

# **ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee**

Minutes of Regular Meeting: March 27, 2012

ATTENDANCE AT MEETING:
Theldon R. Branch, III, Chair - Present
Ann Lents, Vice Chair - Present
Frances Castaneda Dyess, Working Group Chair - Absent, with notice
Dwight Boykins, Working Group Chair - Present
Edward Taravella - Present
C.P. "Chip" Bryan - Present
Honorable Bert Keller, Working Group Chair - Present
Gilbert Herrera, Working Group Chair - Absent
Jeff Ross, Working Group Chair - Present
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 10:34 a.m.

#### 2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Taravella motioned to amend the minutes stating his request for a supplemental report that shows collections/expenditures detailing the projects or uses that the drainage utility fees are being used to fund. Mr. Keller seconded the motion for the amendment. Mr. Bryan motioned to approve the minutes as amended; seconded by Ms. Lents. The amended minutes were approved unanimously.

#### 3. District CIP Town Hall Meeting Update

Mr. Rudick stated that nine meetings have been held since the last Oversight Committee meeting. Most of the meetings were well attended. Most of the Oversight Committee members attended at least one meeting and were thanked for their participation. Staff from several departments and individual district council members were organized and worked well through the process. PWE is currently a) responding to constituent stated/written concerns related to the CIP and 10-year plan and b) entering data received that expands our current data base for the 10-year planning process. A packet of exhibits for each district town hall meetings was distributed. This included district maps and spreadsheets indicating street and drainage projects for FY 2013-17 and identified highest needs areas for FY 2018-22. PDF's of the information will be forthcoming.

#### 4. 10-year Plan Process/Milestones

A calendar of milestones was distributed pertaining to the 10-year ReBuild Houston Plan beginning with the public comment period through the end of April consistent with Administrative Procedure 4-5 relating to the CIP process. Included in this calendar is the milestone for public comment data entry for the SWEET model to be rerun thus generating a revised draft of PWE's 10-year plan. This revised plan will be ready to distribute to the Oversight Committee on April 17 a week prior to the regularly scheduled April 24, 2012 Oversight Committee meeting. The final draft of PWE's plan will go to Finance/City Council by April 30, 2012.

Mr. Taravella asked how the process worked with regard to taking comments from a public meeting and translating it into data. Mr. Rudick responded that the half-sheet form distributed at the town hall meetings was based on 311 data that is consistent with input for the SWEET. Because we have addresses on the form, we are able to determine if we already have that information or if it is new information to be added to the data base. Mr. Ross pointed out that the 311 information will only be used for independent confirmation. It is part of the weighting – that is why on the form we ask for the address. The primary concern is structural flooding and if it is new information – it will provide us with really good data.

The latest list of Need Areas (Storm, Major Roads and Local Streets) was distributed. Mr. Ross raised the concern of some need areas being identified by SWEET that may not necessarily be the highest need areas. Mr. Rudick responded that just because something is being identified as a high need area via SWEET does not mean it is a project. SWEET is a tool and the first filter in helping to determine need. Cognitive thought and analysis will need to go into determining an actual project. Discussion ensued and it was determined to have a special meeting on April 10 to discuss a specific number of areas identified as high need. The purpose is to better understand how the computer model works specific to how some areas are identified as high need. Chairman Branch requested members to get their questions and comments on the specific questions to him by Friday, March 30, 2012. This list should not be more than 5 to 7 areas on the need areas already identified.

It was also determined to have another special meeting on April 18 at 1 p.m. to discuss PWE's final 10-year plan that is scheduled to be released on April 17, 2012.

#### 5. Items on Draft CIP Process Manual

Ms. Lents distributed a handout with two proposed motions. She stated that her first motion regarding funding allocation does not affect the current CIP and that PWE would have the ability to avoid any funding voids or be able to respond to limitations on particular funding streams. She moved that "fund allocations among the various CIP project categories should address need areas proportionately and that the long term desired allocations among project categories be achieved as rapidly as practical". After some discussion, Mr. Ross recommended that the motion be amended to add to the end of the motion "with a target date of FY 2018". Ms. Lents concurred and Mr. Keller seconded the motion. Motion carried.

The second motion was withdrawn by Ms. Lents for the stated reason that the committee has worked out a process to provide clarification for what need areas are.

#### 6. Working Group Report: Planning and Programming

Chairman Ross stated we have already discussed the items as listed above and has no additional comment. Mr. Keller had a related comment on the cost benefit definition as a part of the approved motion of the Committee at the February 7 meeting. Mr. Rudick responded that PWE has had discussion about a benefit/cost definition and it will be in the next version of the CIP Process Manual. This should be done by May or June.

# 7. ReBuild Houston Executive Report: Mr. Rudick presented the following points of interest:

- a. Website: The ReBuild Houston 10-year plan is displayed on an interactive map on the website and staff is working to feature pop-ups for each identified CIP project. Also, the website has had some modification to focus more on ReBuild Houston and it now includes ReBuild Houston Facts and FAQ's. Mr. Ross said we need new information on the web. Mr. Rudick responded that the material featured on the web will continue to evolve.
- b. Verification & Correction information as of January 29, 2012:

i. Total accounts 460,000+/ ii. Verification & Corrections received: 28,400+
 iii. Verification & Corrections approved: 15,700+/ iv. Verification & Corrections denied: 7,400+/ v. Verification & Corrections withdrawn/rejected: 5,100+

- c. Financial Reports
  - i. Drainage Utility Fees Revenue & Expenditures Exhibit was distributed (attached). Mr. Ross requested further clarification on the expectation that the drainage utility fee will not reach \$125 million for the fiscal year.

### 8. Old/New Business:

Mr. Taravella made a motion recommending a quarterly report be prepared for public distribution showing the amount of money that has been spent from the Drainage Utility Fees collected and the specific projects and uses detailing the projects or uses that the fees are being used to fund. Motion was seconded by Mr. Keller. Mr. Ross clarified the definition of "spent" meaning Council authorization. Motion carried.

Chairman Branch stated that both he and Council Member Costello gave a rebuttal to an erroneous editorial broadcasted by Channel 2 about ReBuild Houston.

Chairman Branch mentioned that the next report to Council will be in April. The Oversight Committee would like to be briefed on what the Chairman will present prior to his report.

#### 9. Public Comments:

Ms. Susan Petty of the Charnwood subdivision addressed the Committee regarding their community concerns. She is asking about how if an overlay is accepted by the neighborhood, what is the impact on their pavement condition rating for future reconstruction of the streets.

Mr. Yeager of the TMO stated that he felt that this meeting was a gratifying session and appreciates how the members were addressing citizen concerns.

10. Adjourn – Motion made by Mr. Keller and seconded by Ms. Lents to adjourn the meeting.Motion approved at 12:15 a.m.

# Attachment

• Drainage Utility Fees Revenue & Expenditures Exhibit (as of March 14, 2012)

# Drainage Utility Fees Year to Date Collections / Expenditures (\$ in Thousands) (As of March 14, 2012)

