



Oversight Committee

Minutes of Regular Meeting: January 29, 2013

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING:

Theldon R. Branch, III, Chair - **Present**
Ann Lents, Vice Chair - Present
Frances Castaneda Dyess, Working Group Chair - Absent
Dwight Boykins, Working Group Chair - **Present**
Edward Taravella - Absent
C.P. "Chip" Bryan - Absent, with notice
Bert Keller, Working Group Chair - **Present**
Gilbert Herrera, Working Group Chair - **Present**
Jeff Ross, Working Group Chair - Absent, with notice
Council Member Oliver Pennington - Present

1. Call to Order / Welcome

Chairman Theldon Branch called the meeting of the ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee to order at 10:40 a.m. Mr. Branch welcomed guests and made notice that this would be Oversight Committee member Dwight Boykins' last meeting. The chairman thanked Mr. Boykins for his efforts, time and efforts.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Motion was made by Mr. Gilbert Herrera and seconded by Mr. Boykins for approval of the December 18, 2012 minutes. Motion carried.

3. PWE's Draft "5+5 Year Plan" (FY 2014 – 2023)

Mr. Dale Rudick distributed hard copies of the draft "5 +5 Year Plan" that were made available electronically to the members on January 23, 2013. Mr. Rudick reminded the members that the information was still an internal document that would be refined prior its release to the public in time for the District CIP Town Hall meetings that will be begin in February (Note: Draft "5+5 Year Plan" documents are now available on the ReBuild Houston website). Mr. Rudick introduced Ms. Carol Haddock, Senior Assistant Director of PWE over the Infrastructure Planning Branch, who would review the "+5 Plan" and Mr. John Silva, Assistant Director of PWE over the CIP Programming Branch, who would review the draft "5 year CIP".

Ms. Haddock called attention to the slide (attached). She stated that six consulting firms were utilized to perform pre-engineering analyses. There was a three step process for the engineering consultants to perform: 1) study and identify what the problems are in the identified 'Need Areas', 2) Develop solutions (and alternatives) with a defined scope, and 3) Score the 'candidate projects' consistent with the prioritization scoring as defined in the *CIP Process Manual*. Ms. Haddock further explained the differences between the higher scoring 'candidate projects' recommended for programming in the CIP and the lower scoring 'candidate projects' placed in inventory. The 'Inventory of Candidate Projects' will be reviewed and updated annually to continue to compete with all 'candidate projects' in the future. Ms. Haddock also briefed the members on additional information that was utilized in the last run of the SWEET model.

Mr. Silva explained that Programming (CIP) takes over from Planning. The Engineering & Construction Division reviews the pre-engineering analyses and discusses the best alternative. All the proposed new drainage projects came from identified Need Areas with the exception of one because it was already identified in the current CIP and is a subproject of a larger project. However, it was scored based on the *CIP Process Manual's* project prioritization mechanism and scored well enough for recommended funding in the FY 14 – 18 CIP. No recommended CIP street projects were outside of the identified Need Areas.

Council Member Pennington asked how the information is disseminated. Director Krueger responded that there will be summary content information on all recommended projects as well as the 'Inventory of Candidate Projects'. Chairman Branch stated we will be able to manage expectations by continuing to educate the public on the process. Mr. Pennington asked how the planning information is used specific to drainage. Director Krueger stated that PWE looks at possible improvements to mitigate drainage impacts. There is a three-fold review of drainage projects: mitigate within the right-of-way, surface detention within a project area and regional detention. If the opportunity for regional detention is available for those in pre-engineering then we will look at regional detention. Ms. Lents brought up the opportunity to partner with other agencies. Mr. Krueger responded that we continue to venture out in this regard.

4. Executive Report

The following information was presented by Mr. Rudick:

- **District CIP Town Hall Meetings:** Once information on the meeting dates and locations is released, the information will be forwarded to the Committee. The meetings will be scheduled in February and March. The Town Hall ReBuild Houston presentation will be made at the TTI Council committee meeting scheduled on February 12, 2013. All members are encouraged to attend at least one District CIP Town Hall meeting.
- **Web Site:** A new ReBuild Houston website has been launched.
- **Exhibit:** The Drainage Utility Fee Collection exhibit dated January 16, 2013 was distributed (attached). Mr. Rudick reminded the members that the account balance may appear high but we no longer rely on debt and we are now the bank; thus, funding needs to be available to accommodate the more than \$150 million in appropriations for Street and Drainage projects approved by Council.
- **Next Meeting:** Scheduled for February 26, 2013 at 10:30 in the Mayor's Conference Room.

5. Old Business/New Business

Mr. Bert Keller stated that his cynicism has been relaxed as a result of the high collection rate for the drainage utility fee and it being done with very little fanfare. Chairman Branch said the department did an outstanding job on its rollout.

Mr. Boykins said that he wanted to thank the Mayor and Council Member Adams for being allowed the opportunity to serve on the Oversight Committee. He thanked Chairman Branch for his leadership during this inaugural period. He also thanked Public Works & Engineering staff along with citizens and fellow advisory board members.

6. Public Comments

Ms. Susan Petty commented on methodology, PCR's, cut-through traffic, overlays and age of infrastructure.

Sam Dike of Council Member Davis' office stated that ReBuild Houston is a continuous campaign and we should work to manage expectations. He also asked about differences between how the CIP process use to work as to compared to how the process works today.

- 7. **Adjourn:** Motion made by Mr. Keller, seconded by Mr. Boykins & approved to adjourn at 12:05.

Attachments:

- Slide provided for draft "5+5 Year Plan" discussion
- Drainage Utility Fee Collection exhibit (January 16, 2013)

“5+5 Year Plan” Process

- Performed annually



1

CIP Programming

(Years 1 thru 5)

- Design
- Bid
- Award
- Construction

“+5” Planning

(Years 6 thru 10)

- ID & Prioritize Needs
- Pre-Engineering
 - ▣ Develop Solutions
 - ▣ Define Scope w/ cost est.
- Prioritize Candidate Projects
 - ▣ Based on Benefit/Cost
- Best Projects go to CIP

- Since 1984 -

- Since 2011 -

Drainage Utility Fees Inception to Date (ITD) Collections / Expenditures (\$ in Thousands) (As of Jan 16, 2013)

