# Flood Control and Storm Drainage Subcommittee

## 2024 Bond Task Force

Meeting Date: August 22, 2023	Convened: 6:04 PM	Adjourned: 8:17 PM
-------------------------------	-------------------	--------------------

## **Committee Members Present:**

## **Committee Members Absent:**

Matt Canto, District 4
Macs Reynolds, District 11
Robert Fischer, District 12

#### **Staff Present**

Sarah Standifer, Interim Director, DWU	Natalie Wilson, Manager – Water Utilities
	Administration, DWU (Virtual)
	Administration, DVVO (Virtual)
Matt Penk, Assist. Director, DWU	
Abidur Khan, Engineering Administrator,	
DWU	
Mark Williams, Superintendent – Water	
Utility, DWU	
Ivan Hernandez, DWU	
David Phan, Interim Senior Program	
Manager, DWU	
Patricia Davis, Project Coordinator, DWU	

## **Discussion Items:**

## **Approval of Meeting Minutes**

A motion was made by Jeremy McConnell, District 7, and was seconded by Woot Lervisit, District 10, to approve the meeting minutes of the August 15, 2023, Flood Protection and Storm Drainage Subcommittee meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved by the Subcommittee.

## **Subcommittee Meeting Timeline**

Anita Childress, Chair, reviewed the timeline for the upcoming Subcommittee meetings. September 5, 2023, meeting will be added to the calendar. Discussion was made concerning the Labor Day holiday and availability of Subcommittee members to attend. The general consensus was that the majority of the Subcommittee members will be able to make it, some virtually. Staff will present recommendations for projects made by the Subcommittee to the Community Bond Task Force (CBTF) on September 19<sup>th</sup>. The CBTF will consider public comments from the Bond Town Hall meetings to be held from September 26<sup>th</sup> through October 3<sup>rd</sup>. The Flood Protection and Storm Drainage Subcommittee will likely meet again on October 19<sup>th</sup> (tentatively) to discuss Town Hall meeting feedback and make adjustments to recommendations as needed.

## **Community Bond Task Force**

Anita Childress, Chair, discussed the Task Force's request for proposed High-Low-Medium projects. She mentioned that the Task Force would be discussing allocation of funds in their meeting this evening as well. The Subcommittee should begin to identify three of its highest priority projects.

## 2024 Bond Survey Report

Matt Penk, Assistant Director, DWU, discussed the 2024 Bond Survey report. This survey was part of the Bond 101 townhalls presented at the beginning of the subcommittee process and not the recent survey that the Subcommittee members completed. Questions 5 and 7 relate directly to the Flood Protection and Storm Drainage proposition. According to the survey, the number one priority for the Flood Protection and Storm Drainage proposition is protecting homes and businesses from flooding. Number two is to Build/Repair Bridges and Culverts. Number three is erosion control that threatens public property. Concern with erosion control for private property was right behind public property. Purchase of private properties that have suffered repeated flood losses was the lowest priority.

Matt Penk mentioned that the Flood Protection and Storm Drainage proposition was ranked number 7 on the list in terms of priorities for the next bond program (819 responses were received).

Jeremy McConnell, District 7 asked where bridges fall into the group. Matt explained that bridges in the flood and storm needs inventory are to address drainage/flood conveyance for crossing of creeks so that roadways are not overtopped and not roadway bridge projects for traveling purposes due to pavement condition or need for additional lanes.

Matt mentioned the bond allocation survey for public comment has been extended to August 25<sup>th</sup>. The Task Force and Subcommittee survey has ended.

#### **Project Coordination**

Matt noted that the biggest proposition will be for street improvements. Some of the drainage needs may be able to be coordinated with a street improvement project. DWU will work with Public Works to coordinate projects that may cover both transportation and drainage.

If necessary, money for a project can be reallocated to another project if there is a situation where projects can be combined with another Public Works project.

