

Message.

Subject: S. SHIELDS LANDSCAPING S.I.D.
Sender: Doug MARTINE / CFC/01

Dated: 06/01/87 at 1444.

Contents: 2.

Part 1.

TO: Mike HERZIG / CFC/01

CC: Al BOUSHEE / CFC/01
Bob KOST / CFC/01

Part 2.

I have some potentially serious concerns about the proposed Shields St. Landscaping S.I.D. The portion along Shields is in an area where we have an existing major duct bank (substation tie circuit). Precautions must be taken in this area to avoid damage to our facilities, as repairs could be quite expensive.

Now for the bad news. The installation of landscaping along otherwise undeveloped roads (Stuart & Hobbit Sts.) creates a significant deviation from established installation sequence procedures. In the past, for S.I.D.s, Light and Power has installed street crossings, at Utility expense, in an attempt to avoid future cutting of asphalt when actual development takes place (we have not charged the S.I.D.). If the crossing(s) installed later turn out to be inadequate, or at the wrong location, the developer would be responsible for costs incurred to provide the necessary facilities. Since a "landscaping S.I.D. installs plantings that are exactly where Light and Power facilities are to be placed, it will be necessary for us to install our system prior to the landscaping. This creates several problems. First, we will have to charge the S.I.D. for a portion of our "development charges". This charge is currently \$15.00 per lineal foot of property line adjacent to each side of the roadway. Additional normal "development charges", and "building site charges" will be charged to the developer(s), when development takes place. Secondly, we will need to install streetlights concurrently with our above mentioned system. These lights will not operate until development takes place since there will be no secondary (240 Volt) source available. There will be additional charges (approximately \$4000.00) to make secondary power available for the two sprinkler controls shown. Also, the trees to be installed should be a type that will not grow large enough to block the streetlights (mounted at a height of 33 ft.). The third problem is there is an increased possibility that the system we install (vaults and streetlights) may need to be relocated or augmented to meet the needs of the development. This would be at the developers expense, and can be quite costly.

Fort Collins Light and Power's system has been designed to provide an aesthetically pleasing, reliable electric system at a reasonable cost. This type of S.I.D. has the potential of forcing future system modifications, significantly increasing the final cost to the developer. For this reason, I believe that landscaping S.I.D.s should be discouraged, or not allowed. I am sure that PSCo and other utilities have similar problems with this, and at the very least, there should be a utility coordination meeting, including the party initiating the S.I.D.

Please keep me informed of the status of this project. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.

End of Item 1.

IN TRAY >

DATE: 6 May 87

DEPARTMENT: Eng

ITEM: 2-87B THE PULSE PUD, Phase 1 - FINAL

No Problems

Problems or Concerns (see below)

- Variance request for 25 MPH ~~design~~ ~~design~~ design speed on Stuart in the residential area is OK (including 50' tangent)
- Transition the collector to local cross section on Stuart east of the intersection (dwy.)
- Reduce the neck size of the Coromandel Circle cul-de-sac opening to Stuart by reducing the curb return radii. Try to attain a 36' opening.
- Need soil report for pavement design

Date 5/18/87

Signature M. Kerrig