

The questions and comments below were submitted prior to the Planning Commission review of the CIP by Commissioner Finnegan via email on Monday, February 21, 2022.

General questions (not specific to projects):

1. QUESTION:

The [HFD has raised concerns](#) about traffic-calming measures in the past (as it relates to response time). What is the current position of the HFD on traffic calming measures in neighborhoods to slow traffic and prevent pedestrian injuries and fatalities?

RESPONSE:

The HFD works closely with Public Works in evaluating traffic management systems. When indicated, we test systems to determine their potential impact on responses. We are always open to evaluating systems that assist in improving vehicle and pedestrian safety without adversely impacting the ability to fire apparatus to get to a call in a timely manner.

2. QUESTION:

Public Works: What is the average cost to install a speed hump (like the ones on Franklin St.)? Have the traffic-calming installations in the Sunset Heights neighborhood been successful in slowing traffic?

RESPONSE:

The average cost per speed cushion is approximately \$1,500 to \$2,000. We collected data in Sunset Heights before and after installation of the speed cushions and have seen a reduction in speeds along those segments of roadway.

3. QUESTION:

Public Works: There is an asphalt sidewalk in front of Bluestone Elementary school. Are asphalt sidewalks less expensive than concrete? Could asphalt sidewalks be a lower-cost option for future developments where sidewalks are required in order to lower construction and housing costs? Is this allowed in the City Code?

RESPONSE:

The asphalt sidewalk in front of Bluestone is actually a 10' Shared Use Path and the City standard for Shared Use Paths are asphalt. The City standard for sidewalks is concrete. We have this distinction to delineate between sidewalks and shared use paths. For sidewalks (5') concrete is more durable material and best suited for this use.

4. QUESTION:

Public Works: Are any of the projects in the CIP eligible for funding from recently-available federal infrastructure funds? If so, which projects?

RESPONSE:

Public Works is anticipating that the most likely scenario for accessing any of these funds would be through existing programs such as VDOT's Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), and Smart Scale. Because VDOT will be a recipient of funds that will be used to increase the allotments in these programs. We are still determining if other non-VDOT opportunities will be available to the City.

General Fund Questions and Comments:

5. QUESTION:

IT (IT-SP012) How many FOIA requests did Harrisonburg receive in 2021? Has there been an increase in volume in recent years?

RESPONSE:

It's tough to say whether there's been an increase. While we have certainly seen numerous requests about the Miller Circle explosion that have likely inflated the 2021 number, we've probably seen fewer about development due to the pandemic.

For 2021, the Director of Communications received at least 112 FOIA requests. However, this does not include any request for records that went straight to another department that was able to respond without involving the Director of Communications. HPD receives many of these requests, as does Community Development (who often informs the Director of Communications).

Of those 112 that were counted on March 1, 2022, only four or five required the Department of Information Technology to pull emails. Others were more simple requests that required departments to look through their own emails to find documents.

6. QUESTION:

Harrison House (MGR4) In 2018 [endochronological analysis revealed](#) that this was not in fact the Thomas Harrison house. What is the current plan and purpose for this project, given the inaccurate name?

RESPONSE:

City staff is currently working with the Margaret Grattan Weaver Foundation, Asbury United Methodist Church, and the Harrisonburg Rockingham Historical Society to perform renovations around this structure in order to showcase it to the public.

7. QUESTION:

Water Street Bridge (PWSTBG09) That bridge was recently closed (2020?) for repairs. Would making traffic flow only one way, like the rest of Water St reduce the need for replacement?

RESPONSE:

No.

8. COMMENT:

Reservoir St. sidewalk (PWSTP40) I'm disappointed to see that this is (again) not a higher priority with funding in the next few years. That area on the north side of Reservoir between MLK and Harrisonburg Crossing has heavy foot traffic, and no sidewalk. It is very unsafe for pedestrians.

RESPONSE:

Public Works is planning to submit for a VDOT Smart Scale grant to fund the construction of sidewalk from Harrisonburg Crossing to the railroad tracks at Dutch Mill Court. We agree that this is an important sidewalk connection and are working to find ways to fund its construction.

