

**Minutes
Committee of the Whole
August 28, 2023**

The Committee of the Whole met on August 28, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. in the Conference Room at the City Building. The meeting was called to order at 6:10 p.m. by Mayor Melissa Monich. Attendance was as follows:

Council Members:

Dan Driehaus
Grant Hoffman
Melissa Monich
April Robles
Sarah Stankorb Taylor
Jodi Woffington
Chris Woodside

Discussion of Proposed Capital Improvement Projects and Funding

Mr. Herzog introduced the current ideas for the 5-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) list that the City's Charter requires to be passed each year. This list as it currently stands is a draft version for Council to review. Our hope is to gather input from Council as to the priorities of these projects and any other projects Council may identify. The draft version of the CIP list is included as an attachment to these minutes. The list is a 5-year outlook, but Council will set funding for the upcoming year's projects. The color coding indicated on the sheet represents streets in green, water projects in blue, miscellaneous improvements in grey, and recreation projects in pink. The idea of this list is to inform everyone of the projects that need to be completed in the future so informed decisions can be made when setting priorities. Mr. Herzog asked Council to review the proposed list of projects and provide feedback at the next Committee of the Whole meeting as to which projects they feel should be funded and if applicable, in what year.

Mr. Herzog reminded Council that a decision will not need to be made this evening on what CIP projects to fund or not. At next month's meeting, more in-depth information will be provided for the Members to make a more informed and comfortable recommendation. He asked Council to note the list of projects labeled as alternatives for 2024. There currently is approximately \$361,000 in cash available that could fund one or more of the alternative projects without the need for a grant or loan.

Mr. Herzog also discussed the addition of a \$3M project to expand the Public Safety Building. This project would allow for overnight sleeping quarters and enhanced shared services between the police and fire department. This project is listed as an out-year project because the City would seek grant funding for this project.

Ms. Stankorb Taylor asked if Wyoming Community Foundation funds can be used to finance any CIP projects. Mr. Herzog explained that Foundation funds are generally used for recreation type projects such as the playground improvements and the baby pool features that are on the CIP list. He further explained that having a set and approved CIP list of projects keeps us focused on applying for and/or receiving the grants that we want. We do not want to apply for a grant just to apply for it. It would need to be something that can be used to help offset the cost of a CIP project.

Mr. Rob Nicolls, Public Works Director, reviewed the Streets and Roads Proposed Plan/Policy. He explained that the City hired a pavement consultant to perform a pavement inspection in April 2022. This inspection analyzes the pavements on all streets and provides a "Pavement Condition Index" (PCI) and assigns each street a value of 1 to 100, with 100 being brand new pavement. Residents typically start expressing concern when their street drops below a PCI of 55. Industry standards indicate keeping collector streets above 70 and local streets above 60.

Mr. Nicolls explained the industry standard treatments for the reconstruction of roadways which may include one or more methods such as a full depth asphalt replacement, full depth reclamation, mill and overlay, chip seal/surface treatments, and crack sealing. The Public Works Department performs crack sealing on an annual basis which prevents water from infiltrating the pavement base which then freezes/thaws and heaves the pavement, leading to potholes, etc.

Mr. Nicolls shared a spreadsheet showing the ranking, PCI number, priority rating, and potential reconstruction cost for every public street in the City. He explained the ranking system he applied to each street and using a PCI score of 61 as the City's average, which is considered fair, if the City were to reconstruct all streets with a PCI rating of 67 or less, the cost would be approximately \$37M. This would cover approximately 90 of the 123 streets. The estimated cost includes the design and construction engineering of which the City's portion to pay is 11%. The City pays 8% of the design, and 3% for the construction engineering, which is the field work and inspections. He has added the 11% to the construction cost estimates and included curbs but not sidewalks, only handicap ramps where needed.

Additionally, \$8.2M would be needed to cover the water work replacements on 14 of these 90 streets. Approximately 27% of the City's water mains are more than 100 years old. They have lived their useful lives, but their replacements are not factored into the estimates. Mr. Nicolls reviewed areas where potential savings could be obtained. He also explained the different types of curbs and how they are typically constructed and explained how savings could be achieved if a different type of curb is poured.

