AGENDA
2014 BOND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
November 12, 2018
Meeting Minutes

After determining that a quorum is present, the 2014 Bond Oversight Committee of the City of Denton, Texas, convened in a regular meeting on November 12, 2018, at 12:06 p.m., in the City Council Work Session Room, at City Hall, 215 E. McKinney Street, Denton, Texas.

PRESENT: Committee Chair, Randy Robinson
Committee Members: Tim Crouch, Sarah Gwynne, Brandon McCleskey, and Janet Shelton.

STAFF PRESENT: Bryan Langley, Deputy City Manager/COO, Mario Canizares, Assistant City Manager, Antonio Puente, Jr., Chief Financial Officer, David Gaines, Assistant Director of Finance, Brian Hogan, Assistant Controller, Larry Collister, First Assistant City Attorney, Frank Dixon, Chief of Police, Bobby Smith, Police Assistant, Kenneth Hedges, Fire Chief, Todd Estes, Director, of Capital Projects/City Engineer, Pritam Deshmukh, Deputy City Engineer, Daniel Kremer, Deputy Director of Engineering Operations, Gary Packan, Director of Parks and Recreation, Kevin Ann Mullen, Treasury Manager, Chad Allen, Deputy City Engineer, Caroline Booth, Director of Economic Development, Michelle Cunningham, Economic Development Business Development Officer, and Theresa Jaworski, Recording Secretary.

OPEN MEETING:

Randy Robinson, Committee Chair, brought the meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

The following items were discussed:

1. **Consider approval of 2014 Bond Oversight Committee minutes of July 20, 2018.**

   Committee Member Brandon McCleskey made a motion to approve the minutes followed by a second from Committee Member Janet Shelton. Motion carried unanimously.

2. **Receive a report, hold a discussion, and give staff direction regarding General Obligation (GO) funded capital projects.**

   Tony Puente, Chief Financial Officer, explained that this item details the funding source and the status of each project with a summary. Staff members were present to answer questions or provide clarification.

   Puente informed the Committee of changes in the bond issuance timing and recommendations on proposed allocations that will be explained during the meeting. Gary Packan, Director of Parks and Recreation will present the items related to his area.
Puente introduced Kevin Ann Mullen, Treasury Manager, who presented the report on the GO and CO funded capital projects.

Mullen directed the Committee’s attention to the spreadsheet provided for a status on each of the projects. Funding on the sheet includes the reimbursement ordinance, taken forward in October. It is a little misleading with the September 30 date, but staff wanted to be sure the $19 million in the General Obligation (GOs), as well as the $4.4 million in Certificates of Obligation (COs), were included in the reimbursement ordinance. The projects listed have been funded using the GOs and COs and staff members are available to address any questions the Committee may have on the updates to those projects.

Committee Member Tim Crouch, asked about the reimbursement ordinances.

Mullen explained the reimbursement ordinances are on the bonds to be sold in 2018-19, probably in the May or June time frame.

Puente added that the ordinances allows the City to move forward with some of these projects before the bonds are sold. This is just for federal tax purposes. Bonds will be issued in the summer, then reimburse the City, bringing back dollars that haven’t been expended.

Mullen went over some of the major projects funded by the COs followed by the timing of the bond sales that will include reconstruction of the residential and collectors and brought additional funding for the Bonnie Brae Phase Four project, as well as Hickory Creek. Being fully funded, there will be more movement on those projects.

The sale and timing of the bond sales included a reimbursement ordinance for $19 million in GOs and $4.4 million in COs. Funding for streets reconstruction was initially $7.7 million. Current funding in streets is over $23 million, so, funding was changed to the $7.7 million to fully fund the Bonnie Brae project. The Ruddell Project was put on hold, due to the movement on the TWU side. That funding was moved towards redesign and funded additional projects such as Hickory Creek Road and for the street collectors.

Crouch asked for clarification on the movement of the University Dr.