9. QUESTION:

Crosswalk signals (PWSTP51 & PWTELU04) Do all the new planned crosswalk signals feature "[beg buttons](#)?" Beg buttons prioritize cars over pedestrians, and I hope the city moves away from using them at most or all of our crosswalks.

RESPONSE:

All new and upgraded signals will be installed with pedestrian push buttons. The reason for this is that along some corridors in the City the pedestrian volume is not consistent enough to allow for the continued disruption in travel time for vehicles. However, at intersections where there are consistent pedestrian volumes, we program the signals to "rest in walk," which means that during certain times of day the pedestrian phase is used every cycle and a "call" or someone pushing the button is not required. These are items that our staff routinely evaluate and when we see the need to make timing plan changes, we do so.

10. QUESTION:

Westover Skate Park (P&R 22-4) Feedback I've heard from skaters in our community is that steel is not a good option for the park; that style of park is outdated, doesn't age well, and the surface is poor quality. Charlottesville and other skate parks are made of concrete, have no tall fences like the one at Westover, and seem to be more popular among the local/regional users. What sort of outreach has P&R done to solicit feedback from the local community members who frequent skate parks?

RESPONSE:

The Parks and Recreation Department has been asking for funding to fix the current skate park for years. The condition of the current skate park has reached a stage where it is deteriorating to the point where it has become dangerous. The entire structure of each feature is failing to the point where closures of the park have been necessary while many types of repairs have taken place. In fact, for the first time since opening, we have been forced to close the park in the winter months to try and preserve some longevity without having to close it permanently or be forced to remove some features altogether.

To this date, we haven't received funding to fix the current features that need fixed out of concern for user safety. After visiting with a nationally approved NRPA member and skate ramp manufacturer, they've recommended the steel features for skate parks similar to ours. The steel ramps are a go between for what we currently have now, which is considered the least desirable, to concrete which is the most desirable. The steel ramps are under warranty for 20 years, and are considered very good options for our size park and the number of users that we expect at the current park.

We have occasionally sought, and received, a lot of feedback and suggestions from many different residents and users of our current skate park. For the most part, when suggestions are brought up about how to change the park, we agree with them. When suggestions are brought up about what types of features to construct (I.E. Wood, Steel, Concrete), we also agree. However, and as an example, the Charlottesville skate park was constructed at a cost of over two million dollars. It is the best skate park in our region, and as well funded as that park was, it should be. We would love to have that skate park, and would love to have concrete. However, we have so many needs in the department that are in still need of funding, fixing our current skate park to an appropriate level seems the most prudent and logical step to take to make sure that residents have a skating option until a better, and more size appropriate, skate park can be funded and constructed.

We are working on an internal facilities plan for parks and recreation at the current time. Our thoughts to fix needs for skating in the city are to fix the current park, and its safety issues immediately. We then have a Charlottesville type Skate Park identified as a need and are currently evaluating areas in the city to place a new skate park, thus giving residents two areas to skate, one of which will be state of the art. We envision this new park being made of concrete and going through a robust community engagement process similar to the Kids Castle project at Purcell Park. Until we get to that point, and fix some of the current safety issues at various parks stemming from aging, this is our best option.

We are removing the tall fencing around the current skate park on Tuesday, March 8th. We actually had a talk about that with various staff around the city a month or two ago, and culminated with an agreement that the fences would be removed when we open the park again to users this spring. Barring an unexpected emergency, those fences will be removed soon.

11. QUESTION:

Fence around public safety building (DP20075) Fencing off the parking lot behind the public safety building does not seem good for pedestrian flow to local businesses on the north end of downtown. There is currently a pedestrian bridge across Blacks Run from Liberty Park to that parking lot. What will happen to that path? Have there been repeated safety issues for officers getting in and out of the building to their cars? It seems to me that a large fence at that location will not only create an eyesore, but will impede pedestrian foot traffic in downtown, the one place in the city that is actually pedestrian-friendly.