Discussion was held regarding the potential work that would be involved in the Mt. Pleasant reconstruction. This work will take some time to complete as it would not only involve the reconstruction of the street but also water work and the relocation of the gas and electric utilities as well. Additionally, there are storm drainage issues on the east end of the street and there is the potential that the road may need to be lowered. That is why this project is estimated at \$5.5M and is considered an immediate need. For comparison, the neighborhoods of Poage Farm, Compton Hills, and Whitthorne would be grouped together for water work replacement and full depth road reclamation at \$2.8M.

Mr. Nicolls explained that the data on the spreadsheet presented is not set in stone but gives Council some way to quantify which streets we should do first.

Mr. Herzog reviewed various funding scenarios and reiterated that the City does not have \$25-30M in the bank to replace every street, it would take a long time to raise that level of revenue to pay for every street to be worked on in the City. The scenarios will help Council decide how we want to move forward and how quickly we want to get the streets done.

Several scenarios are possible including one or the combination of tools such as OPWC loans which currently would only allow us to reconstruct Reily, Mt. Pleasant, Oliver, and Wyoming. Also, keeping the City's debt at current levels and retiring \$13M in general obligation debt in combination with OPWC loads, could potentially allow us to reconstruct up to 40 streets which could take upwards of 10 years to complete. Mr. Herzog explained the process of how debt gets paid off and new debt comes on for capital projects and how the City has used its funding sources in the past. The last funding tool to consider is a property tax levy and it was noted that the City has not asked for a property tax levy before, only the school district has utilized a levy for funding. For comparison, a 4.5 mill levy would provide approximately \$24.6M in revenue over 20 years, which could pave 90 streets and water work on 14 of those 90 streets. A 2.25 mill levy would provide approximately \$12.3M and could pave 37 streets.

Mr. Caudill explained the Hamilton County Auditor's methodology of market value and assessed the value it places on all homes in Hamilton County and how the millage gets calculated to determine how much a levy could cost a homeowner. The Auditor shares these methodologies and explains them in further detail on their website.

Discussion was held regarding communication to the public to explain how their tax dollars are used and why we can currently only rehab 1-2 streets per year. Many residents are not aware that the majority of the taxes they pay by living here go to the school system. If a property tax levy were to be pursued, it would likely be timed around the school's potential levy rather than trying to have them both on an election ballot at the same time.

Mr. Herzog explained that he cannot tell Council which option is best, it is ultimately a question for the people that have to live on the streets and drive on them, what they are willing to pay to keep them in good shape. There are also many people that are simply tapped out on how much they can spend or how much they are paying in taxes.

Mr. Woodside commented that in the school discussion sessions that he sat in on there were many people that did not want to be asked to help solve a little bit of the issues, but rather they just wanted to know the whole thing, the whole need to solve the problem because they didn't want the needs to keep hanging over their heads. At this same time, there are always going to be people that are split and divided among how they prefer to have their money spent. Property values are being increased, the school system may potentially be asking for a levy, and the City has been operating on its existing revenues for a very long time.

Mr. Driehaus asked clarification if a levy was approved would we be able to seek out grant dollars throughout the process on the same projects or if it forfeits the opportunity to get matching grants on the construction projects. Mr. Nicolls explained that not all streets will be grant eligible and we would not include those that are grant eligible into the tax revenues until we are issued the grant funding.

Mr. Hoffman stated that he favors asking for a levy but part of him wants to 'rip off the band aid' and get everything fixed at once although not everything will be able to be fixed at one time. He questioned if the City can do 10 streets a year, will it be 9 years to get through all 90 streets? Mr. Nicolls explained that he would group similar streets together that may just need resurfacing verses a street that might need full depth replacement with water work and so it is tough to say how many streets can be done in one year because many times, construction starts in the spring, and they all begin with curb replacements that can take all summer to do. Street paving typically happens in November which is not safe due to the temperatures. He has been trying lately to get curb work done a year in advance on 10-15 streets and then the next year, the road gets paved.

