

**MINUTES
CITIZENS BOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 2005
JOE C. THOMPSON CENTER, RM. 2.110
6:00 PM**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

**Diane Akers
Glenn Coleman
Jon Hockenyos
Leonard Huber
Perry Lorenz
Steve Martin**

**Richard Moya
Nell Penridge
Leslie Pool
Rod Reyna
Sal Valdez**

TRAVIS COUNTY STAFF AND GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE:

**Eric Anderson
Charles Bergh
Jo Carol Bradshaw
Neil Cable
Ken Gaede
Joe Gieselman
Carol B. Joseph
Kelly Page
Belinda Powell
Jessica Rio**

**Wendy Scaperotta
Stacey Scheffel
Elaine Schele
Beth Ann Sprengel
Mike Trimble
Roy Turley
Robert Turner
Gretchen Vaden
Charlie Watts**

1. Citizens Communication

Chairman Moya opened the meeting at 6:17 p.m. and stated that it was acceptable to start the meeting with only seven of fourteen members present since there were no actions to be voted on. He also explained that the agenda item order had changed: #2 was okay, #3 will be #5, #4 will be #3, and #5 will be #4. Mr. Moya then turned the floor over to Mr. Gieselman who stated that staff would continue to pick up where the meeting left off last time on the TNR presentations starting with flood and drainage projects, as well as parks and open spaces. He introduced Stacey Scheffel and stated that the first part of her presentation -- as well as Ms. Scaperotta's would be on "driving the need" for projects. Mr. Gieselman then stated that Ms. Scheffel is the Floodplain Administrator for TNR and that Robert Turner, the other presenter is the Engineering Division Manager for TNR.

2. Receive Staff Report On Needs Assessment For County Capital Improvement Projects

Mr. Turner began by giving an overview of his presentation. He stated that we would talk about the meaning of drainage; a little bit about history and the jargon used and what all of this means to the community. He spoke about the 100-year floodplain boundary and how flooding happens within this area on an average of once every hundred years. Mr. Turner stated that generally the 100-year flood is going effect land and structures along lakes, streams and creeks. These areas have been mapped by Federal Emergency Management

Agency's (FEMA) for Travis County to show where the 100-year flood boundary is located. Ms. Scheffel stated that a person does not have to live in a 100-year floodplain in order for their house to flood. She stated that approximately 20% of the structures that flood in Travis County are not in the current FEMA 100-year floodplain. Ms. Scheffel added that FEMA will only map those areas that are one square mile or greater.

Mr. Turner stated, that the greatest recent rain event happened in 1997. It was a 50-year flood event and was not as serious as a 100-year event. He stated that last year we averaged 53 inches of rainfall and that the Central Texas Area is famous for flash floods. Mr. Turner mentioned that the computation on a 100-year flood gave us 1,500 cubic feet per second on the drainage way and that one of the flood gates on Mansfield dam carries 4,400 cubic feet per second, so during that event, we had one third of what comes through a floodgate.

Mr. Turner stated that part of the County's mission is to protect the health and safety of its citizens and that 44% of weather-related deaths are due to flooding. Ms. Pool asked if the floodplain boundary would be different if the waterways were clear of debris. Ms. Scheffel replied yes, that the floodplain determinations is based upon the FEMA map.

Ms. Pool also asked if the County clears out those areas that are subject to flooding. Ms. Scheffel said that there were two answers to that question. She said that the County's subdivision regulations name the property owner as responsible for the maintenance of the lot where the floodplain is located. She also said that the major floods are not due to debris in the creeks, but to a large amount of rainfall coming down at once.

Mr. Turner informed us on why flooding events cost money and where the public funds go when we have a flood. He stated that flooding has an impact on emergency services personnel costs that include rescues and road closures. He said that then there is the cost of debris removal and road and bridge repair. He also said that flooding could affect property values and therefore our tax base.

Ms. Scheffel stated that there are four ways to solve this flood/drainage problem: FEMA grant programs, US Army Corp of Engineers Flood Damage Evaluation Studies, Drainage Retrofits, and Drainage Replacements. Ms. Scheffel stated that the main purpose for the FEMA grant program is to protect the national flood insurance program.

