Front Steps While we're talking about steps, staff assured us last year when we were talking about City Hall funding that there was enough money left in another project to do needed repairs to the City Hall front steps area. Nothing has happened yet. Are those funds still there? Will that project happen in 2020?**

The project is currently being designed by Schwerdt Design Group.

**42. Rest of City Hall Renovations Budget** In 2019, staff was proposing a multi-million dollar three-phase total renovation for City Hall. That was cut back to something like \$8 million (right?). Discussion was to push back Phases 2 and 3 to out years....but they do not appear at all in the 2021-2030 proposal. Staff's vision for the out-years? Staff's current recommendation for Phase 1? (This has not yet been approved by Council...probably should be).

Given other building needs, staff has not proposed a separate future project for City Hall at this time.

### **3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Financials – Samples from Listed Projects**

I looked at these to see if we are overloading our staff, whether we should address management and/or take a break. This is a random sample, not from the entire reports.

**43. Sales Tax Projects** – Looking at both COT 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Financial Report p. 57-58 and 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Report p. 57. Great to see that many projects came in under budget. In one-only projects, that is a good thing. But in projects such as ADA ramps, curb and gutter and alleys, it means we failed to do as much as we had hoped. It looks like, in the project closings, over \$500,000 went unspent. What happens to this money budget-wise in the department? Does it get carried forward for that purpose, or just get released back in to “the pot?”

In regards to programs, the accounting system typically separates programs by year of funding approved. However, they are not closed out annually as projects within programs may cross multiple fiscal years. Annual programs are typically closed out in the financial system when the funding is exhausted.

**44. 841056.00 et seq – 5/1/2018 Sales Tax, Mixed** Please explain the progression from the 3<sup>rd</sup> Qtr to 4<sup>th</sup> Qtr reports, what happened to the two projects that were cancelled and how 84156.08 could be in Design at the end of 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter and Completed by the end of 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter.

This project (841056.08) was the wheel path milling/overlay of SW 29<sup>th</sup> Street between Wanamaker and Arrowhead. The work was designed in-house and completed in approximately 2 days during Q4. The following 2 weeks under project 841056.10 the same strip approach was used on SW Gage between Emland and 6<sup>th</sup>. Our contractor milled the failed areas and Street Operations placed the asphalt.

The two projects showing as cancelled - 841056.06 and 841056.07 - were actually completed using other project numbers. Those projects were:

- 17<sup>th</sup> Street Mill/Overlay from MacVicar to Fairlawn – 841048.06
- Burlingame from 29<sup>th</sup> Street to 37<sup>th</sup> Street – 841048.07

45. **841040.00 - 3/17/15 Sales Tax Clarion** We spent \$4.6 million redoing streets and curb and gutter in Clarion Woods? We knew that it was bad concrete...but...this much? Wasn't this mostly done a few years ago? When? Isn't it finished? Why is it still marked Construction? Are there any temp notes on this? Or strictly cash?

The Clarion Woods Project (841040.15) was a complete reconstruction of all pavement, curb/gutter and ramps. Any work done previously only delayed the inevitable reconstruction. The project was completed in 2 phases starting in 2018 and reaching substantial completion in late November of 2019. The status is still showing as "construction" because the contractor has Phase 1 warranty work to complete as well as the punch list of work items from Phase 2. This was a city wide sales tax project for all street work however water and storm improvements were funded by utilities.

46. **841055.01 10/21/19 Sales Tax, alley, a sub of 841055.00 2019 Citywide Alley Repair 5/1/18** This one does not even appear on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter financials. Then, with a \$65,000 budget and without any expenses posted, is marked Closing. Story?? No other projects display from the \$250,000 originally allocated to 2019 alleys. Plan?

As originally designed by Bartlett & West (same time as KS Ave between 6<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> was designed), the Secretary of State alley was estimated to cost \$400,000 which would have used two years' worth of alley repair funding. In order to improve the condition and meet the state's request, staff developed an interim approach. The approach used was a "bare-bones" mill/overlay of the existing surface. This project and cost (\$53K) was added to the to the Oakland mill/overlay project – 841056.05.

Most of the 841055.00, 2019 alley budget, was used to complete a combination of alley projects from previous years, planned improvements, the Old Town Team Up to Clean Up and an unexpected urban redevelopment opportunity. This combination of projects included:

- 1400 block between Quincy and Kansas (previous year project)
- 1200 block between Polk and Tyler (previous year project)
- 35 alley approaches in Old Town neighborhood (Team up to Clean up)
- 100 block between Quinton and Kendall (planned improvements)
- Alley between Crane and 1<sup>st</sup> Street between Kansas and Jackson (urban redevelopment)

There is a small amount of funding remaining in both the 2017 alley budget and in the 2019 alley budget. These funds are tentatively planned for use in construction of approx. 15 alley approaches in the Watson/Saline area later this year (in conjunction with a mill/overlay program within the same area).

47. **241034.00 4/19/16 GOB 2017 Citywide Infill Sidewalks** Still says Construction, though 356,000 of 435,000 has been spent. Has this been bonded in full? If so, when? Temp noted instead? If so, what is the history on the temp notes?

We are using the remaining 2017 infill funding to help cover costs associated with the infill project along Topeka Blvd between 29<sup>th</sup> and 37<sup>th</sup>. This project was bonded in full as it is considered a program and with the needs in the community would be fully utilized. Temporary notes were not issued for this project.