
City of Grand Island



Tuesday, May 04, 2010
Study Session Packet

City Council:

Larry Carney
Scott Dugan
John Gericke
Peg Gilbert
Chuck Haase
Robert Meyer
Mitchell Nickerson
Bob Niemann
Kirk Ramsey
Jose Zapata

Mayor:

Margaret Hornady

City Administrator:

Jeff Pederson

City Clerk:

RaNae Edwards

7:00:00 PM
Council Chambers - City Hall
100 East First Street

Call to Order

This is an open meeting of the Grand Island City Council. The City of Grand Island abides by the Open Meetings Act in conducting business. A copy of the Open Meetings Act is displayed in the back of this room as required by state law.

The City Council may vote to go into Closed Session on any agenda item as allowed by state law.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call

A - SUBMITTAL OF REQUESTS FOR FUTURE ITEMS

Individuals who have appropriate items for City Council consideration should complete the Request for Future Agenda Items form located at the Information Booth. If the issue can be handled administratively without Council action, notification will be provided. If the item is scheduled for a meeting or study session, notification of the date will be given.

B - RESERVE TIME TO SPEAK ON AGENDA ITEMS

This is an opportunity for individuals wishing to provide input on any of tonight's agenda items to reserve time to speak. Please come forward, state your name and address, and the Agenda topic on which you will be speaking.

MAYOR COMMUNICATION

This is an opportunity for the Mayor to comment on current events, activities, and issues of interest to the community.



City of Grand Island

Tuesday, May 04, 2010

Study Session

Item -1

Discussion Regarding Odor Ordinance

Staff Contact: Jeff Pederson

Council Agenda Memo

From: Jeff Pederson, City Administrator

Meeting: May 4, 2010

Subject: Discussion of Odor Ordinance

Item #'s: 1

Presenter(s): Shannon Oster, Assistant to the City Administrator

Background

The Public Works Department has been the source on odor monitoring for several years. They administer an Odor Hotline, which has existed since September of 2000. In 2006 the Nasal Ranger Field Olfactometer® was purchased for monitoring odors at the Wastewater Treatment Plant. The Nasal Ranger is a field olfactometer device which measures odor concentration or odor strength. Over the past decade more cities and states have begun using field olfactometers to quantify odor because it is more objective and the relatively low cost and portability.

Discussion

Administration will present the framework of how an odor ordinance would be shaped. This is based on researching other municipalities, studies on odor issues, and speaking with odor experts. What was found is there are few places which have an odor ordinance, because it is a subjective issue, and the difficulty measuring odor in an affordable and timely manner. Of the cities that have an odor ordinance, a complaint response system in combination with an odor investigation is common. Because the complex nature of odor and the multiple steps necessary to determine an odor is offensive, an ordinance would be a new program.

Included in the packet is a framework of an odor ordinance, an overview of the Nasal Ranger and field olfactometry, and a summary of data from Nasal Ranger samples and Odor Hotline calls.

Conclusion

This item is presented to the City Council in a Study Session to allow for any questions to be answered and to create a greater understanding of the issue at hand.

It is the intent of City Administration to bring this issue to a future council meeting.

Framework of an Odor Ordinance

An odor ordinance would likely be treated as a nuisance, so the determination that an odor is a nuisance would go through a process. The following is what the framework of an odor program would look like.

1. **Complaint System.** A complaint system is based on measuring multiple, individual public reactions to an odor that residents believe is unacceptable. Using complaints to initiate the odor process is important to the determination that an odor is offensive versus tolerable. The City would set a complaint criterion that would need to be reached in order for it to be considered an odor episode.

Complaint criteria: receiving 8 official odor complaints in 12 hour period through an Odor Hotline. Calls must be similar in nature. An *Official Complaint* includes: one complaint per household; provide the necessary information to hotline responder; and must call at the time of the odor.

Multiple Episodes of Odor: requiring two odor episodes reaching the complaint criteria in 30 days to trigger a response (e.g. 8 complaints in two separate 12 hour periods). This demonstrates that the odor is a recurring problem for the community. Once that happens an odor investigation follows.

2. **Investigation of Odor.** This will verify the odor is offensive by investigating through the use of a Nasal Ranger (or equivalent field olfactometer), or an odor inspector to confirm an odor is present. The investigation of odor would immediately follow the second odor episode.

