

## MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Meeting held: Wednesday, July 1, 2015

Leawood City Hall- Main Conference Room, 7:30 AM

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carrie Rezac, CHAIR and Councilmember Ward 3  
Andrew Osman, Councilmember Ward 1  
James Azeltine, Councilmember Ward 4  
Jim Rawlings, Councilmember Ward 2  
Ken Conrad  
Jon Grams  
Abbas Haideri  
Marsha Monica  
Chris White

### COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT

Adam Abrams  
Todd Alan Harris

### GUESTS:

Phil Hodes, Resident & Board Member of Hallbrook Farms Subdivision  
Chad Leathers, Ameriss LED Lighting, 111 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, KCMO 64105  
Jim Tiehen, The Tiehen Group, Property Management, Leasing & Brokerage Services,  
3401 College Blvd., Suite 250, Leawood, KS 66211

STAFF PRESENT: Joe Johnson, David Ley, Julie Stasi

Chair Rezac Chair Rezac called the meeting to order at 7:30 AM.

Introductions were made of Committee Members, staff and guests in attendance.

- **FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS:**  
Review/approve the previous meeting Minutes.  
Jon Grams Motioned to accept the Minutes as written of May 6, 2015.  
Marsha Monica Seconded the Motion.  
All attending members were in favor. Motion Passed.
- **SECOND ITEM OF BUSINESS:**  
Review Request from Hallbrook to pay a portion of LED Street Light Upgrade.  
Joe Johnson explained that the Committee packet had a letter from the Tiehen Group and a report from Ameriss with the study of lighting in the Hallbrook Subdivision. The subdivision is looking at switching out the elements in the fixtures with LED bulbs. By going to LED, there is a significant cost savings while still being able to maintain current lighting. Joe will let Jim and Chad talk about their findings. The request is written to ask the City to look at the savings annually and requests the City reimburse Hallbrook that savings on an annual basis. In the memo, it is about 2 ½ years to do the full cost recovery. Over that 2 ½ years' time frame is to reimburse them the savings what they paid out and what the bills would be with the LED's to help offset the difference.

Marsha Monica-That was my question. There would be a time line on that.

Jon Grams-Can you explain the relationship of Hallbrook and the City and why this is coming to the Public Works Committee?

Joe Johnson-The street lights in Hallbrook are private street lights. They are maintained by the Homes Association but the electricity is paid by the City. Most of the street lights are City owned. We do have a handful of subdivisions where we allowed them to have decorative street

lights. Generally we tell them we want the lighting fixture to burn basically the same wattage as our lights. It makes it easier for us to pay the light bill and then in those subdivisions where they are private, or damaged, then that is the HOA's responsibility to make repairs to those lights.

Jon Grams-Are the street lights going to be the same other than the change out of the bulbs?

Joe Johnson-Yes, they are not changing the fixture, just the element. The lighting within the fixture. And then we are talking about the lighting on the public streets. There are a couple of private areas in Hallbrook; this is not for the streets that are private, but for the public streets where the City has meters that control the lighting.

Ken Conrad-How did we get this and how are we supposed to look at this? From a Public Works standpoint I think it is safety but this seems like a financial analysis. How are these lights metered?

Joe Johnson-Just like your house. We have 6 to 10 controllers out there. And off of those controllers there are probably 20 to 25 lights per controller. They are metered and we get a separate bill for each one of those. We track those through Kansas City Power & Light invoices. Not any different than your house. There is a meter on those controllers, there is an address, and once a month we receive 80 bills for our street lights. Last year the City redid all the lights on 114<sup>th</sup> Street. We had 23 lights and we made them all LED bulbs. They were all on one specific controller and we saw 66% savings in electricity by going to LED bulbs. We monitor that on a monthly basis. We took all the bills previously from KCP&L and then the current year after we had the LED's and compared them month by month. So on an annual basis there was a 66% savings.

Chris White-Have you gone though and looked at what the bills have been?

Joe Johnson-We have not, what we would end up doing is create a spreadsheet and at whatever point they switch out the LED's, we would look at the 12 months prior KCPL accounts. Then as we receive the new bills we would enter them and see what the savings is/compared to what they were before.