Mr. Hoffman suggested that if a levy is the path Council chooses to take, he suggests that we over-communicate everything we are trying to accomplish, such as, title things as roads and road problems, rather than using a term such as infrastructure. We would want to have residents a part in the decision-making process.

Mayor Monich asked clarification if income tax revenue is built into any of the scenarios and is it assumed that this revenue will remain flat. Mr. Herzog commented that it is anticipated that the current income tax revenues will be able to continue to fund the equipment fund which is important because equipment has become very expensive and being able to pay cash for our equipment is a huge benefit. He added that he would like to have the equipment replacement fund fully funded by next year and after that, it will take

approximately \$450,000 a year at current replacement costs to keep it fully funded. If we assume that the income tax revenues stay static and the property tax stays where it is, there should be approximately \$800,000 at the end of each year. This revenue could then be used potentially for other road projects or other capital projects. Mr. Caudill explained that we also do not want to tap out our borrowing capacity, you want to have some capacity available in case an emergency happens, and we need to borrow money for something. This is why he recommends we keep the debt level low and to not go above where we currently are. The payment is manageable and leaves room to borrow money for something else if needed.

Mr. Driehaus commented that as a community, it is almost indisputable that the schools are the anchor for the community and in them asking for a tax levy, no matter what it might be for, is going to be a big subject. When it comes to other levies, it would be a shame to have us competing for dollars with different departments. If there is an opportunity to marry public safety and roads, he asked if this is something that is feasible or perhaps has another smaller city like ours done something similar. Mr. Herzog explained that if a levy is passed for streets and road repairs, then that is what the revenue must be used for. Mr. Driehaus asked if it could be referred to as an Infrastructure Levy. Mr. Herzog explained that the broader you make the ask, or the more flexibility to give to the government, in general, the less people may be willing to be on board. However, it is possible to indicate that, using a 5-mill levy as an example, you could offer that 4-1/2 mills would be for roads and a half mill would be for public safety. Residents may not have an appetite for this type of split/share levy.

Ms. Woffington commented that it may take 4-5 years to get 40 streets done but that still leaves many streets still needing to be done and she questioned if a combination of funding resources could be used. Various potential financing scenarios were discussed. Ms. Stankorb Taylor commented that the school district, if they propose to ask for a levy, will be in the spring 2024 election. If the City were to also ask for a levy, would it be prudent to aim for the November election, to take advantage of it being a presidential election with an anticipated high voter turnout.

Mr. Hoffman asked how a levy works, how a levy gets put on a ballot. Mr. Caudill stated that there are paperwork filing deadlines which we will have to research, and we would work with the County to help identify the specific millage amount to request, they will be able to clarify approximately how many mills would generate a specific revenue amount. They will also do calculations taking into account other County levies, school levies, libraries, etc. to be sure that there would not be any overlapping debt.

Ms. Robles stated that she would be in favor of doing more research on how a shared levy might look like for public safety and streets because we must look at it as a way of investing in the infrastructure and future of Wyoming. Mr. Hoffman commented that he

would rather see us do this right and do it one time. Ms. Woffington expressed concern that practically, when we talk about working on 90 streets in a 10-year timeline, there will be residents moving in and out of the City during that time and some will still be asking how long it will be until their street gets done. There will be people who say they paid for or have been paying on this levy for 10 years, and their street has not been done. She is unsure if there is a solution to that now, but the optics of the time horizon are something Council should consider.

Mr. Woodside speculated that we would be able to pinpoint a year for a resident to know when their street would be done. It will not be a matter of if you are on a list but rather you are on a list and here is where you are on that list. For clarification, Mr. Herzog commented that he is regularly asked by residents where their street is on the list, and there is no list.

Mr. Driehaus commented that he would like to know more or learn more about what other cities that are older or small like ours have done with infrastructure and how they have funded streets and roads, and similar projects such as Hamilton, Middletown, or some of the smaller jurisdictions in Columbus.

