



## **ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee**

Minutes of Special Meeting: April 10, 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 – Absent, with notice  
Gilbert Herrera, Working Group Chair - **Present**  
Jeff Ross, Working Group Chair - **Present**  
Council Member Oliver Pennington, Ex-officio - **Present**

### **1. Call to Order / Welcome**

Chairman Theldon Branch called the special meeting of the ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee to order at 11:10 a.m.

### **2. Approval of the Minutes**

Ms. Lents noted an “s” missing in the draft minutes of the March 27, 2012 meeting. Mr. Bryan made a motion and seconded by Mr. Boykins to accept the minutes with the correction. Motion approved unanimously.

### **3. Specific Need Areas of Draft 10-year Plan**

Mr. Rudick recognized other PWE staff members present which included Director Dan Krueger, Deputy Director Daniel Menendez and Assistant Director Carol Haddock. He elaborated that the purpose of the special meeting was for discussion with staff of specifically identified need areas to provide a better understanding of the SWEET model inclusive of the planning and programming methodology.

Mr. Ross stated that the goal of the SWEET model should get us pretty close in determining the highest need areas. The question is not whether it is a good model but clarification on the input into the model to ensure its credibility and to see what is driving the prioritization. Director Krueger reminded the committee that the model has only been used to date in determining need areas, not project prioritization. Mr. Taravella’s concerns relate to the spending of money on outside firms to further study projects that perhaps may not be the highest need – to try to maintain the “worst first” philosophy.

Ms. Haddock addressed why JFK originally appeared on the highest need list for Major Roads. It was discovered that data on portions of the roadway was missing and, as a result, the computer was applying the limited data over the entire segment. In order to avoid such anomalies, the SWEET was reprogrammed. JFK no longer registers as a high need area.

Discussion moved on to Fuqua. The City's Master Thoroughfare & Freeway Plan (MTFP) was recently amended where this portion of Fuqua (a 2-lane asphalt section in poor condition) is no longer the major alignment of the regional thoroughfare. This portion of Fuqua is classified in the MTFP as a collector street and has a very low PCR. The question that surfaces is - because of the realignment of the regional thoroughfare, should this old portion of Fuqua be in the MTFP? Should staff make this determination & decision contrary to the City's adopted MTFP or should it go to pre-engineering? In pre-engineering, the first question to resolve is whether or not this road should be in the MTFP. If a determination is made that it should not be in the MTFP because of its close proximity to the regional thoroughfare, then a recommendation should be made to amend the MTFP eliminating this section of Fuqua from the MTFP.

Memorial between Loop 610 and Westcott was discussed. The committee's concern is that this roadway's condition does not appear to be in a state that warrants it being on a highest need list. Ms. Haddock reminded the committee that the PCR score is 80% of the weight, the other 20% is for the level of service (congestion). This roadway's high volume of traffic is what elevates it to a higher need area. As part of the methodology, pre-engineering will look at solutions to resolve the congestion issue that might address intersection capacity and not include reconstruction. Director Krueger stated that benefit/cost ratio will determine programming of a candidate project.

Council Member Pennington said that he thinks the Oversight Committee is doing what the amendment in the ordinance was designed to do. Mr. Boykins stated he feels the evaluation tool is accurate in what is being described today. He further stated that the CIP meetings were a good indication that the public does not have a bad reaction to ReBuild Houston.

Ms. Lents asked about the rerun of the SWEET Model as a result of public input from the public comment period. Ms. Haddock stated that the line of questions received from the town hall meetings was aligned with the 311 data base format. The only change in the revised draft of the Plan is in ranking between Storm Need Area M08 and M09. They simply flipped with one another.

Mr. Ross mentioned the summary of funding in the 5-year CIP. Form D indicates that the DDSRF will have about \$107 million which is pretty good. Also, it is indicating METRO funding for capital projects is about \$50 million in FY 2016, 2017 and 2018 – the delta is for maintenance and for capital improvements accomplished by in-house forces.

#### **4. Adjourn**

Motion made by Mr. Bryan and seconded by Mr. Boykins to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously at 12:40 p.m.