Chris White-I ask because I'm not familiar with Ameriss, but know there are a lot of companies that do this with industrial lighting. And the usual approach to that is by presenting the electric bill for the last 5 years or whatever, and you pay that to us for the next 3 to 5 years and we pay the utility bill. We get our money off the savings. This is a different approach then what I've seen before; which is an estimated savings. You can't estimate within pennies when you don't even know what the electric rate is. The rates will change over time. They are probably going up. So I'm just saying it is an estimate and that is why I am curious.

Chad Leathers-Estimated within pennies. Well right, the estimate is 10 cents per kilowatt hour. And it is a simple analogy and system that we go through.

Joe Johnson-The difference here is they are not paying the electric rate. Even though they own the street lights, the City gets the bill. The recommendation that we are looking for is that this really does not change safety and it doesn't change lighting. Does this seem like a reasonable request? And is the Committee in favor of it? The City Administrator is in favor of it but he wanted this Committee to hear about it and make sure that it seemed like a reasonable request for the City. If it is based on an average 2 ½ years for the payback curve. We understand rates go up so maybe it is closer to 3 years or it may be right at 2 ½ years. We have the ability to go back and look at previous bills so we can look at the last 12 months before they go to LED and then move forward. Whether we pay it on a monthly basis or a quarterly basis we would be able to track that with each month's billings.

Carrie Rezac-To Ken as to why we are looking at this. I think it is due the fact that this is a partnership with an HOA so it is appropriate for the Public Works Committee to look at it.

Ken Conrad-And I agree. When I first read through this initially I think that is what it is and I wonder if that isn't a discussion that starts at City Council when we begin to discuss

partnerships between HOAs and the City and how we fund things. I wondered what our recommendation coming out of here is. Until we received this packet I had not seen any numbers. So I do not feel prepared at all to discuss the validity of the pay back or the whole partnership. That is just my point. I think certainly there is reason to look at this to save energy. My last question is: What is as far as the output of the lights and the lumenation or foot-candle? Getting back to the Public Works side of all this.

David Ley-Yes we require them to submit their Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) files and verify that they are meeting their average lumen ratio and the average ratio for the lighting. Or that they will be pretty close to the existing street light system.

Ken Conrad-I think that is the first thing this Committee needs to look at; is the objective functionality of this and then move on to how it happens.

Joe Johnson-When we looked at replacing our lights with LED's we looked at trying to find a head that had the appropriate wattage and the appropriate number of LED lights so that it would have a consistent spread of lighting.

James Azeltine-Just to back up, on the surface cost recovery over 2 ½ years sounds great, why would we not do it, but I'd like to ask- you said that they own the lights/poles/fixtures. It seems like several years ago where we had HOA's owned a lot of the streets and they were private. We had a process of the City taking the private streets over and into the public system. What I'd like to ask before we talk about LED lights or not and who pays for it, is what is the advantage or disadvantage of the City owning the fixtures and is that something we should explore and also as far as us paying the electric bill. Is that a courtesy? OR are we obligated to do that? They are not our poles, why would we be paying the electricity? Not suggesting we don't but logically, how did we get here?

David Ley- They have to have street lights. If they had public street lights we would pay for the electricity. But Hallbrook wanted to go with a fancier custom street light that cost a little bit more. We told them they could do that but the City did not want to take on the added cost to maintain the fancier fixtures.

Jim Tiehen-Yes Hallbrook is paying for the maintenance. A couple years ago some of the lights were rotted out and we have had to replace them. We would love for you to take care of them too.

James Azeltine-which is exactly why I asked the question. Wonder if this was just the first step in Hallbrook coming back to us and asking the City to just take them.

Joe Johnson-If they did that we would ask them to make them a public standard before we took them on. We do not want the decorative street poles. They are expensive to do and expensive to repair and the wait is much longer. If a subdivision wanted to have public lights my suggestion would be to make them our standard.

Joe Johnson-There are other neighborhoods in Leawood where they own the lights and we pay the electricity. Hazelwood, Sienna, Tuscan subdivisions own their lights.

Abbas Haideri-Question on lumenation. Are the light poles in Hallbrook the same height as the standard City's poles or are they all lower?