Todd Estes, Director of Capital Projects, explained the TWU Master Plan. TWU has a five, ten, and twenty year master plan. They accelerated their time line and Ruddell functions as an eastern entrance into the University in the twenty year time plan. But as they expand their campus, they are examining the impacts, as they move around the campus. This dovetails into the discussion from the last meeting on the repurpose of some of the funds toward projects that are construction ready; utilizing a portion of the funds originally intended for the Ruddell realignment project and have staff look at Mingo and Ruddell as a whole. The project would include the crossing but invest in the design of a more holistic solution and not isolated on that one part.

A discussion followed clarifying the project plan and how University Dr. will be addressed with the City working in a partnership with TWU, as their master plan evolves.

Mullen asked Gary Packan, Director of Parks and Recreation, to give some highlights on the status of the Parks and Recreation bond projects.
Packan began with the I.O.O.F. Cemetery. Phase One was completed earlier this summer. Crews are currently work on replacing the remaining fencing with the balance of funds from this project and additional donation funding. Oakwood was completed as part of Phase One.

On the playground replacements, Ebers was completed, staff is in the process of tearing out Milam and Denia and they will be playgrounds will be replaced by the end of the year.

McKenna is the last one to be completed out of this package. There had been some discussion in the past with the Parks Foundation regarding putting an inclusive play structure in that area. There was feedback that McKenna might not be the best location, so more discussion will follow. With the road construction of Bonnie Brae, that parking lot may be moving, so that’s in the planning for next year. At this point, whatever funding that remains can be dedicated to McKenna. Not sure if that will be enough for the entire structure at this point in time.

Parks requested that Finance staff change the allocation for the playgrounds scheduled for next year and be moved to this year, as part of moving projects around, going forward with a package and allowing the completion of Shultz and Young at one time. With funding for Shultz and Young ready to go, those projects will begin after the first of the year with the target of completion by summer.

The Trail System project was completed and ties in with some of the assets within the Parks system. Starting at the future tennis center at the corner of Riney and Windsor Streets connecting up through an area that is planned for a new dog park, over to the Animal Center and to Evers Park.

With the Tennis Center expansion at the corner of Riney and Windsor, there were numerous public meetings, as well as, focused groups in July and August along with general community meetings. There was great feedback from these meetings that will be included in an update to the City Council in the future. Currently, there are 16 full size tennis courts in the Master Plan and eight pickle ball courts in the future that are included in the budget for this plan. There will be a Pro Shop, restroom, concession, and storage building that would be renovated. An architecture firm is currently working on this project.

Waterworks Concession Stands were opened this year and both are under full operation. Did have some leakage issues but continue with a full inspection for coverage while still under warranty.

Packan followed with Parks property acquisition update. This was allocated for 2018-19 but staff was asked to push that time line back, due to the lack of any property location. Staff hopes to identify where the parkland should go during the Master Plan process then move forward at that time.

Vela is doing great but have had some delays, due to the rain. Opening will be in March of 2019.

3. Receive a report, hold a discussion, and give staff direction regarding the reallocation of project funds from the Park Improvement project at Lake Forest to the South Lakes Park tennis court project.
Packan stated that there was $150,000 identified for Lake Forest Park facility improvements. Those improvements were completed through a donor, freeing up those funds. Staff has requested that the $150,000 be reallocated to South Lakes Parks for the tennis courts bond project. Currently, there are two tennis courts at South Lakes that do not have lights. The bond package was written for two courts with lights. Preliminary estimates for that project is $250,000.

We're requesting the $150,000 from Lake Forest Park be moved over to South Lakes for a total of $300,000 to complete that project. If funding allows, lights would be on the other two tennis courts for a total of four courts with lights. For full disclosure, there are challenges with the lake. The Park lake needs dredging and the dam needs rebuilding. Staff is looking at a firm to do that work. Funds have been identified for the detailed analysis and construction drawing so that can go out to bid but will be a costly project.

Puente summarized the proposal to allocate to South Lakes Tennis Courts project the $150,000 originally planned for Lake Forest Park improvements and Milam Park. Those projects received outside funding and have been completed. Allocating the $150,000 to the South Lakes Tennis Courts will enable completion of the Tennis Courts lighting project or two courts will be lighted with this funding.