## **Erosion Control on Private Property**

Anita Childress mentioned that she is aware the Task Force is reviewing issues with private erosion control. Sarah Standifer, Interim Director, made mention that there is an ordinance and any changes to private erosion control needs to be addressed by ordinance change. There are not a lot of resources for erosion control on private property. There has been discussion in the past about opportunities for a cost sharing programming, but the costs are most often too high for residents to share in the cost. Anita stated that the Subcommittee needs to decide if erosion control projects in the district are worth the money that will need to be allocated.

Dr. Andrea Hilburn stated that there are homes and homeowners that are aging. She has heard from many neighbors who say they "don't have the fight" for items such as flooding and erosion control.

Larry Brannon, District 5, asked if the Bond Program was really the best tactic to deal with erosion control on private property. The City should start looking at other ways than the Bond Program to fund erosion control on private property. Sarah said there is really no third-party funding to assist with it. FEMA funds will not cover erosion control on private property.

Jeremy McConnell, District 7, asked if there were any cost sharing options for private property owners to pay back money to the City. Sarah said there have not been any conversations lately, but this has come up in the past. Those discussions have always resulted in that it was not viable for most homeowners. To answer the question of how it might work if there was cost sharing, Matt mentioned two examples of cost sharing – Sidewalk program (where property owner pays 50% and the City pays 50%) and Street/Alley Petition where the property owner pays back the City with interest based on the improved value due to the project based on an appraisal (this program is no longer administered by Public Works).

Larry Brannon asked how much of the Bond Program is being considered for Erosion Control. Matt mentioned the allocation being proposed for erosion control is 20%.

## **Funding Scenarios**

Matt provided the presentation, Updates, Feedback and Funding Scenarios, and stated the Subcommittee needs to discuss \$150M and \$100M scenarios in addition to the \$200M we have stated we need. If there are projects in the districts that need to be swapped out, Subcommittee members need to let staff know.

Gregory Franklin, District 8, said there needs to be an equitable way to continue with the \$200 million option. The more the budget is cut, the ratio for each district will go down.

Matt noted that staff will prepare project lists and details for the other scenarios of \$150M and \$100M after this meeting but tonight the focus is on the what would and would not be in each scenario compared to the \$200M version that the committee has developed.

Woot Lervisit, District 10, stated his councilmember is concerned and wants an equitable distribution of dollars in each district. How do we ensure that districts not getting a portion of the larger projects will get a share for other projects in the district? As of now, there are no big projects in his district.

Anita suggested that we present the big projects with scenarios, give list with data and then make our recommendations for projects.

The Subcommittee took a straw vote on Option A and Option B for the \$150M scenario.

## Option A includes:

#### Erosion Control - \$30.1M

Projects will prevent current and future erosion at 45 locations throughout the City.

### Storm Drainage Relief - \$83.3M

Projects will include upgrading & replacing existing storm drainage lines and installing new lines at 6 locations throughout the City.

## Flood Management - \$36.6M

Projects to prevent flooding and relieve properties that suffer repetitive flood loss at 5 locations throughout the City.

## Option B includes:

- Same proportion 20% erosion control, 80% flood/storm
- ~ \$30M for erosion control
- ~ \$120M for flood/storm
- Results in ~\$10M reduction for erosion control just like Option A
  - 45 projects (54 in \$200M option)
- Removing Knights Branch Ph. 2 \$18.3M (in 10-year CIP)
- Removing Trinity River Channel \$23M (prioritize in CIP)
- Keep rest of projects

The Subcommittee voted as follows:

Option A - 5

Option B - 6

Staff will provide more information on the how each option affect the number of projects and allocation in each district, so the Subcommittee is able to make an educated decision.

Robert Perez, Assistant City Manager, joined the Subcommittee meeting to observe. Anita introduced him to the Subcommittee. The meeting was adjourned shortly after.

# **Action Items:**

None

**Next Meeting:** 

September 5, 2023 6:00 – 7:30 PM