Chad Leathers-They are all different. There are light poles at the entrances and then there are light poles within. When you come up to the first entrance on College, there is a 24' pole there. And then the rest are like 16 to 18 feet high.

Abbas Haideri-So what is the standard City Pole?

David Ley-30 feet.

Abbas Haideri-so that means that the spread of that illumination is more than what you have which means you will require more fixtures than what the City would normally have.

Joe Johnson-Their fixtures are similar to the ones on 137<sup>th</sup> Street or 133<sup>rd</sup> Street, where the curved street lights are. Those are similar to what Hallbrook has. So when you have that style,

they sit closer and the spacing is different. There are more street lights than what you would use with the 30' poles.

Abbas Haideri-Which would mean that the City would have to use more street lights per watt than what is on a standard subdivision.

Chad Leathers-All the more reason to go to LED bulbs.

Marsha Monica-That's what I'm thinking too.

Abbas Haideri-I understand that. So what would be a good study is to see what a standard street light illumination would be for that whole neighborhood and say maybe what you want is 50 bulbs; but the standard is 30 bulbs. Maybe the City could pay for 30 bulbs. Does that make sense?

Chris White-Wants to clarify the discussion. All we are talking about is paying the electric cost. Not the bulbs. They are maintaining that. From what I understand is they are asking us to pay a portion of that installation cost that equates to electric savings over the next sum amount of years. On the basis that there would be a higher electric savings. We are already paying the electric. So these new bulbs would reduce our current cost and they are looking for us to help. Because basically we are going to benefit from the change. Was that correct?

Jim Tiehen-Yes. Once we do the initial installation. Then it is our responsibility to take care of those bulbs.

Phil Hodes-And the savings go to you (the City). Your electric costs are going to be 60% lower.

Abbas Haideri-In the future perhaps if other subdivisions come to change their bulbs. Maybe that is what we look at. Obviously a 15 foot high pole is going to deliver less lighting than a 30 foot high pole.

Marsha Monica-But the point is, those pole are already installed. They are grandfathered in I would think. If we go in and say take them all out and do our standard...*(interrupted)*

Abbas Haideri-I'm talking about in the future; setting a precedent.

Chris White-I understand what you are saying; but Marsha's point is well taken. If we are paying this electric bill right now (for however many fixtures they have). Right now, if they do nothing we will continue to pay the bill. If they take the whole cost and do the installation (which I think is permitted under; there really is no reason we would say they couldn't put LED's in) then we will save this money. Whether or not we give any of that back to them.

Jim Tiehen-It doesn't make any sense for us to absorb that because we just do maintenance. Our maintenance cost is \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year and your electricity cost is running-I don't know what it is running.

Abbas Haideri-I want to clarify the statement. Referencing the third paragraph in The Tiehen Groups letter of May 26, 2015: "We are requesting the City consider sharing the cost of installation". It is just the installation. The labor part we are not going into? Or what is that you mean?

Jim Tiehen-To explain what we did. Mr. Hodes was heading the Board in this discussion. We were looking at the cost and we change out our fixtures sometimes more often than we should. We are changing out our fixtures every twelve months let's say. We have almost 630 fixtures. It is costing us Fisher Electric goes out there and changes them and then we have other issues with them. And it is costing anywhere from \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year. What we are seeing happen in the market place is these LED lightings. A lot of my homes associations we pay the electricity costs as well as the maintenance on the light poles. And any time we can get a pay back in three years or less, to us that is a go. It's a green light and just makes sense to do it. When I took it out to bid I talked to Chad with Ameriss and I talked to Fisher Electric. Fisher Electric has been our approved contractor. The savings that we figured and I'll let Chad go through the calculations, but it looked like it was a win win for both sides. The City and the Hallbrook Development.

Abbas Haideri-I agree with the LED and saving energy. The only reason for my question is because this sets a president for Tuscany or Hazelwood or Sienna or whoever else would come in.

Jim Tiehen-But I think in the long run we will all save money because of it. After 2 ½ years it is a pure savings.

