



ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee

Minutes of Special Meeting: February 7, 2012

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING:

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

1. Call to Order / Welcome

Chairman Theldon Branch called the Special Meeting of the ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee to order at 10:03 a.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes

A motion by Mr. Gilbert Herrera & seconded by Mr. Dwight Boykins was made to approve the January 24, 2012 meeting minutes. Minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Consideration & Approval of Planning/Programming Working Group Recommendations

Mr. Jeff Ross initiated the discussion related to Weighting Prioritization Factors. He reported the working group felt flooding is important in the drainage weighting criteria. Meeting the City’s design criteria is also important but should not be the basis in the prioritization of need areas. He said that the weighting factors for impassable streets and underpasses were discussed at the working group meeting and staff followed the group’s recommendation to change the weighting factors relating to flooded streets and underpasses. He also stated that there is no consideration for safety and that traffic volumes are not factored in. Mr. Rudick responded that as described on pages 12 and 16 of the CIP Process Manual, there is a description of the specific criteria with respect to street capacity, which includes volumes and levels of service.

Mr. Herrera said it does not matter how the categories are weighted due to the need for new infrastructure being so great and funding so limited. Assume we change the weighting factors, what is the result? He stated that it probably will not matter in the instant due to the large amount of need for projects. He felt that the long term funding allocation on page 22 of the CIP Process Manual is more important for the committee to focus on.

Director Krueger was asked about SWEET prioritized projects. Mr. Krueger responded that no new projects are listed in the DRAFT FY 13- 17 CIP with the recommendation to allow for additional projects to be added once pre-engineering is completed and candidate projects are defined. PWE has utilized SWEET to prioritize need areas. PWE has not yet used SWEET in project prioritization. As we continue to refine the model, we will utilize SWEET for project prioritization in the future.

Discussion ensued relative to Cost and Benefit. Mr. Herrera stated that the committee should accept the January 2012 CIP Process Manual contingent upon further definition of cost and benefit for project selection.

Mr. Ross then made his presentation regarding Funding Allocation by Component. He asked several questions: Is the historic CIP reflective of what Proposition 1 is about? Should the committee evaluate the projects that have not been initiated as of yet? Are the drainage dollars being spent appropriately? Mr. Ross recognized that the policy decisions need to be left to the elected leaders. He further stated that this was a recommendation from the working group for the City Council to look at.

Chairman Branch stated that the Committee could look at some projects but if a project is placed in the current CIP by virtue of a petition, then it should stay in the CIP. Council Member Pennington stated that he would oppose any recommendation to change the current CIP. The current CIP is good and we would be micromanaging

Mr. Herrera said PWE's CIP Process Manual is a living document and sets a good methodology as to how the factors are currently weighted and staff's recommendation on funding allocation by component. He then made a motion to accept the CIP Process Manual but to add a definition in the evaluation of cost and benefit. Mr. Boykins seconded the motion. The motion was passed 4 to 3. Those voting in favor were Herrera, Boykins, Dyess and Branch. Those opposing were Ross, Taravella and Keller.

Chairman Branch summarized that the action provides a committee consensus and gives PWE the direction to move forward. Ms. Dyess asked Mr. Rudick if the Committee's action provides what is needed. Mr. Rudick responded that the categories that PWE needed input on from the Committee (weighting prioritization factors and funding allocation by component) are both listed as staff recommendations in the CIP Process Manual; therefore, yes, the vote provided the Committee's consensus and the direction needed by PWE.

Mr. Keller stated that he has great confidence in PWE to move forward and made a motion for the delivery of a definition/criteria/methodology in determining cost and benefit of projects. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Mr. Keller further stated that he is impressed with the professionalism and outstanding quality of the maps used in identifying storm drainage needs.

4. C.I.P. town Hall Meetings

Mr. Rudick reminded the Committee members that the CIP District Town Hall meetings will begin on February 13, 2012. A schedule of meetings and their respective district locations was distributed (attached). Committee members were encouraged to attend some of the meetings so they could get a fair representation of the public's concerns. A major component of the CIP District Town Hall meetings will be a "ReBuild Houston Update". A draft power point similar to what will be presented at each of the district meetings was presented to the Committee.

5. ReBuild Houston Executive Report

Mr. Rudick provided the Committee with

- PWE's FY 13-17 CIP Milestones. Mr. Taravella asked for a legend which has been included in the document (attached).
- Verification & Correction statistics as of January 29, 2012
 - o V&C received – over 28,000
 - o V&C approved – approximately 15,500
 - o V&C denied – approximately 7,400
 - o Withdrawn/Rejected – over 5,000
- Transmittal memorandum dated February 7, 2012 with the following (attached)
 - o Dedicated Street & Drainage Fund Group – Quarter 2
 - o Drainage Utility Collection & Annual Projections – Quarter 2
 - o Drainage Utility Collections & Expenditures as of February 1, 2012
- Reminder: Next RHOC meeting is scheduled for Feb. 28, 2012 in the Mayor's Conference Room.

6. Old/New Business: None

7. Public Comments

Council Member Wanda Adams addressed the Oversight Committee regarding several matters.

- She received a delinquent notice from the City of Houston regarding her utility bill. She stated this was her first drainage utility charge and she received a delinquent notice for her entire water/wastewater/drainage utility bill. She asked if this can happen to a person in her position, what about seniors or others? NOTE: This matter was investigated and an explanation with a timeline on her account was forwarded to Ms. Adams.
- The question was raised regarding the drought's adverse effect on the streets since the Street Surface Assessment Vehicle (SSAV) made its run throughout the City. Mr. Rudick responded that the drought's effect was city-wide. The City will utilize the data obtained from the SSAV but there are plans to have the SSAV to make another run city-wide in the future.
- Regarding the current CIP, Ms. Adams said it should be left alone because it was a commitment.
- Other points raised included what we will do to indicate projects are on the ground - we need shovel ready projects; and the future of METRO funding.

8. Adjourn – The Chairman adjourned the Committee at 11:59 a.m.

Attachments

- 2012 Public Meeting Schedule
- CIP Milestones (legend added)
- Transmittal memorandum dated February 7, 2012 with 3 attachments