Using the Nasal Ranger to investigate the odor would set a D/T considered offensive as well as setting other measurement requirements. A 7 and greater D/T or greater than 7 D/T would be appropriate levels to consider a nuisance. D/T ratios are at 2, 4, 7, 15, 30, and 60. There should be at least two readings no less than fifteen minutes apart in a one hour period. The location of readings is taken at the odor source's property line or nearest location of human habitation. The person inspecting the odor using the Nasal Ranger needs to be properly trained to take readings and tested for reasonable odor sensitivity (using a nasal chemosensory test).

The other method to investigating odor complaints is having an odor inspector that simply verifies there is an odor present without quantifying the odor on the Nasal Ranger. This odor inspector should also be tested for reasonable odor sensitivity.

Either of the two investigation methods will confirm the odor is a violation and the odor source is notified there is a violation.

3. **Odor Violation: Remedial Plan, Review, and Implementation Process.** An important part to the odor violation is improving the source of odor. Fines would be less important than compliance in an effort to eliminate odors that exceed the standard specified in the ordinance.

First, the odor source in violation would develop an action plan to resolve the odor issue in a set number of days from violation (30 days). The plan must be submitted to a panel or

community Odor Board for review and approval. The Odor Board will work with the odor source to make sure the plans are adequate and implemented. If consulting work is necessary for developing plans or reviewing plans, then the odor source will pay for those costs. If the plan is not implemented or the odor source fails to submit a plan then it would go to court.

Fiscal Note

Nasal Ranger: +\$1,500

\$150 Nose Piece per user one time purchase

Maintenance of Nasal Ranger: \$160 recalibrating biannually

Training/Odor School: \$375/person plus travel

Odor Sensitivity Test: varies

Administrative Costs: The most substantial cost to an odor ordinance is the staff time necessary for a new program. There would be a significant increase in the time spent monitoring an Odor Hotline and maintaining a log of the information. The Hotline would need to be monitored seven days a week and possibly 24 hours a day. Having staff work as Odor Inspectors would require time for training, as well as be available seven days a week for an investigation. Staff time managing and working with the Odor Board is the last substantial cost worth noting.

An initial discussion has been held between the City and the Central District Health Department, including the role that the CDHD might play in administration of an odor ordinance. Should an Odor Board be established, representation from CDHD would be essential. Determination of any role that CDHD would play in administration of the complaint response process would be determined through further discussions with CDHD.

Overview of the Nasal Ranger Field Olfactometer®

The field olfactometer was developed in 1958, by the US Public Health Service. This is more commonly called a “scentometer” or box scentometer. A field olfactometer quantifies odor concentration based on the dilution to threshold (D/T) and measures by dynamic dilution of odor. This takes the ambient air and mixes it with filtered air, and then sniffed out. Dilution to threshold is read at ratios of 2, 7, 15, 31, 170, and 350. For example, at D/T 2 is two parts odor free air with one part ambient odorous air.

Field olfactometers are one of the only quantifiable odor measurement tools. Other methods to measure odor exist, including the n-butanol scale (i.e. odor intensity referencing scale) and laboratory dynamic, triangular force choice olfactometry; however, field olfactometers have been more frequently used because their relatively low cost and portability.

St. Croix Sensory developed the Nasal Ranger Field Olfactometer in 2002. The Nasal Ranger is a type of field olfactometer, but more advanced than the traditional scentometer because of the calibrated inhalation rate, orifice dial, and nasal mask. It has D/Ts of 2, 4, 7, 15, 30, and 60. A D/T of 2 is considered “just noticeable” and a 4 D/T is common in a city according to odor experts at St. Croix Sensory (2006, McGinley & McGinley).

Field olfactometers are relatively simple to administer but there are human factors involved. For example, people who are desensitized to a certain smell or seasonal congestion can impact a D/T reading. To improve the credibility of the readings there is training available to become a “certified odor inspector” and sensitivity testing. Sensitivity testing is a nasal chemosensory testing method used by ear, nose and throat clinics.

The City purchased a Nasal Ranger in 2006, and began taking samples through the Public Works Department. Operators at Wastewater Treatment Plant have used the Nasal Ranger in twelve locations in the WWTP and JBS vicinity. Those locations were selected by CH2M Hill as a part of an odor study and chosen for modeling, not an ordinance. A summary sheet with the reading’s data is included.



St. Croix Sensory, 2006

Overview of Nasal Ranger Readings and Odor Hotline Complaints

Odor Hotline: Information available since 2006.

Nasal Ranger: WWTP Operators have taken readings since 2007. Typically these are recorded as the number of instances greater than 7 D/T by the odor descriptor/odor source.