Jon Grams-Two points. One: It has already been established by Joe Johnson that there is a tremendous savings with LEDs. So going through these numbers is fine, but he has already proven it with the City's lights with a 66% savings. So I do not know why you can't duplicate that with Hallbrook and the same kind of LED bulbs. The second thing is, as far as if we agree to do this, the part where the poles do not give enough lighting and all this as it does now-that is what the City does. You can bring back whatever you want, but still the City has to approve it. So I think and I don't know that there is a reason to have all these discussions and go through this another two times. It is pretty simple that there is a tremendous savings. I do not know why we wouldn't go along with this. The City is going to approve the \$100,000. Then it is up to Joe and his crew to say yes the lighting is the same as it is now. I do not know what else there is to prove.

Marsha Monica-I want to confirm so I have it clear in my own mind. This is how I read this is basically you are asking the City to reimburse the difference between what they were paying and what they would save back to you and we are not really paying you to do this change out. But we are kind of reimbursing you until you meet whatever you paid out and then it stops.

Group: NO

Jim Tiehan-The proposal was if it is going to cost us \$140,000. Then the City would pay \$100,000 and Hallbrook would pay \$40,000.

Chris White-You might explain the basis on why/where you came you with those numbers.

Jim Tiehan-We are requesting that the City pay that part up front. Whether the City contracts that or we contract that, we pay it/you reimburse us; it doesn't matter.

Carrie Rezac-And then once that process is done the City realizes the savings.

Marsha Monica-Then after 2.7 years, the City will have received their investment back.

Jon Grams-And they (the City) will still have the savings going on forever.

Abbas Haideri-What is the expected life of each of the bulbs?

Chad Leathers-There is a 100,000 burn hours. So that is 11.2 years on 11.4 hours a day which is the average burn hour through 12 months. Eleven years.

Andrew Osman-A couple points. First: If you look at developments that are going on right now. The trend in the market place is better, faster, and cheaper. If you go to a shopping center and a prime example is Camelot Court. They had old 25 year old fixtures and they have been incentivized to upgrade those to LED fixtures. As you walk into the retailers, they are brighter, they are lower, they are better, and they are more inviting. I actually dropped some clients off over the weekend to Hallbrook. We do not live in the area, but it was a very dark, uninviting place just because of the light fixtures and the old sort of materials that they have. Verses what could be with the new LEDs. In my shopping centers when I apply for grants or for applications. We are doing one right now where we are going to LED. KCP&L actually has rebate programs where there are PACE Programs that one can do. That is the incentivizing. Look at the City as that incentivizer to say to these home owner associations; we will rebate you or we will incentivize you. That is the whole process here. We just sat through a budget last week where we wanted to facilitate and help out the communities, the neighborhoods, the Economic Development Committee and by doing so we have money there. How do we shift money around, this is one example to be inviting to the neighborhood associations, the community, to upgrade and bring our standards up to other cities or even bypass or circumvent or have a higher standard. So as Jon said, I don't know why we wouldn't want to do this. When we know from the cost standpoint it makes economic sense.

James Azeltine-In the letter from the Tiehen Group it mentions the cost of installation and the project cost is \$140,000. How much of that cost is for the actual bulbs and how much is the installation?

Chad Leathers-I have that breakdown in the packet for you and I will go over it.

Chair Rezac-Are there any more questions before our guests speak? Marsha?

Marsha Monica-Going back to his point and that is from the City policy standpoint. If the City takes on this then obviously there will be other groups that will come in requesting the same thing. Whether that policy change has been discussed and decided upon.

James Azeltine-That is why we are here.

Marsha Monica-As far as the City Council. Once you establish a policy. We are just recommending. The Council sets the policy. The point is; has there been a discussion at the City Council level that yes, we are willing to look at others (if we do this) and we are willing to look at others?

James Azeltine-No.

Chair Rezac-I think this is what will push that discussion.

Joe Johnson-Remember we are limited. You are not really opening up Pandora's Box. The City is moving to replace all of our street lights to LED's. That will happen over a much longer time. As we have about 3300 lights. But the City is moving in that direction. There are only a handful of subdivisions that are public streets with private lights where we pay the electricity. The savings in going to LED is what will offset the cost. So if the City pays it up front, you are looking at a 2 to 3 year payback and then the City realizes the savings for the rest of time. When the bulb burns out, Fisher or whoever they have maintaining their lights, goes out and replaces it.