RESPONSE:

This fence will provide the needed security for the employees of the Public Safety Building. The Liberty Park path will not be impacted, and the fencing will be designed and installed in order to preserve the connection from Liberty Park to Elizabeth Street.

Water Fund

12. QUESTION:

Western Raw Waterline (proj202 & proj213) We continue to grant utility hookups in the county. Do we make regular adjustments to the hookup fees the city charges in order to account for rising costs of these projects?

RESPONSE:

Hookup fees actually have two components; connection cost plus availability cost. The former is to cover the cost of installation; the latter is similar to a capital recovery impact fee to cover infrastructure beyond the individual service connection. The total fees apply equally to the City customers as well as county customers.

Fees have not changed since 2008. The connection portion has been increasing and the availability side contributions have been decreasing. Fees will be revisited soon but this is not in line with affordable housing goals. For perspective, in Virginia in 2021 the statewide average for water hookup and sewer hook up was \$4,014 and \$4,886, respectively.

Consider FY2022 as follows:

Hook up fee water for residential in Harrisonburg:

- \$2,500 \$2,000 connection; \$ 500 availability

Hook up fee sewer for residential in Harrisonburg

- \$4,500 \$2,300 connection; \$1,200 availability

As a perspective, providing service to County customers with higher rates (not fees) actually allows in-City customers to enjoy cheaper user rates; this is significant for Harrisonburg.

The questions and comments below were submitted prior to the Planning Commission review of the CIP by Commissioner Armstrong via email on Friday, February 25, 2022.

13. QUESTION:

Increasing pedestrian access to primary schools has multiple short- and long-term benefits (e.g. reduce school transit costs, CO2 reductions, public health benefits from walking). There are several proposals for sidewalk construction, which are good, but the

following two project requests appear especially beneficial for primary school access, which I think should be a priority:

PWSIP53 Central Ave Sidewalk
PWSTP55 Country Club Sidewalk

RESPONSE:

Public Works agrees, and these are segments that were identified during our walk to school program development with the City Schools.

14. QUESTION:

The Port Republic Sidewalk proposal should also include a blinking light crosswalk at Crawford Ave. to cross Port Republic. The JMU campus is directly across the street from Crawford Ave. The proposed Port Republic south sidewalks do not improve or eliminate the need to dash across 4 lanes of fast traffic on Port Republic to access the campus directly across the street from Crawford Ave. Numerous residents of the Purcell Park neighborhood currently access the campus at this point with no crossing. Installing sidewalk along Port Republic from Crawford to S. Main is disconnected and piecemeal without a cross walk at Crawford, which allows a pedestrian to also travel on the north side sidewalk down to the Bluestone Dr. campus access and light.

PWSTP47

RESPONSE:

Public Works does not agree with this mid-block crossing at Crawford Avenue.

15. QUESTION:

The project P&R 22-2 proposes to repair/upgrade the playground facility at Purcell Park, and this is given a Priority 2. The Ralph Sampson Park new installation of a Splashpad, P&R 25-3, is assigned a Priority 3. The northeast neighborhoods have long been disadvantaged with respect to access to the major city parks to the south and southwest of the city, and to recreation facilities at Westover. Therefore, the new construction of the Splashpad in the northeast neighborhoods should have a higher priority than the upgrade of an existing playground at Purcell Park. Therefore, make P&R 22-2 a priority 3 and P&R 25-3 a priority 2.

RESPONSE:

The Parks and Recreation Department has requested CIP funding over the last several years to fix aging, and failing, parks in our current system. We have struggled in our attempts to gain adequate funding to repair aging parks. Kids Castle at Purcell Park is one of them. Kids Castle is aging badly and is becoming unsafe for use. So much so, that its footprint has shrunk more than 50% because of aging and unsafe structures, many of which have simply been removed. Kids Castle is one of the most beloved structures in the city. And most people love the concept of what it is now, and are heartbroken when

more of it gets removed. There are serious safety issues with both the structure itself, as well as how it compares to today's modern build standards, that it needs to be prioritized and fixed for the safety of residents and users of the facility. We have only focused on the upgrade at Kids Castle because of mounting safety concerns.