Mr. Nicolls commented that just before he left Middletown, they had put a levy on the ballot that they thought would not pass and it did pass and generated approximately \$32M that covered paving of all streets within two years. They are currently in year three and are almost finished. During the buildup process, Middletown had shared a similar map showing the streets and showed where the work was currently being done, what is up next, etc., and they were determining how often updates should be shared with the community, rather it was quarterly or monthly or more frequently, but the city had planned out those types of methodologies before it moved forward with the construction process.

Ms. Robles commented that it would be helpful to do something similar to what Middletown did and added that because of the proposed changes with taxing and the housing market values, the City should put out information and break down how the City, county, and school taxes are used to educate people on it. There are many misconceptions among Wyoming residents on what their taxes pay for. In the long run, more education behind the use of City monies that come in would be helpful.

Mr. Herzog commented that Council has been presented with a lot of information this evening. He asked that they take the information received and digest it over the next month and be prepared to discuss it in depth at the next Committee of the Whole meeting. Discussion was held regarding the next meeting as it falls on the Yom Kippur holiday and there is no school. Therefore, the next meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 26.

Adjourn

With no further business before the Committee, Ms. Woffington moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Robles seconded the motion. By voice vote, all voted yes, the motion to adjourn carried with all voting yes. The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Debby Martin, Executive Assistant

Melissa Monich, Mayor

Summary of 2024-2028 Capital Improvement Projects

PROGRAM PROJECT	2024	2024 Alt	2025	2026	2027	2028	Out year	Project Cost
<i>Vermont Street Reconstruction with Watermain (budgeted 2023) Comp 2024</i>								\$0
<i>Oliver Rd Reconstruction</i>	\$1,159,000							\$1,159,000
<i>Reily Rd Reconstruction (Design)</i>	\$161,700		\$1,525,181					\$1,686,881
<i>Mt. Pleasant Reconstruction with Sidewalk (Portion of design)</i>	\$200,000		\$200,000	\$5,100,000				\$5,500,000
<i>See Street List</i>								\$0
<i>Hilltop Park Watermain Replacement</i>	\$200,000							\$200,000
<i>Reily Rd Water</i>			\$950,000					\$950,000
<i>Paint Water Tower</i>				\$350,000				\$350,000
<i>Sidewalk Replacement Program</i>		\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000		\$500,000
<i>Police Department Fence</i>		\$100,000						\$100,000
<i>Linden Ln Sidewalk Connection</i>		\$125,000						\$125,000
<i>Civic Center Stage Renovation</i>		\$20,000						\$20,000
<i>PSF Concrete Work</i>		\$45,000						\$45,000
<i>PSF Renovation Project (sleeping quarters shared space locker rooms kitchen)</i>							\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
<i>720 Oak/800 Oak Pocket Park Project</i>							\$109,000	\$109,000
<i>800 Lot Paving</i>							\$50,000	\$50,000
<i>Baby Pool Features</i>		\$30,000						\$30,000
<i>Tennis Court 5 (crack seal pickleball courts)</i>			\$10,000					\$10,000
<i>Grove Roofs - Dugouts, Shelter, Restroom</i>		\$13,200						\$13,200
<i>Oak Park Restroom Roof</i>		\$4,400						\$4,400
<i>Civic Center Bowling Alley Space Improvements</i>							\$510,000	\$510,000
<i>Chisholm Park Playground</i>							\$200,000	\$200,000
<i>Full Size Turf Field Replacement</i>							\$500,000	\$500,000
<i>Rec Center Playground and Picnic Area Improvement</i>							\$150,000	\$150,000
Total	\$1,720,700	\$437,600	\$2,785,181	\$5,550,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$4,519,000	\$14,053,481

FUNDING SOURCES	2024	2024 ALTs	2025	Total
<i>Cash (General Fund)</i>	\$361,700.00	\$437,600.00		\$799,300.00
<i>Cash (Streets and Roads Fund)</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
<i>OPWC Loan (0%)</i>	\$1,159,000.00	\$0.00		\$1,159,000.00
<i>Grants/Donations</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
<i>Cash (Water Fund)</i>	\$200,000.00	\$0.00		\$200,000.00
<i>Bonds</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00		\$0.00
Total	\$1,720,700.00	\$437,600.00	\$0.00	\$2,158,300.00