Marsha Monica-And I'm not really talking about that. You are saying there are only a handful of subdivisions that this only applies to and we really do not have any new subdivisions on the horizon.

Jim Tiehen-I have to believe Marsha, that Hallbrook is the biggest subdivision that is out there that would be coming in.

Jon Grams-What is wrong with the other subdivisions coming to the City? It would save the City money. I don't have a problem with that at all.

Marsha Monica-I'm just saying there might be a precedent setting.

James Azeltine-Yea that is why we need to develop a Policy.

Chris White-And that is the key, what I am hearing is everyone agrees LEDs save energy. We do not really argue with that. Everyone sounds like City Policy is we generally are going to be replacing our light bulbs with LED's. The only real issue I think we have is what/how do we determine if we are going to reimburse a subdivision in the replacing. What is the value of that replacement? You said you have historical readings for the electrical cost. So the City should be able to look at those and say here is what your historical costs were for this subdivision and our policy is we've seen a 60% reduction in electrical costs, so our standard is we will reimburse an LED lighting project for 60% of your annual electrical bill averaging back "X" number of years. It seems that we could have a standard policy that gives us a number independently. So we could apply it to our data of what we have been paying and show our percentage of what we will reimburse because we expect to see this savings. And then if any other subdivision comes in; we already have our policy set.

Jim Tiehen-We obviously feel this is a win-win for both sides. We want to reduce our labor costs and that is where we will have our savings. As Chad said, it's eleven years (hopefully) before we have to change a bulb again, but right now we change them anywhere from 9 months to 18 months. So that is a big savings for us. It seems that this is the direction, the future, energy conservation and that is what we all should be doing. I took it out for bid with Chad's company (Ameriss) and with Fisher Electric. Ameriss came in 10% or so less. Chad has done more homework on it and has more facts and figures so I will let him speak.

Chad Leathers-The City did 23 street lights at a 66% reduction and that was about a year and a half ago. LED's are a faster moving technology than cell phones. Imagine how many times you see where they have a new cell phone out? Same situation. On a month to month basis we're having significant increases in energy savings with LED's. We manufacture. Our technology comes to us, so now at 66 we are proposing a 70% reduction. So we should have another 4% in a year and a half. That is huge. We understand the kilowatt hours used because we work with KCP&L every single day. It is unknown if this will ever be on the Kansas side, but on the Missouri side, Missouri gets a 50% product and labor covered by KCP&L. The reason they do that is because less kilowatt hours used by KCP&L means they receive money back on a federal level. If we are saving energy across the board, everyone is saving more money. So a 70% reduction for these 630 pole lights that the City of Leawood pays energy on; the discussion doesn't have to go past that. But let's look at it. If you look at a 10 year return for the City of Leawood: \$571,000.00. There is a return on investment of 2.7 years. So then we re-coop the cost of investment. After 10 years the re-cooped process is \$571,000 on 630 pole lights. Impressive. It is not that my company does it ten times better than another it is that we have the ability to understand the math correctly, work with KCP&L and we are not just a Kansas City based company. We are in every state in the U.S.

Jon Grams-Did you make any assumptions on increases in electricity in those ten years?

Chad Leathers- Yes, 3%.

James Azeltine-What about the price of the LED bulbs? Is there anything figured in for that?

Chad Leathers-Nothing will change with the bulbs we install. We secure that price. One of our guarantees. We have a five year labor as well. So if something goes out within five years we are also coming out and using our lifts, everything to replace those bulbs.

Having an abandonment tax which is out there for anybody that is taking down an old bulb and replacing it with an LED bulb, basically a portion of the cost of the existing pole/not the labor, can be written off on taxes. There is also a Federal one.

Phil Hodes-That doesn't apply to the City.

Chad Leathers-Correct. Hallbrook representatives presented a report on LED Lighting. Hallbrook representatives are requesting that the City consider the cost of sharing in the expense of upgrading the street lights in Hallbrook with LED Bulbs. Although the lights are privately owned (decorative street lights), the City pays the electricity of the lights. With the calculations they have come up; the LED Upgrade looks to be a win-win situation for both Hallbrook and the City. Chad added that if you look at the cost of waiting analysis in the report, the cost of waiting for only 630 pole lights is astronomical. We are at a \$5,080/month cost of waiting.