That being said, we agree with the above statement that amenities at Ralph Sampson Park being added is a priority, and one that should be addressed. We started that with the new Futsal Courts, and we are in support of a new splashpad at Ralph Sampson Park as well. Further, in the last several months since the splashpad has been proposed, and supported by the Mayor, we would support the priority being changed from a Priority 3 to a Priority 2. However, we do not support the priority being changed at the expense of P&R 22-2. We think it should be added to our current Priority 2 projects.

The Parks and Recreation Department faces many issues of aging parks and amenities. P&R 22-2 is easily one of our top safety concerns.

We are in support of prioritizing P&R 25-3 as a Priority 2. We are also following ARPA funding closely as the Splash Pad at Ralph Sampson Park has been suggested by our department there as well. However, until we start to be more successful in gaining funding for some of our projects that present serious safety concerns, it makes it hard to suggest new amenities when we have so many amenities in our system that are unsafe and failing. The Purcell Park project appears in the CIP simply for safety reasons. Most city residents love the current park the way it is. However, more and more of it disappears each year.

16. QUESTION:

The proposed Downtown Park Development, P&R 28-2 should be made a priority 2 (or better yet a priority 1).

There are numerous overlapping benefits for this urban downtown park, which would convert non-permeable asphalt to a central downtown park. In addition to the huge benefit to businesses and the city image, this would also be located proximate to Blacks Run and help with storm water management; there are added benefits of tree plantings, CO2 reduction, proximity to the Pavilion and Farmer Market. This is the only proposal to create additional park greenspace, which is so important to the future of Harrisonburg.

RESPONSE:

The Parks and Recreation Department supports the concept of the downtown urban park. However, our department has been in need of CIP funding to fix aging parks that, some of which, have become serious safety issues. Two of the biggest issues we face at the current time are an aging, and out of date, Kids Castle at Purcell Park and a deteriorating skate park at Westover. Until some of those issues are fixed, it becomes hard for us to prioritize a new project over current parks that have severe safety concerns.

In addition, and as another example outside of safety, we are now turning away kids in some of our youth athletics programs because of a lack of field space. If, for instance, we had lights at Smithland Sports Complex, we would be able to accept more kids into our programs such as soccer, flag football, etc. Thus, our current parks need a lot of attention at this time, making it hard to add another park online with so many deficiencies in our current parks.

The downtown park will no doubt provide everything mentioned in the statement above. That's very exciting, and will no doubt create a beautiful space in the city. But our current parks, most of which are also beautiful, contain two of our most popular recreational amenities that are currently failing. As a result, we face closures of current facilities that have even resulted in removal of some parts of each park.

We are closely monitoring City Council's endorsement of the downtown master plan. Once that is complete, and we are able to have some conversation about what was approved/endorsed, we will continue to have more urgent conversations about how the new downtown park will fit in our current system which needs modernized as well.

In our perfect world, all of these projects would be a priority 1. But at this current time, we have mainly prioritized user safety as our number 1 concern in most of our CIP projects.

The questions and comments below were submitted prior to the Planning Commission review of the CIP by Council Member Dent via email on Sunday, February 27, 2022.

General questions (not specific to projects):

17. QUESTION:

Where's the solar?

(I asked the same question last year.)

CIP requests should address the priorities City Council has made clear in the Renewable Energy Resolution, the Environmental section newly added to the Vision Statement, and the project to seek SolSmart designation.

Solar panels should be included in the CIP, both as standalone new projects and as requirements for construction or renovation of all municipally-owned buildings and facilities.

RESPONSE:

The Interim City Manager has already communicated with staff that beginning with next year's CIP process that he would like to ensure there is an eye toward sustainability and/or resiliency for applicable projects, where, among other ideas, the Sustainability and Environmental Manager could be part of the CIP review team.