➢ Action Items requested from Committee:

On the approval of the reallocation of Park Improvement funds to the following Re-direct $150,000 to offset increased costs at South Lakes Tennis Courts for two new tennis courts and lighting of all courts.

Tim Crouch made a motion to approve the reallocation of Park Improvement funds to South Lakes Tennis Project with a second by McCleskey. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Receive a report, hold a discussion, and give staff direction regarding the reallocation of project funds from the Southwest Park Master Plan and Design project to a citywide PARD Master Plan.

Puente reminded the Committee of the $1.255 million provided for the Southwest Parks Master Plan. The request is for a reallocation of $100,000 from that project for a citywide PARD Master Plan incorporating aspects of the Southwest Parks Master Plan.

Shelton asked if the $100,000 is the entire amount of funding allocated to the City Wide Plan.

Puente replied that it was not the entire funding.

Packan explained that there is currently no funding allocated towards the Parks Master Plan so the majority of the work is being done in-house to aid in that process.

Gwynne asked if there was a need for some sort of Southwest Master Plan.
Packan explained that would be done as a separate project in concert with the master planning process. When the needs analysis of the community is initiated and the growth direction is evident, that will help determine what will go in that area.

Staff will take that information, work with a firm to put the plan together, and go out to bid or it will be a funded project for a future bond program, then integrate any other City assets that may be on that property.

Gwynne asked if the plan is to keep 250,000 in the Southwest Master Plan.

Packan stated the total funding requested for the Master Plan was $1.2 million the amount of the reallocation is for $100,000 to help with the Master Plan, leaving $1.1 million for the entire Park Development.

Committee Member Janet Shelton added that the amounts are disparate, if you could do a Citywide Park Master Plan for $100,000 and $1.1 million for Southwest Park Plan.

Packan explained, it appears that funding includes environmental test studies as well as design. Conceptual plan is one stage, the work on CDs and once that is approved it can actually to out to bid. Whether it is built at one time or phased, that will grow to a higher amount.

Gwynne reiterated that these are early fees that will need to be covered before the bid to know what will be allocated.

Packan confirmed. We can’t know what the bid will be at this time.

Deputy City Manager Bryan Langley clarified that Citywide, staff would consider all the needs involved, then from that, an overall plan, and specifically for the Southwest Park, all the amenities that we want included in the actual design for that park. Then as previously mentioned, the bid can go out for that plan.

Robinson agreed that the Southwest Plan will be a major piece of the overall plan for Parks and Recreation.

Packan added the Southwest Master Plan itself is estimated at $250,000 plus with a big portion of that is being done in-house to save. The cost of the Citywide Park Master Plan is not just $100,000, depending on your scope. But if design for the project is ten percent, that's a $10 million project or a million dollars in design work for a new park, that figure won’t get the entire cost.

A discussion followed on the current and future funding plans for the Parks Master Plan and the Southwest Master Plan, possible DISD ownership, and future needs of land in the area.

- Action Items requested from Committee:

On the reallocation of project funds from the Southwest Park Master Plan and Design project to a citywide PARD Master Plan.
Tim Crouch made a motion to approve the $100,000 of project funding be used to assist in hiring consultants to complete the citywide PARD Master Plan in 2019. Janet Shelton followed with a second. Motion passed unanimously.

5. **Receive a report, hold a discussion, and give staff direction regarding the reallocation of project funds from the Sprayground project to the Carl Young Park restroom project.**

Puente stated the $13,620.93 remains in that project and the request is to reallocate that to the Carl Young Park for the restroom project.

Packan reported that the Sprayground was completed with the dedication in May. In addition, the Street Department put in a parking lot and park sign. Staff is working towards a new restroom facility. The cost came in much higher than anticipated. A preconstruction meeting is planned, in preparation for that to be built, as well as a restroom in Quakertown.

The funds allocated were $200,000 for a final cost. Approximately $13,000 was leftover and a request will be submitted for reallocation of those funds toward the restrooms.

> **Action Items requested from Committee:**

**On the approval of the reallocation of Park Improvement funds to the following:**
Re-direct $13,000 to offset increased costs of restroom facilities in Carl Young Park and Quakertown Park.