Chair Rezac-After hearing the discussion thinks she would ask Joe to work on drafting a policy that you think is reasonable for not only this situation but anything moving forward. And maybe that is the recommendation to the Council to review.

Joe Johnson-Asked Chad how they came up with their breakout.

Jim Tiehen-Looked at the total savings that we would re-coop and what the City was going to re-coop and just prorated it by the total cost, and rounded it.

James Azeltine-I just did a quick calculation. They want us to pay \$100,000 of \$140,000 which is approximately 70%. And it happens that the product costs are approximately 68%. So the inference is that they want us to just pay for the product costs and not the installation services. Which I think is the way it should be because they own the poles so they should be paying for any kind of maintenance which I would put installation under that. But I would be in favor of paying for the actual product and setting a percentage. They have chosen 71%. I don't know what the right percentage is.

Jon Grams-The savings is based on the fact that each of us is getting paid back in 2 ½ years. They are saying they are not going to have maintenance of \$15,000 for a little over three years because of the new lights. So that is how they come up with their \$40,000 and then we get to pay the difference. And we get paid back in 2 ½ years. So we are each getting paid back on the same basis. So that is how they came to their rationale. It didn't matter how the figures came out, but that is how they did that. I think that is a fair deal. We are both in it.

Jim Tiehen-I think that is the way to do it Jon, because otherwise you don't know what a contractor is going to put in for labor verses the material and I don't think you want to be subjective to that. I think that is fair to look at the savings and the pay back. And both parties will be paid back in the same period of time.

Chris White-And we do not want to incentivize having a higher cost product because we will pay for the product vs the labor and things kind of move around to make sure that what we are actually reimbursing is reflective of what the City is actually going to save for the electric costs.

Jim Rawlings-There are only a few more subdivisions like this. It would be good to have a policy for this; however they may never come to us with it. There will be an end to it as there are only 4 or 5 others areas.

Joe Johnson-Those other subdivisions may have half the lights total compared to what Hallbrook's Subdivision has.

Jon Grams-They would need to have the money to pay for their portion.

Chris White-But you would want to encourage it. I think generally it is in our interest for them to do this because it will make the City's electrical bill come down in cost.

Marsha Monica-Does the City have a plan to switch out our lights?

Joe Johnson-Advised all new construction the City does will have LED's. For example 143<sup>rd</sup> Street. We are looking at our thoroughfares right now for our construction projects. At some point we will look at replacing the remaining lights with LED's. Most of the street lights in the City, the City does own.

Ken Conrad-Asked if the City owns most of the street lights.

Joe Johnson-Advised yes about 3300. And then there is a small number of private subdivisions that own their own street lights.

Abbas Haideri-Asked about the color and if the LED's were going to be white. Are we trying to blend all the lights across the City? Is there a standard temperature of the lights?

Chad Leathers-They can do color schemes from 2700K (which is the color temperature) all the way up to 7K.

David Ley-Yes we keep it at 4200.

Chad Leathers- (4,000 to 5,000) is City regulations?

David Ley-Yes.

Jim Tiehen-Obviously for Hallbrook we want to make sure that our residents are pleased so we do not want to have a major change out of illumination.

Ken Conrad-So what are they? Is there a foot candle now in Hallbrook?

Chad Leathers-We are more concerned about throw. LED's are directional. Even if it is 16 feet, I can match the throw of a 40 foot pole. I can cover the whole thing.

Ken Conrad-So these are going to be pretty much custom designed LED clusters for a fixture.

Chad Leathers-Cluster is a great word for it. When you get into City or cobra heads or street lights like this it literally is just a cluster of light emitting diodes.

Abbas Haideri-and then the throw can be controlled so that it is not going beyond properties.

Chad Leathers-Absolutely, we just did Loch Lloyd with the Tiehen Group and it is 100% custom. Some people did not want it coming in their yards, some people only wanted it in a specific area, and we customized it.

