

Marquez, Kendra

From: Pritzlaff, Ronald
Sent: Friday, January 21, 2022 8:40 AM
To: Marquez, Kendra
Subject: FW: decorative lighting discussion at PW&SC

Back up docs for ornamental lighting.

Ron J. Pritzlaff, P.E.

Assistant Commissioner of Public Works / Operations
730 Washington Avenue, Room 304
Racine, Wisconsin 53403
(262) 636-9400
(262) 636-9142 Fax
ronald.pritzlaff@cityofracine.org

From: Rooney, John <John.Rooney@cityofracine.org>
Sent: Friday, January 14, 2022 3:41 PM
To: Jones, Mollie <Mollie.Jones@cityofracine.org>; McCarthy, Terry <Terry.McCarthy@cityofracine.org>; Santiago Jr., Edwin <Edwin.SantiagoJr@cityofracine.org>; Lemke, Melissa <Melissa.Lemke@cityofracine.org>; Rouse, CJ <CJ.Rouse@cityofracine.org>
Cc: Molitor, Ara <Ara.Molitor@cityofracine.org>; Pritzlaff, Ronald <Ronald.Pritzlaff@cityofracine.org>; Mason, Cory <Cory.Mason@cityofracine.org>; Vornholt, Paul <Paul.Vornholt@cityofracine.org>; Letteney, Scott <Scott.Letteney@cityofracine.org>
Subject: decorative lighting discussion at PW&SC

PW&SC members:

I've done some research in regards to the discussion on decorative lighting. Please see below for existing ordinance and my thoughts on this matter.

- **Sec. 82-41. - Ornamental lighting.**

(a) *District of partial or single block.* An ornamental lighting district composed of a partial block or single block of any length contiguous to an existing ornamental lighting district may be designated an ornamental lighting district by proceeding under this section regardless of the length of such block or partial block.

(b) *Petitions.* An ornamental lighting district may be applied for upon submission to the common council of a petition signed by the owners of two-thirds of the property fronting on any block or contiguous blocks of an aggregate length of at least 600 feet. "Block" means the frontage on both sides of any street between two intersecting streets. The petition shall request the establishment of ornamental lighting of a specified uniform type of pole and fixture for the entire block or blocks which, if such district is approved, shall be installed at locations as determined by the traffic engineer. The type of ornamental lighting fixture and pole shall be subject to the approval of the public works and services committee in the hearing process. Petitions shall be referred to the public works and services committee for a public hearing, which shall be held within 45 days after such referral. The traffic engineer shall cause notice of such hearing to be published in the official newspaper at least one week prior to the hearing.

(c) *Hearing.* The public works and services committee shall consider the petition and the comments made at the public hearing, which shall be recorded. The committee shall make its recommendations with the reasons therefor. The common council shall, by resolution, approve, deny or modify the proposed ornamental lighting district. The ornamental lighting district shall include only frontage which abuts upon the block or blocks included in the petition. The traffic engineer shall order the lighting installed as approved by the common council.

(d) *Assessment of cost.* Pursuant to Wis. Stats. § 66.62, the cost of purchasing and installing the ornamental poles, fixtures and accessories shall be determined by the common council and assessed on a front footage basis to the property fronting on the ornamental lighting district. The assessments shall be made by the traffic engineer and reported to the city clerk who shall enter the tax upon the tax roll. Any person against whose land a special assessment is levied shall have the right to appeal therefrom in the manner prescribed in Wis. Stats. § 66.60(12), within 40 days of the date of the final determination of the common council.

(Code 1973, §§ 9.32.010—9.32.040; Ord. No. 8-04, pts. 17, 18, 4-7-04)

Cross reference— Utilities, ch. 98; supplementary zoning district regulations, § 114-656 et seq.

I was partially correct and incorrect at committee meeting. Let's go through what was incorrect first. There is no designation of historic district required to have ornamental lighting, it is actually approval of an "ornamental lighting district" that is necessary to have consideration of decorative lighting. What is correct is the approval of a district, albeit NOT historic, and the assessment to abutting property owners. The process is well defined in 82-41 above.

Essentially, a petition needs to be submitted to the CC with 2/3 of all property owners abutting approving the formation of an "ornamental lighting district". After that, the process seems quite routine. The cost of ALL lighting then gets apportioned and distributed to those in the district. A public hearing is then held, and if approved the cost assessed to the abutting property owners.

A simple example for "new" ornamental lighting, let's assume:

1. Three blocks of 600 feet in length. Two sides equals 3,600 feet of frontage (3 blocks * 600 feet * 2 sides).
2. Lighting staggered every 150 feet for a total of approximately 24 street lights based on photometric calculations.
3. The "cost of purchasing and installing the ornamental poles, fixtures and accessories" is estimated at \$10,000 per pole (includes everything from poles, arms, fixtures, bases, footings, wiring, conduits, footings, control cabinet, etc.). This would total \$240,000 (24 lights * \$10,000).
4. Assessed cost per front foot is \$66.67 (\$240K / 3,600 feet).
5. Cost per property owner of a standard 40 foot wide lot is \$2,666.67 (40 feet * \$66.67).

Another simple example for "existing" standard lighting being converted to "ornamental", let's assume:

1. Difference between "existing" and "ornamental" per pole is \$5,000 (YES, decorative outdoor lighting is extremely expensive).
2. For this example that would cut the capital cost in half. Therefor with same assumed spacing/photometric, the cost per property owner of a standard 40 foot wide lot is \$1,333.33 (40 feet * \$33.33).
3. One thing to consider as well is that in general, decorative neighborhood lighting is on shorter poles that standard street lights are, and could require additional poles to have the same photometrics, which means additional costs.

Summary:

In the future, when the City Engineer's Office identifies a circuit that needs replacement we could notify the abutting property owners of this process if the CC would prefer. This could be done in the spring around the same time we hold

hearings for assessable paving. The petition could be viewed as a preliminary resolution, and the final disposition would be a final resolution. We could then budget assessable costs in the that fall for CC approval and construct the following year.

I must caution the PW&SC and the CC that the City taking on the cost of upgrading all standard street lights through GOB funding is not inexpensive. The City maintains ~3,600 street lights and about a 1/3 are decorative. That said, without any judicious process in place to determine where decorative lights are warranted means upgrading the remaining 2/3 would be approximately \$12M. That is \$12M in today's dollar. Even if the CC budgeted \$500K annually that would take nearly two dozen years to accomplish, and the cost would be subject to inflation which is not calculated. For reference, the CC has generally authorized no more than \$200K annually to replace existing street light circuits that are in a state of disrepair, and in 2022 no street light funds were appropriated.

Feel free to discuss and let me know your thoughts on this matter. If deemed necessary by the PW&SC, the Chair can sponsor an item to discuss this in an open format. We can loop in the City Attorney to help clarify and write any ordinance change that is desired by PW&SC.

I hope this helps.

Respectfully,

John C. Rooney, P.E.
Commissioner of Public Works



City of Racine, Wisconsin

730 Washington Avenue

Racine, WI 53403

Office 262-636-9121

Direct 262-636-9460

Mobile 262-620-4615

Email john.rooney@cityofracine.org