Flood Control & Storm Drainage Subcommittee

2024 Bond Task Force

Meeting Date: May 25, 2023	Convened: 6:00 PM	Adjourned: 7:35 PM
I Miccinig Date. May 25, 2025	Odriverica, 0.00 i ivi	Halbarrica. 7.33 i ivi

Committee Members Present:

Committee Members Absent:

Committee members i recent.	Committee Members Absont.
Anita Childress, Chair	Matt Canto, District 4
Edward McCullough, District 1	Susan Falvo, District 9
Gloria Alvarez, District 2	
Dr. Andrea Hilburn, District 3	
Larry Brannon, District 5	
Erica Solis, District 6	
Jeremy McConnell, District 7	
Gregory Franklin, District 8	
Woot Lervisit, District 10	
Macs Reynolds, District 11	
Robert Fischer, District 12	
Laurel Stone, District 13	
Stephen Tordella, District 14	

Staff Present:

Otali i resent:		
Terry Lowery, DWU Director	Marie Marroquin	
Matt Penk, DWU Assistant Director	Ivan Hernandez	
Sarah Standifer, DWU Assistant Director	Catherine Massolo-Pedroza (Interpreter)	
Eduardo Valerio, DWU Assistant Director		
Abidur Khan		
Mark Williams		
Natalie Wilson		

Discussion Items:

Anita Childress, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

Anita recommended a few changes to the May 11, 2023, Flood Protection and Storm Drainage Subcommittee minutes. Change "their" to "its" in the first paragraph. On the second page regarding public speaking at the subcommittee meeting, she asked staff to add "unless designated" after the first sentence. A correction was made on the last page, changing the tour start time to 9:00 a.m. instead of 9am.

A motion was made by Gregory Franklin, District 8, to approve the minutes for the May 11, 2023, Flood Protection and Storm Drainage Subcommittee. The motion was seconded by Dr. Andrea Hilburn, District 3. The minutes were then unanimously approved.

Anita Childress gave a recap of the tour on May 20, 2023. The purpose of the tour was to educate the subcommittee on flood management, storm drainage, and erosion control. Anita commended staff on how well the tour was put together.

Matt Penk presented "Technical Criteria for Flood Protection, Drainage and Erosion Control."

Laurel Stone, District 13, asked if commercial properties were considered for the Federal Voluntary Purchase program.

Sarah Standifer explained that, currently, no commercial properties are included in FEMA's Voluntary Purchase program. Matt Penk mentioned that if a property is part of the Voluntary Purchase program using federal funds, it can never be developed.

Edward McCullough, District 1, asked if the frequency of flooding is based on models and in determining 100-year flood event, is there a recent event to equate to that?

Matt Penk replied that in most cases the City doesn't have models. City staff uses rain gauges, performs area visits and reaches out to property owners in particular areas after large rain events. The 100-year event, statistically speaking, has a 1% chance of happening in any given year.

Laurel Stone, District 13, noticed there were no addresses listed on the Needs Inventory prior to 2014. How long have they been a priority? Has each location been on the list for 10 years?

Sarah Standifer explained there are some locations that have been on the list prior to 2014, but the Needs Inventory list was updated by staff in 2014 for the 2017 Bond Program.

Stephen Tordella, District 14, asked if the reason for keeping a location private has to do with property values in the area.

Sarah explained that keeping the location of Voluntary Purchases private is to protect the property owner's privacy. If a property is being sold, the information then would be disclosed to a potential property buyer.

Gregory Franklin, District 8, asked for confirmation that the Voluntary Purchase would not be part of the Bond funds.

Matt Penk explained bond funds could be used for Voluntary Purchase and that properties that are not on the FEMA list could also be pursued. However, it is a "voluntary" purchase. If funds are put into the Bond Program for Voluntary Purchase, and the property owner does not want to participate (since it is voluntary), it is difficult to reallocate the funds to other projects. Also, once a property is purchased, it cannot be developed.

Larry Brannon, District 5, asked why the property could not be made available to surrounding property owners, knowing that nothing could be built.

Sarah Standifer said that we have offered that option, but usually the property owners are not interested. The property would have to be sold at the appraised value. It is an option, but no one has exercised the option due to the restrictions on the purchased property.