Phil Hodes-I want to thank all of you for listening to us. I've sat at these tables; I've been in your shoes. I was a five-term City Councilman in Leawood in the 1970's and 1980's. I think back to those days and I've aggravated Joe for probably that many years. I knew Andy when he was a

baby. I e-mailed David almost weekly. I love Leawood. I've only lived in Leawood and if I move out of Hallbrook, we will live in Leawood. But I personally appreciate all the time you spend making this a wonderful place to live. I just heard that Scottsdale is change out. I knew that as I live in Scottsdale 7 to 8 months a year. Their big emphasis now is to change out all the bulbs to LED. So I think you are on the right path. One additional feature is I do not know how many bulbs we have (630); I would say that at any one time 20 are out. They go out on a weekly basis. So this will save us money. It will increase the lighting illumination in a beautiful subdivision. By the way we have spent 1.4 million dollars on landscaping in the last year so Hallbrook will even be more beautiful than it ever was. Thank you for listening to us and appreciate you moving it up the ladder so it will eventually get to the Council to have it passed so we can get this system put in place.

Ken Conrad-As far as a recommendation, it is the future and it is the hottest invention in an energy savings piece. I think the City and everybody ought to use it. We get ads for Ace Hardware to come buy a Florissant LED for \$20 and never change it again. This is obvious. I am not comfortable making any kind of a recommendation relative to the numbers of this proposal. I think we need to look at that. When I first saw this I thought this really ought to be going to the Sustainability and to the Finance Committees. My personal role if I categorize it on this Committee is those safety standards/how it works. And I think you can do it through the engineering of the systems. So I am all for it. I do not feel comfortable making a recommendation on how this is all funded and financed. Although I think it is going in the right direction. This Committee ought to recommend that this does go forward and in fact the City investigate and it sounds like we are LED substitution and change over for all of our fixtures. I'm just going to jump in on the early recommendation because I'll probably vote against anything that has to do with the actual process.

Jon Grams made a Motion that the Committee recommend approve what Hallbrook is asking for (the \$100,000) for their LED lights and that the City at some point come up with a policy if they think it is important for other subdivisions that are potentially going to do this in the future. My recommendation to the City Council would be that we approve this.

Carrie Rezac-So there are two parts to your recommendation. That we approve what Hallbrook is asking for AND that the City make a policy.

Jon Grams-Yes if they think it is important. Make it real easy. I would say if someone comes to you, it has to be no more than 2 ½ year pay back to the City of what they put up, and that the Homes Association puts up the difference.

Abbas Haideri-The only thing I would amend to that is that you make a policy and perhaps it happens simultaneously and that get approved for this. That way there is no changing numbers as to what happened to Hallbrook and what happens for someone else.

Chris White-Am kind of where Jon is at. Probably wouldn't vote for one that had exactly that number. I would indorse one that said the City reimbursed them based on the City's calculation of actual energy savings for the payback period of the project. That way the basing is based on what the City sees as our experience and what we will see across the board. His specific product is more efficient and that is great. But that is going to set the standard for all projects and not all projects are going to see that same number. So I am not sure I would support the actual number but the concept. And we are close to that concept.

Abbas Haideri-I support the concept. The policy needs to come first

Chris White-So I can say supporting the motion supporting the proposal and if the City determined an equitable amount for reimbursement then I'd vote for that.

Carrie Rezac-So I'm hearing that following an agreement on the policy, that the Committee would like the Council to give favorable consideration to Hallbrook's request.

Chris White-That the City determine the policy for reimbursement rates and then approve.

Marsha Monica-And then apply it to Hallbrook's request.

Carrie Rezac-Jon please re-state your Motion.

Jon Grams-How long does a policy take to create? Are we talking next year or soon?

Joe Johnson-Oh no it can be quick.

Jon Grams-Motion rephrased: That the Public Works Committee recommend approval of Hallbrook's request based on a Policy being developed that determines the amount the City will be willing to pay of the total cost.

Abbas Haideri seconded the Motion.

All members in attendance were in favor.

Motion passed.

Chair Rezac adjourned the meeting at 8:26 AM.

Minutes transcribed by: Julie Stasi, Administrative Services Manager  
Leawood Public Works Department