

Sarah Kane

From: Debra Unger on behalf of Darin Atteberry
Sent: Tuesday, April 16, 2013 11:57 AM
To: Ross Cunniff
Cc: Darin Atteberry; Diane Jones; Michelle Provaznik; Ellen Switzer; Dennis Sumner; Steve Catanach; Tom Vosburg; Brian Janonis; Robin Pierce; Joe Olson; Karen Cumbo; Mark Jackson; Polly Bennett; Kelly DiMartino; Mike Beckstead; Molly North; Marty Heffernan; Ken Mannon; Wendy Williams; Sarah Kane; City Council
Subject: RE: Questions on Tuesday Agenda items (Council SAR #22092) - Agenda Items 10, 11, 12, 17
Categories: Timely or Council Packet Item

Ross,

Please see staff's response below re: your questions about Items 10, 11, 12 and 17 on tonight's Council agenda:

- 1. Item #10, appropriating prior-year reserves – sub item 14 here is “install new logos” - do we have an accounting of how much has been spent so far on the logo program, and an estimate of how much is remaining to do? Is this the last item, or will there be more?**

Staff is compiling this information but, unfortunately, will not have it available for tonight's meeting. A response will be forthcoming.

- 2. Also item #10 - sub item 15 is, “Gardens on Spring Creek improvements” (specifically, ADA improvements) - have the ADA requirements changed since the lobby was built, or did we miss something when it was designed? If we missed something - have we missed it at other facilities, and are we taking corrective action to make sure we don't miss it again in the future?**

Response from Michelle Provaznik, Director, The Gardens on Spring Creek:

The Gardens were built in 2002 in accordance with the ADA standards that were in place at that time. The ADA standards, ANSI A117.1, were updated in 2003 and the City adopted them after that. There was not a requirement as part of this update that existing buildings be reconfigured to meet the standard; it remained that the building had to meet the standard that was in place based on original construction unless renovations were executed. When The Gardens decided to renovate the front counter to improve customer service, the requirement to meet the current ADA standard was triggered.

- 3. Item #11 - “Traffic system... in the vicinity of Lemay, Riverside, and Mulberry” - what are the considerations for pedestrian and bike signaling that go along with this? Will the signals be “bike-friendly” and “pedestrian-friendly”? Seems to me it would be cheaper to do it right the first time rather than go back and redo it...**

Response from Joe Olson, Traffic Engineer:

Bicyclists and pedestrians will be considered directly in the timing algorithms that are implemented as part of this project. Timings will be set to minimize delays for all users and to ensure adequate time for both bikes and pedestrians to cross at intersections. Given that everyone is impacted by the trains, it is our expectation that this project will provide benefits to all travel modes.

- 4. Item #12, unanticipated grant revenues in the Light & Power fund - I assume that this has no impact to cost of service for customers or any other impacts on the operating funds of L&P (the item does not specifically say**

so).

Response from Ellen Switzer, Utilities Financial Operations Manager:

The acceptance of the grant does not require additional staffing or have other cost impacts on Light and Power operating funds or the electric cost of service. Of the \$845,232 total appropriation, \$472,823 appropriates existing support donations from the DDA and Community Foundation, both of which provided matching funds supporting the original scope of the RDSI Cooperative Study with Department of Energy (DOE). There is no added scope or City expense related to this portion of the appropriation.

The appropriation of the \$372,500 Department of Energy Grant is for added scope of work to the project. This added scope is matched with 50% local support. Participants in this second phase are all meeting the 50% matching requirement.

For the City, all out-of-pocket project hard costs are being covered by DOE funding. The City's matching donation is being met by the use of existing personnel (with fully loaded labor costs) for work on the project. No new personnel costs or other out-of-pocket expenses will be incurred by Light and Power as a result of the grant appropriation.

5. Item #17, IGA for the USA Pro Challenge bike race - what, exactly, are the \$50,000 of in-kind expenditures going to be? Is \$50K the cap?

Response from Kelly DiMartino, Assistant to the City Manager:

Exact costs are hard to determine at this point, mainly because our law enforcement and public works expenses are still being developed. However, the primary categories for in-kind expenses will be as follows:

Law Enforcement: Police Services will assist with traffic enforcement and safety along the route, as well as provide security at the Finish Festival in Downtown Fort Collins.

Streets & Traffic: Assist with road closures, detour routes and temporary signage.

Parking: The host City is responsible for securing and covering costs associated with all parking needs; this could include use of the garage or additional parking enforcement for the day, as well as set-up of a large secured area for bike parking.

Parks: Support for festival set-up and clean-up.

Exact amounts for each service will be determined as the event details and budget are finalized.

The IGA does allow the partners to consider additional in-kind contributions, but only after exhausting all options to cut spending or solicit additional private funds.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Debra Unger

Executive Administrative Assistant
City Manager's Office
(970) 221-6266

[Click here to Tell me about my service...I want to know!](#)

From: Ross Cunniff
Sent: Sunday, April 14, 2013 8:31 PM
To: Darin Atteberry
Subject: Questions on Tuesday agenda items (Council SAR #22092)

Darin,

I've finished going through my packet, and I have questions on several of the items on Consent:

1. Item #10, appropriating prior-year reserves - subitem 14 here is "install new logos" - do we have an accounting of how much has been spent so far on the logo program, and an estimate of how much is remaining to do? Is this the last item, or will there be more?
2. Also item #10 - subitem 15 is, "Gardens on Spring Creek improvements" (specifically, ADA improvements) - have the ADA requirements changed since the lobby was built, or did we miss something when it was designed? If we missed something - have we missed it at other facilities, and are we taking corrective action to make sure we don't miss it again in the future?
3. Item #11 - "Traffic system... in the vicinity of Lemay, Riverside, and Mulberry" - what are the considerations for pedestrian and bike signaling that go along with this? Will the signals be "bike-friendly" and "pedestrian-friendly"? Seems to me it would be cheaper to do it right the first time rather than go back and redo it...
4. Item #12, unanticipated grant revenues in the Light & Power fund - I assume that this has no impact to cost of service for customers or any other impacts on the operating funds of L&P (the item does not specifically say so)
5. Item #17, IGA for the USA Pro Challenge bike race - what, exactly, are the \$50,000 of in-kind expenditures going to be? Is \$50K the cap?

I probably won't pull any of these, but may address them in Consent Followup if I can get answers before Tuesday night.

Thanks,
Ross