



## **Oversight Committee**

Minutes of Regular Meeting: June 26, 2012

### **ATTENDANCE AT MEETING:**

Theldon R. Branch, III, Chair - **Present**  
Ann Lents, Vice Chair - **Present**  
Frances Castaneda Dyess, Working Group Chair - **Present**  
Dwight Boykins, Working Group Chair - **Present**  
Edward Taravella - **Present**  
C.P. "Chip" Bryan - Absent, with notice  
Bert Keller, Working Group Chair - Absent, with notice  
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 meeting of the ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee to order at 10:38 a.m. once a quorum was present.

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

Mr. Rudick presented a package of minutes from four previous meetings. The April 10, 18 and 24 meeting minutes were reviewed and commented on at the regular meeting of May 22, 2012. Those draft minutes, as revised, were posted online. Revisions to the May 22 meeting minutes included three edits from Ms. Lents and two edits from Mr. Ross. Motion was made by Mr. Herrera to accept all four sets of minutes with suggested changes and was seconded by Ms. Lents. Motion carried.

### 3. "5+5 Plan" Discussion & Appropriate Action

Chairman Branch asked Mr. Ross to provide a summary of the SWEET demonstration discussions that took place on Monday, June 25, 2012. Mr. Ross began by summarizing the previous May 18, 2012 SWEET demonstration discussion that reviewed four (4) scenarios that looked solely at or a combination of pavement condition rating (PCR) or volume/capacity ratio (VCR). When more weight is given to VCR, then the needs shift more to the west side. The two additional scenarios discussed on June 25, 2012 utilized the current 80%/20% weightings as presented to the public. The variation from that 80/20 run was to separate thoroughfares and collectors with an average daily traffic (ADT) count of 15,000 or less. Those thoroughfares and collectors with an ADT count of less than 15,000 were then placed in the Local Streets category. This scenario run did two things. 1) It shifted need area focus to the west side and 2) it displaced local streets currently in the need areas with thoroughfares and collectors. The analysis of these additional scenarios provided committee members with a greater comfort level utilizing the 80/20 run currently used in the draft "5+5 Plan". Two conclusions were reached. 1) The highest need areas should not be ranked by numbers but suggested to show groupings and 2) reinforces the need for PWE to review the list prior to being made public. This would help take into account information that is not a part of the real time model such as a recent overlay or when a road's cross-section as indicated in the MTFP is not necessarily needed. This could be accommodated with the judgment of experienced senior PWE members stating the reason for a recommended change in the need areas. Mr. Ross also stated he felt PWE did a good job of analyzing and sharing their observations of the two scenario runs.

Ms. Lents stated that she concluded from the discussion that there may be some changes in need area determination. Since we are on the front end of this transition, it might be misleading to rank as 1, 2, 3, etc. Her suggestion is that the highest need areas be placed in groups in alphabetical order. Council member Pennington added that groupings would be better because the need areas listed is information prior to any pre-engineering being performed. Chairman Branch added that PWE, through SWEET, will make prioritization of candidate projects based on pre-engineering utilizing a benefit/cost analysis.

Council member Noriega stated that it might be good for at-large council members to be a part of the review to help balance between districts with more of a city-wide review. Mr. Taravella said that the 10 year plan is a two-step process where we are identifying need areas and then we will have project prioritization. He added that the cost/benefit analysis should be objective to take out any politics. Mr. Pennington recommended following the procedure that has been set in the *CIP Process Manual*. He also reminded committee members that we are trying to rectify 20 to 30 years of neglect.

Ms. Lents brought up concerns on how we are structuring the process and brought up the Bagby project. She would like a formal PWE response. Chairman Branch said this is more procedural and Bagby is a TIRZ project. Council member Costello said that TIRZ CIP projects are separate and independent of the City's CIP. The Chairman asked Mr. Rudick to report back to the committee as it relates to Bagby.

Mr. Boykins broached the subject of the Neighborhood Street Reconstruction (NSR) process. Mr. Herrera raised the concern of community support and their past efforts to get their local streets on the funding list and then to have the process change. He observed that we are not close to having the funding to address the needs that are out there. Ms. Lents asked if they could have information on what is on file with NSR's. Director Krueger said yes. Mr. Krueger said the issue is with accepted NSR petitions. This program started out as a cost-share program. Then the COH decided it would not charge which was an inducement for more petitions. Dozens of these petitioned streets are not in the CIP program. A memorandum was written and distributed (prior to the Oversight Committee being formed) explaining the transition from NSR to "worst first". NSR was a demand driven program; ReBuild Houston will be a needs driven program. Mr. Krueger further stated that no commitment was made when the petition was received. Requests may continue to come in but it will be based on need. Also, the way the NSR petition was set up was for streets on a block by block basis which is not the most efficient method to address holistic needs. Mr. Herrera stated that there had to be a better interface with petitioners. Mr. Ross added that the NSR was a "hop-scotch", block by block petition and now PWE can be programmatic to do a neighborhood project.