Based on the information below the Hotline calls and amount of readings over 7 D/T has declined each year. Rendering has always been the most frequent odor source. Although the information is interesting, the report below is not a reliable resource to track odors or shape an odor ordinance due to inconsistent sampling, user variability, and lack of detailed data. The readings are more useful to self-monitoring at the WWTP and tracking odor sources.

	2007				2008				2009				2010
Odor Type/Odor Source	1 st Quarter (Jan-Mar)	2 nd Quarter (Apr-June)	3 rd Quarter (Jul-Sep)	4 th Quarter (Oct-Dec)	1 st Quarter	2 nd Quarter	3 rd Quarter	4 th Quarter	1 st Quarter	2 nd Quarter	3 rd Quarter	4 th Quarter	1 st Quarter
Total Readings	1,194	1,186	1,195	1,030	1,193	1,037	1,095	771	797	656	488	524	177
Number of Readings = to 7 D/T	1,162	1,113	1,078	940	1,163	984	1,024	736	775	627	480	509	166
Rendering	22	47	91	65	30	50	52	29	19	29	8	15	7
Burning-JBS	1	5	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-
Lagoon/Sewer-JBS	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	-
Lagoon Gas-JBS	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Manure-JBS	1	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
JBS Odors	0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-
Chemicals	0	-	-	-	-	1	17	2	-	-	-	-	3
Straw-WW	3	14	4	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Septic	0	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Compost/Sludge	0	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aeration Basin	2	4	9	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lagoon-WW	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Sewer-WW	1	3	10	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total > 7	32	73	117	90	30	53	71	35	22	29	8	15	11
% of Readings >7	2.68%	6.16%	9.79%	8.74%	2.51%	5.11%	6.48%	4.54%	2.76%	4.42%	1.64%	2.86%	6.21%
Hotline Calls	3	1	3	14	4	2	0	0	1	43	2	3	1



City of Grand Island

Tuesday, May 04, 2010

Study Session

Item -2

Review of Capital Improvement Plan

Staff Contact: Jeff Pederson

Council Agenda Memo

From: Mary Lou Brown, Finance Director

Meeting: May 4, 2010

Subject: Capital Program and Related Financing

Item #'s: 2

Presenter(s): Steve Riehle, Public Works Director
Steve Paustian, Parks and Rec Director
Mary Lou Brown, Finance Director

Background

Five Year Capital Fund (400 Fund) programs have been identified and prioritized through a process very similar to Program Prioritization. The programs have also been assigned to the appropriate fiscal year according to the ability to fund the program from the appropriate source and also according to the scheduling guidelines provided by other governmental agencies.

Discussion

The Study Session will focus on a discussion of the programs included in the multi-year plan, the assumed financing sources and the potential impact of bond financing on the City's overall debt position. Based on comments from the Study Session, a final proposal for the Capital Program for the 2011 Budget will be developed and presented to Council for approval on May 18.

Conclusion

A recommended Capital Plan will be presented at the May 18, 2010 Council meeting.

Multi Year Capital Program

2009/2010 Current Fiscal Year

		Funding Sources						Total Expected Cash Flow
Project	Amount in 2009/2010 Budget	Special Assessments	Keno	Gas Tax	GO Bond	GO Bond with Election Requirement	General Fund	
Funding amount available		659,804.00	368,438.00	700,000.00				
Stolley Park Rd widening - Locust to Events Center - Construction	200,000.00			200,000.00				200,000.00
So Locust - I80 to city limits	126,000.00			126,000.00				126,000.00
Capital Ave; drainway to Webb Road	150,000.00			150,000.00				150,000.00
Realign Walnut entr. & Custer/15th signal	100,540.00			10,000.00				10,000.00
New traffic signal installations	106,000.00			106,000.00				106,000.00
Wasmer detention cell	220,000.00				25,000.00			25,000.00
Moores Creek, Faidley, Edna construction	250,000.00				250,000.00			250,000.00
Northwest drainage project - feasibility & design	725,000.00				725,000.00			725,000.00
Platte Valley industrial site, cells to Wood River	127,000.00							0.00
Construct drainway - CCC to Wood River	382,500.00							0.00
Misc safety enhancements - RR study	150,000.00				150,000.00			150,000.00
Integrated/comprehensive drainage plan	115,000.00	115,000.00						115,000.00
Annual sidewalk projects	25,000.00	8,000.00						8,000.00
Hiker/biker trails	200,000.00	10,000.00						10,000.00
Infrastructure emergency funds	60,000.00	60,000.00						60,000.00
Fiber optic connections	90,000.00		90,000.00					90,000.00
Miscellaneous park projects	150,000.00		270,000.00					270,000.00
Athletic complex development	1,300,000.00						1,300,000.00	1,300,000.00
Total	4,477,040.00							3,595,000.00
Funding amount remaining		466,804.00	8,438.00	108,000.00				
Total					1,150,000.00		1,300,000.00	

