



ReBuild Houston Oversight Committee

Meeting Minutes: November 15, 2011

ATTENDANCE AT NOVEMBER 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 - **Present**
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 meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Ann Lents made the recommendations to change the following to the October 25, 2011 meeting minutes:

- Item 3d: add to the end of the line "and on all Rebuild Houston funds."
- Action Item on top of page 2: Change the last sentence to read "CM Pennington warns that RHOC should be careful that the materials distributed are accurate so they are not misleading".

A motion to approve the meeting minutes, with changes, was made by Mr. Boykins and seconded by Ms. Dyess. Motion was approved.

3. LID Presentation

Ann Lents introduced both Kevin Shanley of SWA Group and Michael Bloom of Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. Ms. Lents said the presentation is made in the spirit of furthering the Oversight Committee's education.

Mr. Shanley provided: time lapse images illustrating the change from farm property to development, hydrographs, detention basins within parks, etc. He stated that private development is a large component of Low Impact Development (LID). He discussed green infrastructure approaches to be considered for ReBuild Houston. He also mentioned that LID monitoring is not easy. It was recognized that changes to our practices will not happen quickly and is a slow evolution. He discussed life cycle or whole life costs in regards to O&M costs.

Mr. Bloom provided information on Houston topography, soils and rainfall. He presented LID cost information from an EPA publication showing that for some public infrastructure projects LID design approaches can be less expensive than traditional designs. He shared information about the pollutant levels in stormwater as compared to municipal wastewater. He noted that pending EPA regulatory changes may mandate use of LID in the future. He showed stormwater treatment system performance statistics from the *International Stormwater Best Management Practices Database*. He shared thoughts regarding local impediments to using LID. He summarized city and county pilot projects and desired future monitoring.

After the presentations, some points were raised and elaborated on as follows:

- Mr. Ross: Houston specific LID examples are needed taking into account our flat terrain and clay soils. This would include Houston cost data vs. the cost of the examples cited from Seattle.
- Mr. Bloom: There are impediments to LID. LID is a viable option but requires upfront discussion and planning by agencies. Formally adopted design details are needed to help facilitate the practice. We should not mandate yet, but encourage - perhaps with pilot projects and technically appropriate monitoring.
- Mr. Shanley: LID is not a way out of the drainage fee. It is hoped that the market will demand its use just like LEED is market driven. Major thoroughfare conversion to utilize the median as a way to store and convey storm water as long as you are not destroying the existing trees in the process. Infill is a challenge – Cottage Grove is a good example of what can be done. He hopes that ReBuild Houston will evaluate storm / transportation needs.
- Mr. Krueger: There may be some cases with opportunities and we have the best engineers in Houston designing our projects. If it can be done, he would like to see the proposals. A concern raised was the low flow median option. Overflow from private property fronting public rights-of-way would have to flow over the travel lanes to get to the median, thus affecting mobility.
- Mr. Boykins: How does LID compete with Proposition 1 funding and purpose. Mr. Krueger responded that it is not out of bounds.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Boykins requested the addresses for current LID projects and pilot programs. Mr. Bloom and Mr. Shanley committed to providing the information.

NOTE: The following link is from a Land-Water Sustainability Forum related to a LID design competition:
http://www.h-gac.com/community/water/cwi/past-workshops/documents/cwi-lid_10-27-2010_green_roadway.pdf

4. Old Business

Mr. Ross raised the subject of project priorities and categories of funding. His concern is that there is an appearance of not properly using the funds. **ACTION ITEM:** He stated he would provide a spreadsheet via e-mail to the committee members with an exhibit better describing his thoughts for further discussion.

Mr. Krueger made several points as it relates to the PWE's development of the CIP:

- PWE will not propose a final CIP document until late March 2012.
- PWE is proceeding with the Mayor's implementation plan from December 2010.
- The current CIP is not to be delayed.
- Committee does have a role in the process.

Dale Rudick distributed last year's CIP Schedule to help provide a better understanding of the CIP process. The next CIP (FY 2013 – FY 2017) will be a similar process.

5. New Business

As promised by Director Krueger, a Memorandum and related exhibit illustrating the "Drainage Utility Collections & Expenditures" was distributed. This exhibit is to help "clearly report the current status of the drainage utility funds on an on-going basis" for the general public. Chairman Branch requested comments be forwarded to him.

Dale Rudick distributed the First Quarter (September 30, 2011) FY 2012 Dedicated Street & Drainage Fund report.

Motion made to adjourn by Ms. Dyess and seconded by Mr. Boykins. The Committee adjourned at 11:37 a.m.