If desired, Planning Commission could recommend there be a statement included in the Introduction section of the CIP document that states that solar panels and other environmental, resilient, and sustainable infrastructure should be *considered* with all City projects. The word *considered* is emphasized because, for many different reasons (i.e. project location, site characteristics, surrounding infrastructure and environment, and others) solar panels and other sustainable infrastructure and technology might not be possible without other significant investment. Such decisions should be made on a case-by-case basis.

18. Where are the electric vehicle (EV) chargers?

(Also asked last year.)

An RFP has been in the works for some time for publicly available EV chargers on city-owned parking lots. Would this project meet the fiscal threshold and other criteria for inclusion in the CIP?

By state law, EV chargers should be provided with all new government buildings for government employees. Are these chargers included in the CIP proposals for new city buildings, such as the new fire station(s)? (plural if FS4 is replaced rather than just renovated)

RESPONSE:

City staff is currently finalizing an RFP that plans to bring Level 2 Electric Vehicle charging stations to a few City owned lots in downtown as well as some City park facilities. The current RFP will lease the parking space to a Level 2 EV charging company, and they will be responsible for installation, maintenance, and administration of the EV charger. This will remove any financial obligations on the City.

Furthermore, with regard to the referenced state law, there is some confusion as to what the law requires. It could be that buildings constructed or extensively renovated after July 1, 2023 have to have sufficient electrical infrastructure for EV chargers for a locality's fleet vehicles to be stationed at the building and that buildings have to be EV charger ready. It does not appear that the law is requiring that EVs be purchased. Staff will await further guidance.

19. QUESTION:

Where can we address the need for downward-facing streetlights to reduce light pollution?

RESPONSE:

Staff communicated this question to HEC to also receive their feedback. HEC noted that they have "been installing 'Cut Off' lens roadway lighting for over 30 years and it is still [their] standard today. Although there are a few residential neighborhoods that have what

is referred to as “barnyard” type lighting installed, [HEC has] been replacing those over the years with the cut off style and no longer stock [the barnyard] style.” The exception to what is noted above is that “the tear drop style of lighting that was chosen for the downtown area a few years ago.”

20. QUESTION:

In general, are American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) and/or Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) funds considered as potential “Grants” sources? What other grant sources are available? (as appropriate to each project) ARPA Funds have been requested for some projects, and so far, officially granted only to Fire Station 5 (see below).

RESPONSE:

Some CIP projects could be funded with ARPA money. However, since the CIP is a planning document, and because ARPA money is unique and atypical, at this time, staff suggests not demonstrating ARPA funding as being a source for any project so that we can evaluate all projects through the normal, planning lens to evaluate the big picture of the demand.

It should also be understood that the funding sources for projects shown in the CIP can change. As an example, a project could be anticipated to be funded through bonds, but then when the time arises to proceed with funding a project, it could be that grants have become available and/or portions of the project could be cash funded.

General Fund Questions:

21. QUESTION:

New Fire Station 5: please reorder the timing on the CIP sheets for construction of FS 5 (HFD4, p. 11) in the next year, and renovation or replacement of FS 4 (HFD1, p. 8) following the completion of FS 5. Also note Grant funding from ARPA for FS 5 as approved by City Council.

Both fire stations should have solar panels installed during construction or renovation, and EV chargers for all government employees (see above).

RESPONSE:

As noted in the previous response to question #20, staff suggests not demonstrating ARPA funding as being a source for any project so that we can evaluate all projects through the normal, planning lens to evaluate the big picture of the demand.

With regard to the installation of solar panels, staff is supportive of the idea to provide some EV chargers, which can be considered during the budgeting and design phase of the project. If installation is desired, the RFP for the project can include this detail and appropriately funded and installed.

22. QUESTION:

New Emergency Communications Center Building (HRECC2, p. 12), targeted for 2025: Where is this intended to be located? In the City, or the County? What will happen with the existing facility in the Public Safety building?