Janet Shelton made a motion to approve the reallocation of Park Improvement funds to redirect $13,000 to offset increased costs of restroom facilities in Carl Young Park and Quakertown Park. Sarah Gwynne seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Puente asked for any questions from the Committee on the project updates presented.

McCleskey asked about the updates to the Bonnie Brae project north of University, since the last meeting.

Estes reported that staff is still working through the funding options with COG. They have taken charge and we are exploring federal opportunities, grants, and a variety of others. They are also pursuing the crossing at 288, where TxDOT gets engaged in a better way from Bonnie Brae to 288. Looking at realigning on the north side of 77 that leads to the UNT property of the triangle piece next to 288 itself. This would be coming across, alter the alignment just a little to the east to wind it over and north to go up and over 288 and then tie it in on the other side with a series of service roads to ultimately project it long-term further north.

Estes explained that these plans are all on the table right now as far as what is accomplished with this project. The funding picture is part of that, as TxDOT really starts to broaden their scope of what goes into this project. There will be more clarity as we go into the beginning of next year as all opportunities are considered and COG has been a very active player in making that happen. We have our design consultant onboard so going forward for the design, keeping the pace with the construction plan laid out earlier this year. To do that, we need to design as quickly as possible along with acquired right-of-ways.
Committee Member Sarah Gwynne asked if somewhere up 77 and that area is where Denton High School will be moved and if the construction will be completed before that move.

Estes answered that COG is aware of the schedule and all parties are working together with the school district, making certain that when the school opens, the road will be open. Their projected timetable puts them opening the campus for school the summer of 2022, meaning construction must be complete by end of 2021 or beginning of 2022. Staff is pushing as fast as possible on the design schedule, even while the actual construction funding is becoming clear.

McCleskey asked in his review of the minutes and reports in the package from last meeting, has the section between Scripture and University been put on hold.

Estes advised that was the original thought but COG has pushed that into the entire financial scheme for the project. The request was help to go from University to 77 but as the plan for funding the entire project of Bonnie Brae north of Scripture evolved, COG noting the plan to fund the project with a bond program or resources, suggested incorporating this entire scheme for paying for project. Part of that was that the City, COG and other entities brought to the table the option of paying a third, third, and a third, making the City responsible for one-third of the total cost of construction of Phase Five or segment from Scripture to University and the design cost. Lumped together, that covers the City’s third and with the remaining two thirds being covered by the other entities or the County, COG, TxDOT, and the school district and University of North Texas.

6. Receive a report, hold a discussion, and give staff direction regarding the reallocation of project funds from the Wheeler Ridge project to Bonnie Brae Phase 6 project.

Puente advised the Committee that the Wheeler Ridge Project is a $620,000 project.

Estes explained the intention was to use the Wheeler Ridge Project funds to provide emergency access to the Wheeler Ridge neighborhood, especially before 2499 was under construction and Hickory Creek was not through, dead ending and raising emergency access concerns. With 2499 online and Hickory Creek about to add two more lanes out to 2499 and working with the Fire Department, there was no need for a relief route with opportunities for a more direct route.

➢ Action Items requested from Committee:

On the approval of the reallocation of Wheeler Ridge project funds to the Bonnie Brae Phase 6 project.

Sarah Gwynne made a motion to approve the reallocation of Wheeler Ridge project funds to the Bonnie Brae Phase 6 project with a second by Brandon McCleskey. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Receive a report, hold a discussion, and give staff direction regarding the quality of street construction and reconstruction.

Daniel Kremer, Deputy Director of Operations for Streets, Traffic and Drainage, went through the basic quality control and how the department works in keeping the streets up to par.
The process begins with geotechnical testing, taking core samples to the bottom of the pavement or about 24-36 inches deep to verify what is in the soil and determine what to put down for the subgrade. City standards are 12 inches of subgrade and 12 inches of asphalt, unless the geotechnical testing proves differently and follow what is recommended. The line locates follow, to detect all the in-ground utilities and avoid hitting any lines when the work begins.

