

October 12, 2015

The City of Corpus Christi has a street reconstruction problem that is substantially larger than the money we have and will probably not be completely addressed within a generation. Hence, the current goal is to start the process of fixing the streets even though there is complete agreement that the work will never be finished.

If we intend to spend nothing on the project, then nothing more should be done.

However, it is very likely that \$10 to \$20 million per year will be allocated to street reconstruction. It is precisely because these are small amounts in relation to the total need that issues of efficient spending and prioritization become so important.

Repairing the streets has an engineering component, an accountability component, and an information sharing component. Each of these elements must be assessed; some may be improved. In no way do we engage in this task to pass judgement on current street efforts. This is a process of evolutionary progress.

What is necessary is a plan. The process of making the plan vets ideas so that good ones can be elevated and bad ideas discarded. It provides complete and coherent consideration of the activity with assignment of responsibilities. It allows City Council, City Staff, contractors, and taxpayers to be on the same page with regard to the cost and the expected results. Any plan must be specific, actionable, and produce tangible results.

The plan is not a forever thing; it will change based on a variety of factors and for good reasons. This is healthy and does not invalidate the need for a plan.

Planning starts by looking at the recent activities. It is the right starting point because one presumes these current activities reflect the current understanding that exists within the City with respect to engineering, accountability, and information sharing. I presume that because this discussion solely relates to well defined street activities that have already occurred, that the impact on City Staff will be negligible because the information is at their fingertips.

Irrespective of any additional funding for any street related project, the City should benefit from this review because the City already spends significant amounts on street construction and maintenance.

However, this largest impact occurs in the near future when tens of millions of new funding is committed for reconstruction. The most important aspect of planning for this expansion of street activity is for City Staff to specifically propose what gets done with new dedicated street reconstruction budget. I propose that City Staff plan for only one year ahead. By doing so, it is not a waste of resources, because if any funding is to occur, virtually everyone agrees that near-term planning is a necessary first step. The quality and efficiency of their plan will be judged on its own merits, and the exercise itself will likely cause improvement.

I submit this to the City Council as the charging document to define a course of action for the Infrastructure Committee, City Staff, and City Council. I have met with many, many stakeholders in the street process, and this incorporates the valuable feedback that I have received. It remains an open document to be improved.

We will showcase the successes before asking for new money from the taxpayers. We will fix what is wrong before scaling-up processes to ensure that tens of millions of dollars are spent wisely.

Faithfully submitted,

Andy Taubman

Deliverables of the Infrastructure Committee

1. Information communications standard for overall City streets
 - a. GIS map of City streets that link to the following if they exist:
 - i. Information related to last repaving (e.g. when, who)
 - ii. Current condition of surface
 - iii. Current condition of utilities/subsurface
 - iv. Current maintenance/reconstruction workplan
 - v. Budget for maintenance/ reconstruction workplan
 - vi. Estimated timing for maintenance/ reconstruction workplan
 - vii. Log of street cuts by third parties
 - viii. Log of last documented review (e.g. automated evaluation)
 - ix. Log of key dates (e.g. warranty expiry)
 - x. Log of Out of Cycle repairs (e.g. pothole repair)
 - xi. Inventory of street characteristics that match potential variance options
 - b. Publish all reporting described herein, and roll-up report of Project Units activities
2. Reporting with respect to future direct street work
 - a. Street acceptance and documentation standards
 - b. Budget variance analysis standards
 - c. Change order documentation and process standards
 - d. Sources and uses of funding report standards
 - e. Check register from dedicated funds
3. Reporting with respect to future indirect street work
 - a. Overhead allocation report standards
 - b. Street repair worklist (e.g. out of cycle maintenance) standards
 - c. Street repair cost (e.g. out of cycle maintenance) standards
4. Decision support methodology
 - a. Review street engineering standards and understand variance options
 - b. Identify assumption in-field checklist/activities to minimize maintenance becoming reconstruction or other errors immediately prior to letting contract for street work
 - c. Methodology and criteria for upfront cost v. lifecycle cost for decision making between paving methods
 - d. Develop standard costing model to set standards (e.g. cost per foot per type of material). Periodic update to reflect market cost and current contract pricing
 - e. Identify potential new contractor / engineer / service provider options
 - f. Identify and catalog factors other than PCI which might change prioritization of street activity

5. Inventory of current street projects currently active within the City
 - a. Bond program
 - b. Maintenance program
 - c. Reconstruction program
 - d. Identify third party, inter-departmental, or indirect dependencies

6. Review of recent street maintenance / reconstruction
 - a. Financial accounting for expenditures since program start / review of dedicated fund expenditures
 - b. Publication of completed work description
 - c. Review of contracting methods and outcomes
 - d. In-field sample review of completed work

7. Miscellaneous
 - a. Design elements of dedicated fund for street reconstruction
 - b. Outreach to internal and external utilities to make sure they are in the loop

City Council will direct staff to prepare the following:

1. Detailed spending plan for existing street maintenance program:
 - a. Next year's budget for street maintenance is approximately \$11 million
 - b. For any work associated with the amount of funds described immediately above, identification of logical street segments that need to be serviced as a single project, each one being a "Project Unit"
 - c. Assessment of current condition surface. Assessment of underground utility condition and requirements
 - d. Detailed, written lifecycle plan for each Project Unit
 - e. Budget for execution of each Project Unit including estimate of all hard costs, soft costs and overhead and designation as insider or outsider payments
 - f. Timing / ordering of project within queue
 - g. Proposed contracting plan

2. Detailed spending plan for future street reconstruction:
 - a. Assume a newly created \$10 to \$15 million fund for one year of street reconstruction
 - b. For any work associated with the amount of funds described immediately above, identification of logical street segments that need to be serviced as a single project, each one being a "Project Unit"
 - c. Detailed, written reconstruction plan for each Project Unit
 - d. Budget for reconstruction of each Project Unit including estimate of all hard costs, soft costs and overhead and designation as insider or outsider payments
 - e. Proposed contracting plan
 - f. Future maintenance requirements for newly reconstructed streets