



**REBUILD HOUSTON**  
*better streets. better drainage. better future.*

## **Oversight Committee**

Minutes of Regular Meeting: August 28, 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 - **Present**  
Gilbert Herrera, Working Group Chair - Present  
Jeff Ross, Working Group Chair - **Present**  
Council Member Oliver Pennington - Absent, with notice

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

Chairman Theldon Branch called the meeting of the ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee to order at 10:38 a.m. A meeting in the conference room scheduled preceding the Oversight Committee meeting ran long, thus causing a delay. The Chair called for a moment of silence to recognize the passing of former Council Member Ernest McGowen and Planning Commissioner Kay Crooker.

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

Mr. Dwight Boykins voted to accept the minutes of June 26, 2012 and July 24, 2012. Ms. Ms. Ann Lents seconded. Minutes were approved. Mr. Jeff Ross made an observation that the NSR funding source is not limited to ad valorem taxes. He also asked if the committee voted not to place the Drainage Utility Fee Collections/Expenditures on the web. Mr. Rudick stated that council members asked the Chairman and staff if there was more information specific to the Drainage Utility Fees that could be provided regarding collections and expenditures. The exhibit answered their questions of concern and thus began posting in March or April of 2012 minor modifications. Note: On December 13, 2011, the committee recommended to not post the exhibit dated November 10, 2011 as presented.

### 3. C.I.P. Process Manual Discussion

Mr. Dale Rudick distributed the Significant Revisions in Version 3.0 of the draft *CIP Process Manual*, Version 3.0 dated July 18, 2012 that was distributed at the last meeting. Also distributed was a copy Tables 3.1 to 3.5 from the *CIP Process Manual* and made available copies of the Manual for those who may have not brought their copy. As stated last month, the primary change to Version 3.0 pertains to the definition of the benefit/cost for project prioritization. Mr. Rudick introduced Ms. Carol Haddock, Senior Assistant Director, Planning and Development Division of PWE.

Ms. Haddock briefed the committee on traditional evaluation systems and how the goal is to determine how many users benefit. Because of ReBuild Houston's identified need areas, we know what the initial problem is to solve. The tables provide the process to objectively determine a Candidate Project Priority Score (CPPS) quantifying the benefitted population and the estimated cost of the candidate project. These tables provide the means to objectively assign scores to help determine the best candidate projects for funding.

Ms. Castaneda Dyess posed the question regarding business vs. residential areas as well as the type of traffic on the roads. Ms. Haddock responded the process will look at both residential local and non-residential local streets which will count the number of houses or multi-family units. With respect to truck traffic, pavement condition is the primary driver in identifying need, not the type of traffic.

Council Member Green asked about funding allocation for local streets. Mr. Rudick responded that this committee has reviewed funding allocation and has made a recommendation to move to an allocation proportionally representative of each category with a target of FY 18. We have been charged by Council with honoring the FY 12-16 CIP which is essentially the FY 13-17 CIP until candidate projects from this benefit/cost process are placed into programming for FY 17 and FY 18 in the next CIP (FY 14-18). Ms. Lents stated that on page 23 of the draft it says the desire is to not reduce current funding allocation; what is the rationale? Ms. Haddock said not wanting to reduce funding is different from change in percent of allocation. The City is not over investing in major thoroughfares. The thought process is that we will not grow the funding in that category until the other categories catch up where they need to be proportionately.

Mr. Keller said that some big storm drainage projects have included thoroughfares and local streets. Do you have a ballpark estimate of what percentage is for storm drainage? Ms. Haddock said roughly 50-60%, depending on circumstances, can be attributable to the storm portion. She added that the City looks at all four infrastructure categories when performing pre-engineering for a major infrastructure project.