RESPONSE:

There is no identified location, this project is actually marked for rescheduling to a number of years from what CIP shows. However, we identified some budget needs in order to perform the studies necessary to better predict what the actual cost and need (space/people/etc.) might be. Instead of arbitrarily pushing it forward another year or two, during our CIP meeting we talked about starting some of the studies this year in order to make an informed decision about how far forward to push the project.

23. QUESTION:

ECC – Uninterruptible Power Supply (HRECC13, p. 18) – this was listed in the requests for ARPA funding; targeted for 2024. How does this relate to the *new* building above, in HRECC2?

RESPONSE:

Because the new project for a new HRECC will be moved much further into the future (once more research and investigation is completed) the UPS replacement should be considered in the immediate future to keep our mission critical technology running (this bridges the gap in a power outage until the generator kicks on).

24. QUESTION:

New Public Works Facility (PWSTB03, p. 42) – on request list for ARPA funding, currently on hold pending Community Engagement and priorities. Alternate sources of funding? Infrastructure act?

RESPONSE:

Staff is unsure of the answer to this question, but does not believe that the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act is an option.

25. QUESTION:

Country Club Road (PWSTP25, p. 55) Isn't this road extension now obsolete with the approval of the Blue Stone/Country Club housing development?

RESPONSE:

While the developer for the referenced project successfully rezoned the site to allow for the multi-family project, at this time, the developer has not submitted any documents for the engineered comprehensive site plan review, which would be the next step in the development process. Nonetheless, whether that project is built or not, the CIP project for

Country Club Road is still planned to include two lanes with a center turn lane, sidewalk, and shared use path.

26. COMMENT:

Elizabeth Street Deck (DP20071, p. 87) – Replacement of parking deck should include rooftop solar panels that power electric vehicle chargers.

RESPONSE:

It is envisioned that the redevelopment of this parking deck will be accomplished through some form of Public Private Partnership, and that redevelopment may make the parking decks more mixed use in nature. The mixed-use nature of the development may limit the ability to cover the rooftop parking for EV chargers as this space may be used for another use.

27. COMMENT:

Water Street Parking Deck (DP20073, p. 88) - Replacement of parking deck should include rooftop solar panels that power electric vehicle chargers.

RESPONSE:

It is envisioned that the redevelopment of this parking deck will be accomplished through some form of Public Private Partnership, and that redevelopment may make the parking decks more mixed use in nature. The mixed-use nature of the development may limit the ability to cover the rooftop parking for EV chargers as this space may be used for another use.

School Fund Comments and Questions:

28. COMMENT:

Replace Roof at THMS (Schools, 1023, p. 99) – Replacement of roof would be an ideal time to install solar panels.

29. COMMENT:

Replace Roof at SES/WES (Schools, 1323, p. 102) – Replacement of roof would be an ideal time to install solar panels.

30. COMMENT:

Resurface Parking Harrisonburg HS (1523, p. 104) – Resurfacing the HS parking lot would be an ideal time to install EV chargers.

RESPONSE TO ALL THREE COMMENTS ABOVE:

The School Division will continue to look for ways to expand its ability to not only be environmentally friendly but also look for ways to save money by improving the existing schools' infrastructure. A current example of this is the installation of solar panels on the roof of Bluestone Elementary School scheduled to begin this Spring.

Water and Sewer Fund Questions:

31. QUESTION:

Specifically for Water and Sewer projects (proj202, p. 106, and following; sew203 p. 12 and following) - Are ARPA and/or IJJA funds considered as potential funding sources? Most water/sewer projects requesting ARPA funding were postponed to IJJA; word has it that urgently needed projects should potentially be funded by ARPA as the funds are already in hand, and IJJA requires a competitive state-run application process that could take longer.

RESPONSE:

It appears that water and sewer projects might not be selected to be funded through ARPA. HPU will, however, pursue American Infrastructure Bill funding based on the principles that might be the best fit given the qualifying parameters for those monies. HPU has included in its Long Term Financial Model approximately \$6.1M that we will pursue to upgrade 11,000 feet of its Western Raw Waterline. This will have benefits that include electrical energy and carbon footprint reduction, continuing service to rural customers, and water intake preservation. Each of these parameters are specifically cited as target topics in the bill. If HPU fails to receive the funding, then rate increases will fund this project.