Kremer continued with the first step of the construction or the mill. This is the quickest and most efficient method of removing the top section above the subgrade where the remix and stabilization takes place. The top section is removed then the geotechnical tested recommended mix is added. This is compacted and allowed a “cook” time for the lime to get into the soil, dry out, and harden for about three days. The subgrade is remixed, then there is the gradation and moisture test on-site, that verifies all is ready for the final compaction, lay the base course, roll it and apply the top surface.

Estes explained the process of the recent updates to the transportation manual last spring and the actual pavement cross section that was updated two years ago. The updates were prompted by a shift from the 1990’s process. The root cause of problems is not so much the pavement; it is important, but if the base or foundation is not good, whatever you put on top is not going to be good. There was a heavy move from asphalt to concrete in the 80’s and 90’s when concrete was cheaper. Currently, both materials cost about the same but there were still failures in concrete in the 2000’s and a lot more expense, as concrete is much more expensive to repair and the longevity is not there. The engineering community discovered that there was just not a good base or foundation work.

Estes added that from 2,000 until now, there have been concentrated efforts to work through different methods to build up that base. That resulted in the manual updates and really changed the conditions out there. There are still a lot of streets that were built under the old pavement scheme so the foundation of those roadways are still pretty thin. A lot of roadways in town, asphalt and concrete, built in the 40’s, 50’s into the 70’s are still in pretty good shape but over time, they’ve had lots of traffic on them. Some of these older roads are breaking down but doing better than some that are 5, 10 and 20 years old. Lots of things to contend with at one time.

Kremer went over the road quality control. Testing is onsite and a pavement study every five years to check all roads and their condition. There is an increase in focus on the maintenance plan with the goal of checking every road in the City within five years. A plan is in place with a tracking system for crack repairs, micro seal, standard inspections, and follow up on citizen’s requests. Lessons learned: pavement failures in some new neighborhoods coming out of warranty. T&P has been doing pavement studies. There have been streets added that may have subgrade issues they are verifying and the studies will continue.

Estes added these studies are fairly comprehensive. There are 60 or 70 places that will be bored out to determine what caused the failure or what issues are going on. The goal would be to throw some science at it, not just for the current roads but what the other roads we are dealing with in the future.
Kremer continued with in-depth information on geotechnical testing. Currently, it is every 200-300 feet to take a core. Cores go from 24-34 inches, depending on the depth of the proposed pavement. Every street will get a minimum of two cores. Some issues require a deeper core to see what is happening further down below to cause an issue.

Kremer also explained the issue of curbs. All interior City streets have a curb. Asphalt naturally spreads and is moving. Without a curb to hold the asphalt, it will slowly pull off to the sides. On some of the rural roads with no curb or bar ditches, the asphalt will slide. One of the options is to put in a ribbon curb. It doesn’t actually have a full curb, it doesn’t stand up and there is no sidewalk, but just a concrete wall on the side to help keep the asphalt in place and control some of the moisture from the bar ditch. Could also put in standard curbs but that would mean adding draining systems and inlets, increasing the cost two to three times the times.

Couch addressed the pictures he submitted of the roads at Ranch Estates. The road is two years old and falling apart. There is concern for those roads as well as a concern that a 2012 Bond Package of $20 million where roads were built under poor standards.

Estes stated that concern was understandable. Staff can’t address what happened before last year but currently, the direction is to build to today’s standards. What’s in the manual is a minimum in place as the most conservative pavement design we can have in the City, based on the worst conditions. Those who wish to build a road are held to those standards, unless they want to do the homework. What we have told the development community is what we are doing internally or the geotechnical testing to make sure what we put in the ground is what should be is going into the ground. What was found, was from the testing but that only went as far as the depth of the asphalt, especially in the Ranch Estates subdivision.

Estes explained that as staff looked through most of the neighborhood, the majority is better but we are seeing significant problems in areas that were problems before with the exact location and same cracking. In assuming the only need was a redo of the base and the pavement on the whole thing, so we went as far as the pavement. What we learned is, when looking at old roads, we examine the roadway condition and go below the full depth of the pavement to determine how much pavement and base is out there while considering if it was significant enough and meets today’s minimum. Going back, we discovered that what was put in was today’s minimum, based on the geotechnical testing.