Stephen Tordella, District 14, wanted an explanation of the difference between "Flood Management" and "Storm Drainage" projects.

Matt explained that "Flood Management" is more about how flooding is managed. Storm Drainage has more to do with conveyance of water and increased capacity to keep it off roadways and property by things such as inlets, storm drains, and pipes.

Woot Lervisit, District 12, asked if there was something that shows the highest-ranking projects to the lowest-ranking projects.

Matt Penk explained that the ranking information is in the needs inventory spreadsheet that was provided and has been sorted from highest score to lowest score.

Laurel Stone, District 13, asked how the subcommittee will know what the estimated cost is for a project and what the associated engineering cost is on each project.

Matt Penk explained that each project has an estimated cost included in the spreadsheet that includes both engineering/planning and construction. The planning and engineering design is approximately 12-15% of the construction cost.

Gregory Franklin, District 8, asked what "matching funds" means.

Matt Penk explained that this refers to additional funds that could be available for projects by partnering with agencies outside of the City (FEMA, Texas Water Development Board, etc.). DWU could also work with the Public Works Department in the event they have a project in the same area and the two departments can coordinate construction. In Matt and Sarah's opinion, there are not a lot of opportunities for matching funds for flood management and storm drainage projects given the current availability of funding at the state and federal levels and the priorities for that funding.

Matt Penk encouraged everyone to spend time looking at the spreadsheet listing the projects and that he would go over the information and how to read it.

Larry Brannon, District 5, expressed concern about silt from erosion. Where does the silt go and is it considered pollution?

Matt Penk commented that DWU has funded some dredging projects. They are not specifically listed in this Needs Inventory list. A dredging study was performed in 2013 and the City is still working to implement those projects. If dredging is for recreational benefits or aesthetic benefits, that is not something we pursue. If it impacts our ability to store or convey water, we can include.

Sarah Standifer commented that as far as pollution, staff investigates and inspects the quantity of debris going into our creeks. We work with the Code Compliance Department to take care of those situations immediately.

Edward McCullough, District 1, does the Capital Plan get funded by tax revenue?

Matt Penk explained that the Capital Plan gets funded by stormwater rates and then the department takes out debt. We can fund about 15% of the Capital Program on rates (cash) alone. The rest is funded by debt payments. The current Capital Program is not sufficient to make a significant impact in the long list of needs. The plan is to build it up over time by raising stormwater rates to support a larger program.

Edward McCullough, District 1, asked how the Bond Proposition works and how the bonds are paid?

Sarah Standifer explained that a Bond Program is approved when Dallas voters vote on a Bond Proposition. Each proposition will provide specific projects and dollar amounts for each project. Sarah also answered questions on how bonds are issued and where the money comes from to pay the bonds.

Stephen Tordella, District 14, asked why Dallas relies on Bond Programs every five to seven years as opposed to property tax increases.

Sarah Standifer explained that the needs require something other than just our operating and capital budget from stormwater fees. Sarah also explained that the law (recently passed) restricts the ability to increase property tax without going to the voters. State law makes it more challenging to increase property taxes. Residents can say they do not want any more bond programs but the result would be increased property taxes to a level that would not likely be well received. Bonds allow the projects to be financed over time with debt payments.

Matt Penk spent some time explaining the Needs Inventory list. The spreadsheet is sorted by highest to lowest project score and provides the project name, description of project, Council District, scoring, cost estimate (current dollars), 2026 Estimate (assuming a 5% inflation by the time the project is constructed), created on date (the date the project was entered in the Needs Inventory), Modified Date, whether the project is in the current 10-Year CIP, the funding year if in 10 Year CIP, and the number of service requests for this location. Additional spreadsheets show the projects sorted by highest to lowest project score by category (Erosion Control, Flood Management and Storm Drainage). A council district specific spreadsheet was also provided to each subcommittee member for the district they represent.

Anita concluded by stating, DWU staff are the subject matter experts and will provide suggestions on recommended project, but each subcommittee member should review and provide input on projects that you feel are important.

DWU will provide a recommended list of projects and the criteria used to select those projects at the next meeting on June 13, 2023.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 P.M.

Action Items:

Staff will provide 2017 Bond Proposition language/example ballot.