2010/2011

Funding amount available		766,804.00	308,438.00	808,000.00			
Platte Valley industrial site, cells to Wood River					127,000.00		
Construct drainway - CCC to Wood River		382,500.00					
Wasmer detention cell					195,000.00		
Realign Walnut entr. & Custer/15th signal				90,540.00			
Infrastructure contingency funds (emergency)			60,000.00				
Construction of NW GI flood control project					400,000.00		
Lincoln Park pool						1,100,000.00	
Misc. parks projects (annual)			150,000.00				
Concrete lining of drainage ditches		50,000.00					
Annual sidewalk projects		25,000.00					
Quiet zone - UPRR corridor - Lincoln, Broadwell and Blaine/Custer					150,000.00		
Broadwell Ave/UPRR - Environmental study/preliminary engineering				128,000.00			
Independence Ave Ditch - Design					80,000.00		
Blaine bridges over Wood River - Design and ROW				45,000.00			
Hiker/biker trails		60,000.00					
So. Locust trail bridge engineering			10,000.00				
Round-a-bout @Capital Ave & North Road				360,000.00			
Funding amount remaining		249,304.00	88,438.00	184,460.00			
Total					952,000.00	1,100,000.00	

2011/2012

Funding amount available		549,304.00	388,438.00	684,460.00			
Infrastructure contingency funds (emergency)			60,000.00				
Construction of NW GI flood control project					600,000.00		
So. Locust trail bridge construction			120,000.00				
Misc. parks projects (annual)			150,000.00				
Faidley Ave - North Road east to Irongate Ave (approx 2,000 feet)				112,500.00			
Update Moores Creek drainage plan					39,000.00		
Blaine bridge replacement with culverts					50,000.00		
Broadwell Ave/UPRR - Final design & ROW appraisal				128,000.00			
Signal @ US Hwy 30 (2nd Street) and Lincoln Ave				55,000.00			
Niedfeldt Park			20,000.00				
Concrete lining of drainage ditches		50,000.00					
Stolley Park upgrade					100,000.00		
PVIP drainage project -phase 2					99,750.00		
Independence - Construct culverts and fill in west ditch					70,000.00		
Lighting on US Hwy 281 from Stolley Park Road to Old Potash					250,000.00		
Husker Hwy west of US Hwy 34/281 intersection					250,000.00		
Heartland Public Shooting Park development					150,000.00		
Signal @ US Hwy 34/281 and Wildwood Road				85,000.00			
Signal @ US Hwy 34/281 and Rae Road				67,000.00			
Stolley Park Rd & North Rd intersection				146,000.00			
State/Diers intersection improvements					390,000.00		
Left turn lane on 13th @ Redwood/Mansfield				62,000.00			
Annual sidewalk projects		25,000.00					
Funding amount remaining		474,304.00	38,438.00	28,960.00			
Total					1,998,750.00	0.00	

2012/2013

Funding amount available		774,304.00	338,438.00	528,960.00			
Infrastructure contingency funds			60,000.00				
Construction of NW GI flood control project		400,000.00					
Misc. parks projects (annual)			150,000.00				
Trail along Locust from I-80 to Wood River floodway			120,000.00				
Broadwell Ave/UPRR - ROW		200,000.00					
Concrete lining of drainage ditches		50,000.00					
US 30 widening - west city limits to Hwy 281				500,000.00	1,390,000.00		
Annual sidewalk projects		25,000.00					
Wasmer detention cell - park improvements		40,000.00					
Miscellaneous safety projects - TBD					150,000.00		
Funding amount remaining		59,304.00	8,438.00	28,960.00			
Total					1,540,000.00	0.00	

2013/2014

Funding amount available		359,304.00	308,438.00	528,960.00			
Infrastructure contingency funds			60,000.00				
Construction of NW GI flood control project					400,000.00		
Misc. parks projects (annual)			150,000.00				
Concrete lining of drainage ditches		50,000.00					
Trail along I-80 from Mormon Island to Locust			120,000.00				
Annual sidewalk projects		25,000.00					
Broadwell Ave/UPRR - Construction				500,000.00	1,660,000.00		
Funding amount remaining		284,304.00	(21,562.00)	28,960.00			
Total					2,060,000.00		