Chairman Branch recommended that we move forward with the "+5 Plan" without numerical rankings – in an alphabetical listing by groups. Mr. Ross made a motion to move forward with the "+5 Plan" in alphabetical groupings with additional background information to be included such as overlays and other circumstances in the form of footnotes. This recommendation includes further review of the process for local streets and storm drainage to be continued by the committee. Mr. Boykins seconded the motion. Motion was approved.

The subject of detention and comprehensive drainage planning was raised. The Director responded that the next version of the *CIP Process Manual* will help address detention and how project prioritization would consider detention requirements and costs. Pre-engineering will help address detention on the individual project level as well as the sub-regional or regional level. LIDAR also helps to not review need areas in isolation. Further discussion revealed that pre-engineering will be looking at solutions not just in the need area but will be looking for the source of the problem.

#### **4. Executive Report**

Mr. Rudick stated that a special demonstration of the Street Surface Assessment Vehicle has not been set yet due to the recent special meetings related to the SWEET demonstrations but will be set very soon and committee members will be invited once that has been arranged.

A list of ReBuild Houston projects currently under construction, in design and near construction was distributed. This list is located on the ReBuild Houston web site. Also, the new logo has been added to the web site.

Next regular meeting will be on July 24, 2012 at 10:30 a.m. in the Mayor's Conference Room.

**5. Old Business / New Business: None**

**6. Public Comments**

Ms. Susan Petty representing Charnwood said they received a response from PWE on their inquiry and are still reviewing the response. She would get with Mr. Rudick after the meeting to discuss further.

Mr. Daniel Riley representing Independence Heights stated their neighborhood has some concerns and it was requested he get with Mr. Rudick after the meeting to exchange information.

Mr. Roy Yeager with TMO stated he was still digesting the meeting discussion but still has questions as to when projects get on the list.

**7. Adjourn: Time 12:26 p.m.**



## Examples of ACTIVE CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

### Utilizing DDSRF Funding (Drainage Utility Fee, Ad Valorem & 3<sup>rd</sup> Party)

CIP Project Name	CIP Number
Aldine Westfield Paving & Drainage	N-000577
Astoria Boulevard Drainage Improvements	M-000276
Brays Village Drainage Improvements	M-000280
Bretshire Stormwater Detention Basis	M-000296
Bridge Replacement along Brays & Sims Bayous	N-000785
Hiram Clark, S. Post Oak Bridge/Drainage Improvements	M-000101
Kirkwood Dr. (Briar Forest) Drainage Improvements	M-000250
N. Eldridge Paving & Drainage	N-000795
Whiteheather Drainage Improvements	M-000262
Various Local Drainage Projects city-wide	M-000126
Neighborhood Street Reconstruction	
• Project 435A	N-000367
• Project 446, 446A	N-000378
• Project 450	N-000382
• Project 451	N-000383
Street Overlay Projects – Complete or Near Complete	N-001037
• Caroline, Crawford, Calumet, Southmore Blvd.	
• McKinney, Kirby, Montrose Blvd.	

**Examples of PROJECTS UNDER DESIGN and/or NEAR CONSTRUCTION****Utilizing DDSRF Funding (Drainage Utility Fee, Ad Valorem, 3<sup>rd</sup> Party)**

<u>CIP Project Name</u>	<u>CIP Number</u>
Airline Drive Drainage Improvements	M-000284
Alameda Road Paving & Drainage	N-000806
Beechnut Paving & Drainage	N-000765
Broadway Paving & Drainage	N-000573
Buffalo Speedway Paving & Drainage	N-000847
Clinton Drive Paving & Drainage	N-000804
Ella (Wheatley) Paving & Drainage	N-000533
Gellhorn Paving & Drainage	N-000623
Greens Road Paving & Drainage	N-000791
Hirsch Road Paving & Drainage	N-000617
Holmes Road Paving & Drainage	N-000590
Kirby Drive Paving & Drainage	N-000594
Long Point Paving & Drainage	N-000674
Martin Luther King Paving & Drainage	N-000801
Memorial Drive Paving & Drainage	N-000798
North Main Paving & Drainage	N-000816
Parker Road Paving & Drainage	N-000708
Pinemont Paving & Drainage	N-000475
Pleasantville & Glendale Drainage Improvements	M-000286
Regional/Subregional Stormwater Detention Drainage Improvements	M-000296
Sageorchard & Sagarbor Drainage Improvements	M-000291
Wallisville Paving & Drainage	N-000626

<u>CIP Project Name</u>	<u>CIP Number</u>
Wirt Road Drainage & Paving	M-000287
W. Little York Paving & Drainage	N-000687
Yale Paving & Drainage	N-000592
Various Local Drainage Projects city-wide	M-000126

Acronyms:

- CIP – Capital Improvement Plan
- DDSRF – Dedicated Drainage & Street Renewal Fund (ReBuild Houston fund comprised of Drainage Utility Fee, Ad Valorem taxes and 3<sup>rd</sup> Party funds such as METRO, TxDOT, etc.)

Note: More information can be obtained about each CIP project on the COH website as follows:

- CIP Number with the M prefix: <http://www.houstontx.gov/cip/12cipadopt/storm.pdf>
- CIP Number with the N prefix: <http://www.houstontx.gov/cip/12cipadopt/street.pdf>

June 6, 2012