Staff found spots out there as well as other things that are going on. Looking at the soils report revealed a potential in the area for some high sulfates. Sulfates and lime do not act well together and can turn the base into almost a mud. An uneven base will cause the road to break off. We suspect that might be one of the conditions out there but that was not a test that was done before. Now that we are aware of what created a lot of the problems that were previously corrected, we require deeper testing. We also suspect in some areas there may be something deeper than 24-36 inches that could be causing this issue. We recognize the need to go deeper just to make sure there is not something in the area that we should test more closely or work the base a different way. Lot of things going on and this is part of that pavement study. We will have better information toward the end of the year and know what exactly is going on.
Crouch asked if we look at the City as a whole, the money spent out of the 2012 Bond package prior to these new standards, are we looking at having to buy those roads again in many places or are the standards that were there holding up in most cases and Ranch Estates is just one?

Estes answered that staff would need to examine the soil and geotechnical testing logs on every road repaired from 2012 until last year when the minimum requirement began. From looking at the soil logs from Ranch Estates subdivision, street repairs went by the pavement recommendation from the geotechnical engineer that matches our current design standard. That has been the standard operating procedures since the 2012-2014 time frame. Short answer, no. I don’t think it is going to be an issue. A definitive answer would take looking at the geotechnical reports on every one of those streets. We can look into those, sample them and review to be sure that we avoid that issue as much as possible.

Crouch added the important aspect in terms of our responsibility of the bond money being spent the way it was intended to be spent and for the road to last two years before it’s falling apart. If this is an outlier that’s one thing, but if it is a reality throughout the community, we have wasted a lot of taxpayer money.

Estes agreed. That is the reason for putting steps in place, beginning last fall and moving forward, we will not accept less than what is already recommend in our current standards and from what we’ve seen in looking at Ranch Estates, we were meeting our current standards because we were doing the geotechnical testing up front.

Crouch stated his interest in knowing at the next Committee meeting, how the roads are that were built under the old standards in this short window that we’ve been in. The Committee needs that understanding.

Estes clarified, the request is for a quick assessment of how each of the roads identified in the bond that were built before today and how they are faring.

Robinson added that if there was a road rebuilt two years ago and you see breaks in it, you are going to call somebody. Should be able to log that as part of the on-going assessment as you go through. Hope that what we’re seeing is a soil condition that is an outlier and an exception. It’s good to hear that there are standards in place to make the right engineering decisions.

Gwynne asked on the five year testing plan, how do you chose what is being tested.

Kremer explained that the car graph system tracks all the roads. It takes the current pavement studies we have and puts the current OCI (Overall Condition Index) and tracks them determines the deterioration program based on time, vehicle trips, etc. We are working on pulling up lists for examining so many roads a month to check, verify or drive. There is a process set up for asphalt and concrete, looking at a normal 30-45 year life of the street, there will be some work on it every two to three years, whether it is a crack seal, micro seal, then go into the overlays, just keeping the process going. Based on that timing, we are looking at hitting it the year before it is due for maintenance and determine, is this road good? Is it where it should be? Should it go on the next maintenance program or can it be delayed? That is how the plans are set up.
We’re working on generating the reports to get it out of the system, make it easier so work orders can be set up the for the guys going out in the field with their IPad. They drive the road, make comments, and enter the information into logs, to track the history of the roadway work.

Gwynne asked if the testing reveals if the work was done under current standards.

Estes clarified the different initiatives for the Committee. The five year testing that Daniel just explained is more of an assessment of the pavement condition. That is done every three to five years through a contractor with a van or vehicle that drives through every street within the city limits. He assesses the pavement based on how many cracks, how wide are the cracks, what type of payment and all that is going on out there.

Core samples are done before doing any construction. We’ve made some changes in that process. The previous method to just go out and do the construction with very limited plan up front. They would call in the geotechnical testing company and request they come out and core this so they would know what to do. That has changed to a more consolidated project management format. Begin with the number of streets we plan to work on next year, put them through a design criteria matrix that sets out these are so simple, do the testing, do the survey, lay out what it looks like, and then go build it.