She stated that Travis County has participated in this program since 1998, when we had a major flood on Onion Creek. The studies are funded at 75% federal and 25% local, and to date we've brought 44 properties, which is basically due to the post flood mitigation. Ms. Scheffel stated that after a flood, a County must be declared a presidential disaster area in order to be eligible for funds. She said that FEMA has a very particular definition of repetitive loss.

Ms. Scheffel pointed out that there are ongoing flood studies that include Onion Creek and The Highland Lakes. Future studies include Walnut Creek, Colorado River and the Longhorn dam. She noted that all information about these studies can be found on the website at FDEP.org.

Ms. Scheffel stated that the County's current subdivision regulations require the preservation and dedication of floodplain area. Mr. Turner stated that the County staff would not issue a

development permit unless the development plans show that it will be elevated one foot above the 100-year floodplain level.

Mr. Coleman asked about the jurisdictional boundary limits that the floodplain ordinance covers. Ms. Scheffel replied that we have jurisdiction in the entire unincorporated area of the County. Ms. Pool asked a question concerning the Walnut Creek “buy out” situation in the newspaper. Ms. Scheffel stated that this item was in the Commissioner’s court today and that TNR staff is working with residents on what to do about it. Mr. Gieselman added that the County might be launching a new “buy out” program for those who have property damage due to erosion.

Mr. Turner stated that there are certain threshold criteria to consider when looking at bond project eligibility. He handed out a summary of the selection criteria to the committee. One of these criterion would be whether or not the County has an obligation to do something because of a legal obligation. The candidate project also needs to be in the unincorporated area of Travis County (including the ETJ). He then went into other criteria the county uses to decide the merits of a drainage project.

Mr. Turner stated that the project must fall under one of the existing County programs that we operate. If it does, then the project is prioritized based upon other factors such as safety. Flood damage to a structure would be another criterion, as well as road damage. Other criteria to consider are things such as hazards to health from pollution and stagnant water. In addition, the number of citizens impacted in return for the investment is a consideration.

Mr. Hockenyos asked had there been any potential projects that did not fit into these broad categories? Ms. Scheffel replied that all of our projects would fit into the categories. Mr. Hockkenyos asked if cost/benefit criterion serves as a tiebreaker. Mr. Turner replied that it does, more or less serve as such. Ms Scheffel added that in some cases, it is really a case of how much value to place on human life.

For this next item, Chairman Moya introduced Ms. Wendy Scaperotta who is the parks planner for Travis County. Ms. Scaperotta stated that she would talk about what Travis County’s parks and open space needs are and how we determine those needs. Also she said that she would address what Travis County’s role is in fulfilling those needs. She said that we have a TNR Parks and Open Space Plan and a Texas Parks & Wildlife approved plan that guides the process.

Ms. Scaperotta stated that the reason we seek Parks & Wildlife approval is because it supports best planning practices that they require if a jurisdiction is to receive their funding. She stated that in the 1997 bond program, we took on a new responsibility by acquiring acreages for Metropolitan parks that generally are all over 200 acres. Those metro parks are Northeast Metro, which has a total of 415 acres and Southeast Metro, which is about 300 acres. In addition, she said we used 1997 bond funding for the reconstruction at Mansfield Dam, and some improvements at Webberville Park.

Ms. Scaperotta stated that there were funds allocated for land acquisitions and development in the 2001 bond program that was a continuation of additional phases of development for these parks.

Mr. Gieselman commented that today the Commissioner's court gave authorization to proceed with the negotiation for the acquisition of land for a Southwest park. He stated that he would be able to give the group more specific information about the park at the next Committee meeting. He also said that the price of land in Southwestern Travis County is much higher than what we have seen anywhere else in the county.

Ms. Pool asked if someone could show a general location of where SH 130 would be coming through the county. Ms. Scaperotta showed the location on the map. Ms. Scaperotta continued with a slide presentation about the Draft 2010 Parks and Open Space Plan, stating that the public input and needs assessment phases were complete and added that the plan formulation phase was in process.

