

**FACILITIES, PUBLIC WORKS, AND INFRASTRUCTURE
STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING
TEMPLE CITY, CALIFORNIA**

MEETING MINUTES

JUNE 2, 2017

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Pro Tem Man called the Facilities, Public Works, and Infrastructure Standing Committee meeting to order at 11:08 a.m.

2. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Councilmember – Man and Yu

ABSENT: Councilmember – None

ALSO PRESENT: Community Development Director Michael Forbes, City Engineer Ali Cayir

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS – None

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Condition Assessment Report of Temple City Sewer System

The Los Angeles County Sewer Maintenance District recently completed a comprehensive assessment of the maintenance and structural condition of Temple City's sewer mainlines.

Mr. Forbes presented a report providing a summary of the District's assessment and the actions taken to address issues that were identified in the assessment.

Mr. Yu noted that the maintenance district pays for ongoing maintenance and repairs but not system replacement or upgrades, and inquired when the city would need to begin setting aside funds to plan for system replacement.

Mr. Cayir replied that the City's sewer master plan has a prioritized list of areas that are deficient in capacity. The highest priority areas on Rosemead Blvd. and Longden Ave were already replaced.

Mr. Yu requested that staff return with additional analysis of the sewer master plan's recommendations regarding system replacement and upgrades, and recommendations for funding sources for such work.

B. Crosswalk at the Intersection of Temple City Boulevard and Workman Avenue

Temple City Boulevard will be resurfaced this summer as part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program project.

Mr. Forbes presented this item, stating that the City is currently reviewing the unprotected crosswalk that crosses Temple City Boulevard at the north leg of the intersection of Temple City Boulevard and Workman Avenue to determine if the crosswalk should be modified or removed in conjunction with the resurfacing.

Mr. Yu expressed his concern that the City is in the process of building a new parking lot at that intersection, encouraging people to park there and walk throughout the downtown. Removing the crosswalk would remove the ability for people to cross at that intersection.

Mr. Forbes noted that it would still be legal for pedestrians to cross at the intersection without a marked crosswalk. The concern is that marked crosswalks at uncontrolled intersections can provide a false sense of safety for pedestrians. Mr. Forbes noted that if the crosswalk remains, it may be necessary to install additional warning systems such as a High-Intensity Activated Crosswalk (HAWK) beacon with an estimated cost of \$250,000.

Mr. Yu stated that removing the crosswalk would reduce the walkability of the downtown area and would be contrary to the City's economic development and downtown enhancement objectives.

Mr. Man agreed and said that removing the crosswalk would be contrary to the goal of downtown revitalization.

Mr. Cayir recommended that the crosswalk be left as-is for now, and that the need for additional warning systems be reevaluated at a later time. Mr. Man and Mr. Yu concurred with this recommendation.

Mr. Yu requested that the City conduct a pedestrian count of people using the crosswalk after the new parking lot opens to see if use of the crosswalk increases.

C. Update to Pavement Management Program Report

During discussion about the Fiscal Year 2017-18 street resurfacing project at the City Council meeting of April 18, 2017, the City Council requested that staff initiate the process of updating the 2013 Pavement Management Program report.

The report serves as a planning document for prioritizing and funding street resurfacing projects.

Mr. Forbes and Mr. Cayir presented the item and stated that the City intends to issue a Request for Proposals from consultants to update the report.

Responding to Mr. Yu, Mr. Cayir noted that the report should generally be updated every three years. He described the update process, which involves a windshield survey of street conditions.

Responding to Mr. Man, Mr. Cayir explained the process for determining what type of resurfacing is appropriate, starting with review of the as-built street plans.

Mr. Man explained his concerns with the City's current pavement report, including its use of the Army Corps of Engineers rating system, as opposed to a locally developed rating system. He noted that the Army Corps system suggests that streets are in better condition than they actually are.

Mr. Man further stated that he believes the report is narrow and conventional in its recommendations and lacks a strategy. The report should be expanded to provide different strategies depending upon the amount of funding available.

Mr. Yu noted that when the report was prepared, it was a new concept for the City Council and community, and there was no political will to explore funding strategies for street resurfacing. He believes that the report should be updated to reflect the potential opportunities for new funding sources.

Mr. Man stated that he is satisfied with the street resurfacing that has been completed so far, but he believes that the current report does not accurately reflect street conditions. He said that the City needs to educate residents that the roads are not in as good a condition as the report suggests. The report needs to be updated to show residents that the streets are in poor condition to justify a new property assessment for pavement maintenance.

Mr. Yu asked how much it would cost to update the report, and wondered whether it would be more cost effective to have Transtech perform the update rather than issuing a Request for Proposals and hiring another firm. Mr. Forbes and Mr. Cayir answered that they would need to evaluate whether that would be the most effective option.

Responding to Mr. Man, Mr. Cayir said that Transtech is capable of updating the report, but they do not typically do that type of work because there are other companies that specialize in such reports.

Mr. Man stated that he was not looking for a report that would require substantial effort or cost, such as pavement testing; he is looking for a report that will provide different strategy options depending upon the City's goals and available funding. He also noted that the updated report will need to account for those streets that have been resurfaced over the past few years since the original report was prepared.

Mr. Yu requested that staff bring back information about funding mechanisms that other cities use for pavement management. He also requested information about Measure R and Measure M funds and the City's revenue projections from those funding sources.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12 p.m.

The next committee meeting will be scheduled on a date to be determined in July to further discuss the Pavement Management Program report.

Another committee meeting will be scheduled on a date to be determined in early September to discuss sewer system replacement and funding.