32. QUESTION:

Management of Pumping, Storage & Transfer Assets (proj216, p.110, and possibly some following projects) – What renewable and “smart” technologies are being proposed for upgraded water and sewer management assets?

RESPONSE:

Within the Pumping, Storage and Transfer program, HPU currently has active a Genesis 64 software upgrade project for its water and sewer system SCADA monitor and control system (April 2022 rollout). HPU also uses cloud based “Pump Optimizer Monitoring & Control” for its North River Pump Station, which is an annual 2.5M kilowatts electrical demand center; the same technology is being designed into the Shenandoah Power Dam Pump Station and Shenandoah Goods Mill Pump Station (expected 2024 rollout). Performance load is significant and house load is very small when managing pump stations. Opportunity may exist to pursue alternative energy for reduction of electricity used under performance load; obstacles will include significant cost and long-term leasing.

In other areas, HPU currently has active a billing software upgrade project (April 2022 rollout) and future AMI meter reading technology (expected FY2023 rollout).

HPU is also active in pursuing contracting of water and sewer pipe technology to provide pipe condition assessment and thus to optimally plan the replacement of pipe assets.

School Transportation Fund Question:

33. QUESTION:

School Buses (trans2, p. 130) – What is the schedule for phasing out diesel buses and replacing them with electric school buses, with cost and grant considerations? Diesel buses should be phased out as rapidly as possible, and at some point within the next five years no new diesel buses should be purchased.

RESPONSE:

There currently is no established schedule for phasing out diesel school buses. A realistic outlook for a phasing schedule would look at the next ten (10) years. Electric buses are still considered very new technology that is still in the infancy stages. An electric school bus currently costs about \$400,000.

Replacement should consider overall costs that include training mechanics and stocking parts for the electric buses. Supply chain issues continue to plague the automobile industry so prolonged delays will impact timelines. Grant opportunities will be proactively sought, and the buses tested for long term durability and suitability for school routes. As technology improves and costly infrastructure needs are met, it will be practical to then consider more concrete plans for full fleet replacement. Firefighting technics for electric buses, and the City's electric grid capacity will also be considered when developing long term replacement plans.

Public Transportation Fund Question:

34. QUESTION:

Transit Buses (trans1, p. 132) – Same question as above: what is the schedule for phasing out diesel transit buses? Diesel buses should be replaced with electric and/or use renewable fuels (such as biodiesel), since transit buses have a different schedule than school buses (driving all day, charging time difficult)

RESPONSE:

We are set to commence a State mandated ten (10) year strategic plan that will guide the replacement of diesel transit buses. A feasibility study will also be considered to establish long term electric infrastructure needs and other associated costs including training mechanics, stocking new parts, as well as working with our bus manufacturer to ensure proper maintenance and warranty procedures.

The City's electric grid and its capacity to handle the conversion will be a critical determining factor when considering long term diesel transit bus replacement. We are currently learning from other agencies with regards to what works well and what doesn't with regards to infrastructure and electric transit bus needs and repairs. The lessons learnt will be vital as we transition to electric transit buses.

Sanitation Fund Question:

35. QUESTION:

City Landfill Closure and Monitoring (PWSLCBG, p. 134) – When will the closed landfill be stable enough to consider brownfields solar mounts, as previously explored?

RESPONSE:

The prior discussions for solar at this location showed that the most optimal location is on the southern facing slope below the existing ballfields. We are currently using this area as material staging for our rock crusher. We crush old curb and gutter, and sidewalks and reuse this material as base for other City projects. At this time, we have not yet determined an end date to these operations.

Stormwater Fund Question:

36. QUESTION:

Blacks Run South Stream Restoration (PWSWPR19, P. 140) – What if any changes might be needed with the proposed new Public Works building? (PWSTB03, p. 42)

RESPONSE:

No changes are needed to accommodate a new Public Works facility.