DEBT SERVICE FUND - GENERAL FUND

	Wood River Flood Control Bonds	Various Purpose Paving Bonds	Various Purpose S Locust Street	Public Safety Center	Heartland Event Center	Library Expansion	State Fair Building	CIP Bonding+40k fees	TOTALS
Pmt for 2010	270,408	54,148	354,227	861,063	569,493	829,690	753,112	40,000	3,732,140
Balance at 9/30/2010	1,230,000	55,000	2,680,000	5,735,000	6,270,000	4,470,000	4,518,829	2,000,000	26,958,829
Pmt for 2011	268,006	56,430	375,913	857,663	570,038	832,828	753,112	284,627	3,998,615
Balance at 9/30/2011	1,005,000	-	2,365,000	5,115,000	5,950,000	3,785,000	3,951,806	3,833,727	26,005,533
Pmt for 2012	274,745		376,385	858,173	569,715	829,540	753,112	535,195	4,196,864
Balance at 9/30/2012	765,000		2,045,000	4,470,000	5,620,000	3,080,000	3,360,429	5,498,362	24,838,791
Pmt for 2013	275,615		375,980	857,373	563,574	829,780	753,112	791,784	4,447,217
Balance at 9/30/2013	515,000		1,720,000	3,800,000	5,285,000	2,350,000	2,743,651	6,990,073	23,403,724
Pmt for 2014	265,865		374,508	860,573	566,495	828,415	753,112	1,054,471	4,703,437
Balance at 9/30/2014	265,000		1,390,000	3,100,000	4,935,000	1,595,000	2,100,382	8,303,974	21,689,356
Pmt for 2015	270,433		366,753	856,873	568,443	830,303	753,112	1,323,333	4,969,248
Balance at 9/30/2015	-		1,060,000	2,375,000	4,570,000	810,000	1,429,484	9,434,076	19,678,560
Pmt for 2016			372,629	856,785	569,470	825,390	753,112	1,598,449	4,975,834
Balance at 9/30/2016			715,000	1,620,000	4,190,000	-	729,769	10,373,215	17,627,984
Pmt for 2017			367,288	860,075	564,450		753,112	1,879,893	4,424,817
Balance at 9/30/2017			365,000	830,000	3,800,000		-	11,112,987	16,107,987
Pmt for 2018			376,863	866,105	567,938			2,167,742	3,978,647
Balance at 9/30/2018			-	-	3,390,000			9,643,648	13,033,648
Pmt for 2019					565,194			2,127,742	2,692,935
Balance at 9/30/2019					2,965,000			8,091,029	11,056,029
Pmt for 2020					566,706			2,127,742	2,694,448
Balance at 9/30/2020					2,520,000			6,450,214	8,970,214
Pmt for 2021					562,475			1,883,115	2,445,590
Balance at 9/30/2021					2,060,000			4,963,054	7,023,054
Pmt for 2022					561,900			1,632,546	2,194,446
Balance at 9/30/2022					1,580,000			3,640,308	5,220,308
Pmt for 2023					564,738			1,375,958	1,940,696
Balance at 9/30/2023					1,075,000			2,494,436	3,569,436
Pmt for 2024					561,563			1,113,271	1,674,833
Balance at 9/30/2024					550,000			1,539,795	2,089,795
Pmt for 2025					562,375			844,408	1,406,783
Balance at 9/30/2025					-			792,852	792,852



City of Grand Island

Tuesday, May 04, 2010

Study Session

Item -3

Report on Program Prioritization Model

Staff Contact: Jeff Pederson

Council Agenda Memo

From: Jeff Pederson, City Administrator

Meeting: May 4, 2010

Subject: Program Prioritization Update

Item #'s: 3

Presenter(s): Jeff Pederson, City Administrator
Mary Lou Brown, Finance Director

Background

The City Of Grand Island began the Program Prioritization process several months ago working with consultants from the International City/County Management Association. The last formal update was provided at the City Council Retreat in March. Since that time the entire City Of Grand Island model has been complete in preparation for the 2010/2011 budget process.

Discussion

The City Administrator and Finance Director will provide an update to the Program Prioritization process, as well as bring for the model that has been created for Grand Island. The Study Session will explain how the City will be budgeting with Program Prioritization for the upcoming fiscal year.

Conclusion

This item is presented to the City Council in a Study Session to allow for any questions to be answered and to create a greater understanding of the issue at hand. It is the intent of City Administration to bring more detail on the 2010/2011 Budget at a later date.