

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTIES OF POTTER AND RANDALL

CITY OF AMARILLO

On the 23rd day of June 2021, the Heritage Hills Public Improvement District (PID) Advisory Board met at 10:00 AM by video conference in Room 203 on the second floor of the Jim Simms Building, 808 S. Buchanan, Amarillo, TX with the following people present:

VOTING MEMBERS	MEMBERS PRESENT	TOTAL NO. MEETINGS HELD SINCE APPOINTMENT	TOTAL NO. MEETINGS ATTENDED SINCE APPOINTMENT
Perry Williams	No	9	5
Seth Williams	Yes	9	9
James Bentley	Yes	9	8
Aaron Johnson	Yes	5	5
Kris Roberts	No	4	3

CITY OF AMARILLO STAFF:

Kelley Shaw, City of Amarillo
Kim Conley, City of Amarillo

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:

ITEM 1: Approval of Minutes from the June 16, 2021 meeting

Mr. Shaw briefly discussed the previous meeting and asked if there were any concerns or questions on the minutes of the previous meeting. Mr. Seth Williams motioned to approve the minutes from the June 16, 2021 meeting. Mr. Aaron Johnson seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

ITEM 2: Discuss PID improvement funding and coverage

Mr. Shaw began by discussing the possibility of using surplus funds to pay a developer without issuing a bond. Mr. Shaw stated that paying through surplus is possible, but it must be done in a specific way. He also stated that, to pay from the surplus, it would have to be discussed and recommended by the board and added to the budget. Mr. Seth Williams asked if the payment was made through the surplus if the contractor would still need to go through the usual application process. Mr. Shaw stated that yes, this is the case and that doing it this way would require a lot more involvement with the city to administer the contract and work closely with the contractor. Mr. Williams asked for a document stating why the developer cannot do work for the PID and ask for reimbursement. Mr. Shaw stated that he can provide documentation.

Mr. Shaw then explained that projects that have been completed, inspected, and accepted fall under the city's umbrella insurance policy. He stated that he had a large discussion and that the Risk Management department is looking into getting a city policy separate for PIDs due to the high frequency of claims being made by the numerous PIDs. He also stated that if

the city decided to get a separate policy for the PIDs, the cost for this policy would be allocated to all of the PIDs. Mr. Johnson asked if the PID makes any kind of payment for deductibles or premiums currently to be under the city's umbrella policy. Mr. Shaw stated that the PID tries to find out who may be responsible for an accident for reporting and claims purposes, but the PID does not currently pay any deductibles or premiums. Mr. Johnson asked if the PID is covered by the city for liability and Mr. Shaw stated that all of the boards are covered liability-wise.

ITEM 3: Discuss the design of PID improvements

Mr. Bentley began by giving a brief description of the two light designs provided to the board. He stated that both plans feature solar lights. The SCL 1 model was the first design presented with lights placed at 70 ft apart on 12 ft poles. Mr. Bentley stated these lights would take about three hours of direct sunlight to charge and would last throughout the night. The batteries for these lights are estimated to last 10 years and they come with a 5-year warranty, though he was unsure what all the warranty entails. Mr. Bentley explained that the light and the pole are sold separately. There are 35 lights in the SCL 1 model. These lights cost \$1,695 per light and \$665 per 12 ft pole to equal a subtotal of \$82,600 and a shipping cost of \$2,223. These are material costs and do not include installation or other fees.

Mr. Bentley also proposed a second version, the SCL 2 model. These lights are brighter and give off more light. This model showed lights placed at 100ft apart on 20 ft poles. There are 20 lights in the SCL 2 model, and the lights cost \$2,465 per light and \$977 per 20 ft pole to equal a subtotal of \$68,840 and a shipping cost of \$3,060. This model is approximately \$13,000 cheaper than model 1. Mr. Johnson stated that he was in favor of model 2.

Mr. Bentley suggested a third option, to take the SCL 1 model and cut it down by 50%. He stated that by cutting the model by 50% the board could wait for feedback from the property owners to see if additional lighting is needed or wanted. The board also discussed the possibility of using smaller pathway lighting instead of the 12 ft or 20 ft poles. Mr. Bentley suggested to use the SCL 1 model at 50% and place the smaller lights between the 12 ft poles to fill the darkness. The board discussed the possibility of using the smaller lights completely as the appearance of the light is more pleasing. The board also discussed the benefits of solar lights instead of electric lights to avoid unnecessary costs in the future as well as the ease of installation.

Mr. Williams stated that he'd like to see the price of the smaller pathway lights. After another brief discussion, the board decided to gather the prices for the smaller lights to replace all of the light poles in the SCL 1 model and prices to use the smaller lights between the 12 ft poles as suggested by Mr. Bentley. Mr. Williams suggested that installation requirements also be looked into to ensure the poles that are selected have the appropriate footing.

Mr. Johnson asked if the budget could be changed at this meeting to increase a line item. Mr. Shaw explained that at this point the budget had already been put into the budget book for city council. However, if the PID should need to amend the budget at a future time, a budget amendment could be done.

ITEM 4: Discuss future agenda items

The board briefly discussed possible times for the next meeting to discuss the lighting further and agreed to meet next Monday, June 28th at 3:00 P.M. via Zoom.

ITEM 5: Adjourn Meeting

There being no further action, the meeting was adjourned.