Ms. Scaperotta presented other slides covering the subjects of how Travis County assesses needs through customer demand, established standards based upon population and resources. She also discussed things such as local expert interest, rates of participation in outdoor recreation and constraints to participation. She discussed the ten activities with the highest average expected number of participants per household, with the highest being the activity of picnicking.

Mr. Hockenyos asked about what the County's policy is on neighborhood parks in the unincorporated areas of Travis County. He asked if we develop and maintain parks such as this. Ms. Scaperotta replied that we are not actively pursuing new neighborhood parks, since they are very expensive for the County to maintain because of their tendency to be geographically dispersed and we have a very large county.

Ms. Penridge asked if the Metro parks should always have all of the activities and amenities that have been built into them. Ms. Scaperotta said that generally we have always developed a mix of things in each park.

Ms. Pool asked how many soccer fields do we have within the county. Mr. Bergh replied that NE Metro Park has 14 soccer fields, 4 multi-use fields, and the SE Metro Park has another 4 soccer fields. He stated that there are 2 soccer fields in Webberville, and multi-use fields at Richard Moya Park.

Ms. Scaperotta discussed parks and open space selection criteria and distributed a handout. Like the drainage projects discussed earlier, there are threshold criteria that are applied to each potential project, such a project's location, its consistency with policies and plans. Other questions such as "does it have a design life of 20 years or better" and are there any agreements that need to be in place for it to be a feasible project.

3. Receive Staff Report on Draft Project Selection Criteria for the use of Ranking Potential Road Capacity, Bridge, Parks, Open Space and Drainage Projects.

This item was address under item #2 above.

4. Receive Staff Summary on the Jail Operations Study

Mr. Trimble gave a brief overview of the presentation he made to the group at the last meeting and began touching on a few other key components. He talked about prisoner classification levels and stated that some of the things found in the Jail Operation Study show that there is no significant disparity between custody levels and housing security levels. He

said that we are now left with more medium and maximum classified inmates, but still have bed space that's configured for minimum classified inmates.

Mr. Trimble also spoke about "Inmate Population Projections". He stated that there were three different models: Low, High, and Proposed. He stated that the proposed model presented an 18% increase in average daily prisoners (ADP).

Ms. Pool asked about the accuracy of these expected ADP increases. Ms. Pool commented that she was interested in knowing if the County projected too high or too low in the past and how close these past projections turned out. Mr. Trimble replied that we hit around the projected number in 2002. Ms. Pool requested that Mr. Trimble bring those figures to the next meeting.

Mr. Trimble spoke about the County's physical plant assessment goals and about physical plant concepts. He presented a site map of the existing Del Valle complex and explained that the way the complex is laid out causes lots of inefficiency from an operational standpoint. The buildings are spread out and scattered, requiring additional staff to carry out oversight of the prisoners. Ms. Pool asked what was the thinking at the time it was built and Mr. Trimble replied that County personnel thought that the facility would be temporary and that the population would drop.

Mr. Trimble presented and explained Concept C-1, which was to maintain the existing building configuration and replace the bed space where replacement is necessary. The County would also build the required additional bed space.

Concept C-2 is the recommended concept, which is to maintain the existing buildings with useful life, replace bed space, construct additional bed space in a more consolidated configuration and configure new beds around existing facilities.

Concept C-3 is total replacement, which is not realistic and is the highest in cost.

Mr. Trimble expounded more on the recommended C-2 Concept. He presented a chart of the proposed changes and stated that he would later talk more about the custody levels and the meaning of this concept. Mr. Lorenz asked the question "If \$43 million is for variance beds, then what portion of the \$100 million bond money cap will be used for this project?"

Mr. Trimble replied that staff is working on coming up with an estimate of the C-2 concept alternative that will be presented at the next meeting.

Ms. Penridge asked if beds are needed downtown facility. Mr. Trimble replied, that the needs for downtown-beds are not being considered in the \$100 million figure.

5. Receive Staff Report on The Status And Management Of Past And Current County Capital Improvement Projects.

This item was postponed until the next meeting.

6. Adjourn

It was motioned by Chairman Moya and seconded, that the meeting be adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.