Mr. Ross raised the subject of extreme events being conveyed within the public right-of-way and if any analysis has been done on the cost to keep the extreme event out of people's yards. Ms. Haddock responded no because the standard the City has is to convey it within the public right-of-way. That is

the reason we have placed three alternatives for measurement of the benefit – the intent is to allow the alternatives to compete with one another. Mr. Ross asked if past data can be run. Ms. Haddock responded that we are not likely to get definitive answers. The drawback to attempting to apply to existing or past projects is that they were not developed in the same manner that we will have moving forward. Before, we did not look at all four categories. Chairman Branch said it would be best to do a thorough analysis of those going through pre-engineering utilizing the methodology established. Director Krueger added that we have an objective method proposed for pre-engineering. Yes we can compare to past projects. We will address prioritizing projects by utilizing objective criteria and if we compare it to the past, what do we compare it to - subjective information? Council Member Costello stated that what he thinks Mr. Ross is asking - should we advocate for keeping the extreme event within the right-of-way. Perhaps do a sensitivity analysis on some past projects. What happens if we relax the criteria? Director Krueger responded that question is a Chapter 9 Infrastructure Design Manual question – not a methodology question. Chapter 9 is currently in the review process.

A motion was made by Mr. Ross requesting PWE to provide information about the effectiveness of the expenditures required on some of the existing projects to bring an extreme event down into the right-of-way versus letting the extreme event still inundate properties without inundating building structures. Motion was seconded by Mr. Boykins. Motion carried.

The question was asked if there is a reason for the review of Chapter 9 of the Infrastructure Design Manual. The Director responded that the Department routinely reviews the design standards every five years. The department invites public input through the web and those users with an interest in the standards such as developers, contractors, suppliers, engineers, etc. This year it is Chapter 9 and next year it is Chapter 10, Streets. Those with a heightened interest in ReBuild Houston are aware of this schedule.

Ms. Lents asked about the pilot program identified in the Manual. Ms. Haddock said that the pilot project is to go into a small area and take measurements of the ditches and to determine how we can gain information about our ditches in a manner that is more consistent with the information we have for storm sewers. Director Krueger said the goal is to have a more complete extent of information within open drainage areas.

Mr. Taravella referenced the check point review conducted by the Pre-Engineering Review Committee as stated in the July 18 Manual. He wanted to know where the human review is of what is generated out of the SWEET model. Mr. Rudick responded that data review was a topic of one of the segments of the Committee's resolution that PWE responded to via a memorandum dated July 20, 2012 that we will develop a quality control and quality assurance plan regarding citywide data collection efforts. Ms. Haddock responded that she will review the manual and update language as appropriate. Mr. Taravella stated that he felt there is a lack of understanding of the tables in the manual by some of the committee members.

**4. "+5 Plan" Presentation to TTI**

Mr. Rudick reminded the members that since the committee recommended to move forward with the "+5 Plan" for FY 18 – 22, the intent has been to go before Council's TTI Committee for the recommendation on the proposed "5+5 Plan". It is scheduled for next TTI meeting on September 11, 2012. A draft of the power point planned for the TTI was presented to the committee members. Some minor comments were received to be incorporated into the report to the TTI Committee. It was requested of the members to plan to be present at the meeting so that they can be recognized.

**5. Executive Report**

Mr. Rudick informed the committee that the Bloomberg Philanthropies Mayor's Challenge has been extended to cities to submit one application for their best candidate idea to address a challenge that is relevant to multiple cities. The prize is a \$5 million grant and four \$1 million grants which is to be used in that identified need, solving the problem and sharing the knowledge so other cities can benefit. Mayor Parker is considering four Houston ideas with one of them being ReBuild Houston. With Council Member Costello's lead, Ms. Lents, Mr. Ross and Mr. Rudick provided in put for a white paper to be considered by the Mayor regarding a ReBuild Houston application. Over 400 cities are expected to submit an application.

The ReBuild Houston website now includes a new exhibit illustrating Planned FY 2013 Street Overlays. A Drainage Utility Fee Collections/Expenditures exhibit dated August 16, 2012 was distributed. The next Oversight Committee meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2012 at 10:30 a.m. in the Mayor's Conference Room.

**6. Old Business/New Business - None**

**7. Public Comments**

Mr. Ross said that Richmond Avenue between Main and as far west as MetroRail is planned to go was not included in the needs analysis. If Metro's University line is not built, he would like to know how Richmond is ranked. Mr. Rudick will provide that information to Mr. Ross.

**8. Adjourn:**

Motion made and approved to adjourn the meeting at 12:16 p.m.