Now we are doing it up front and early in the process, instead of the back end of the process. The previous geotechnical testing was done was within a week or month before actually doing the work. Instead of, let’s do this way up front, look at it holistically to determine what roads should be addressed, at what time, the roads that need more work or less work than others. That was never really giving a good assessment. We’re doing that now and have learned from that and it will require a lot more of the really deep cores and shallow cores on a more frequent bases than what was done in the past.

Shelton asked when stating that Ranch Estates were done according to the standard, was it the standard at that time or our new standard?

Estes answered. When we tested the roadway, we cored every 200-300 feet or so, when the geotechnical engineer drills through the pavement with a machine and test everything under it to a certain depth, we tell them what that depth is, 24-36 inches is typical when rebuilding an existing roadway. When they assessed what was under that 24-36 inches, their recommendation came back as the same recommendation we require as a minimum today. Even though it wasn’t the minimum at the time they tested it, it is today. With that being the case, we are meeting the standard today which leads us to think there is something very unique going on at these locations in that area and it could be a cause we’ve seen in other locations or there may be some sulfates in the soil where the lime is not reacting well to it or might be some other things going on much deeper and we just didn’t catch it.

Gwynne reiterated, you are saying this is the minimum standard for today. As a prevention, the deeper core samples and a test for sulfates.

Estes confirmed, always. That is what we are doing today. The original roadway was six inches of asphalt on top of six inches of lime, stabilized subgrade. What’s in there now is an eight inch base, with seven inches of asphalt, the minimum for residential streets.
What’s there is the design pavement recommendation. There are some locations with some issues going on and we are seeing that occurring in the exact same location.

Using Google Earth in Street View, reveals what the roadways looked like in 2013 and what they look like today. The pavement is in really bad shape, almost through the entire neighborhood. If you look at where the conditions are failing today, there are spots with the exact pavement failure today. But with so much going on, it was assumed that the problem was resolved at the time. Across the board, most everything else looks good. Ninety percent of the subdivision where the pavements gone it, it’s working except the isolated spots.

Crouch added that isolated is minimizing what has occurred out there. There are cracks developing now in almost every piece of roadway out there. If we had rain and freezing rain, the roads will be torn apart even more that it already is.

Estes confirmed, there are fairly long stretches, especially shown in the good pictures you provided with an inch to two inch gap. Those were areas that were experiencing that same issue in 2013.

Crouch added, as much as four to five inches in some sections in the road. What’s the long term plan now?

Estes replied that as soon as staff receives the testing results, we will be able to give an answer of what that would be.

Gwynne asked they are doing more extensive testing.

Estes confirmed they are going twelve to fifteen feet below the surface, to be certain we know everything that’s going on and they are testing for the sulfates to make sure there is not something in there interacting with the base.

Crouch expressed his hope that it is an outlier, but it is a concern.

Robinson there are certain areas of the city that experiences foundation issues more than others. It all goes back to the soil. There are different types of soil all over town, clay, sand.

Estes added and that is why the request was made to Council for the pavement study, to get a more holistic solution and not just guess. There are weird soils here with the clay, chemicals and composites that are added makes it interesting.

Gwynne asked if the pavement study is not isolated to that neighborhood but all over town and provides ideas on what testing to do for new construction in the future?

Estes answered that staff is trying not to be narrowly focused on what testing will reveal because we want to see the data, information and look for the real patterns that are occurring and have a real basis for what’s the problem and let’s fix it holistically.

Crouch asked if there is a slow-down in current reconstruction projects in waiting for the test results.
Estes answered no. We are doing the geotechnical testing deeper and we are also looking at the composites, chemicals and compounds that are in the soil to be sure these things don’t happen. We can’t afford to slow down any longer but we can do what we’re doing up front better, and we are doing that.

Crouch agreed.

8. **Under Section 551.042 of the Texas Open Meeting Act, respond to inquiries from the 2014 Bond Oversight Committee or the public with specific factual information or recitation of policy, or accept a proposal to place the matter on the agenda for an upcoming meeting.**

Robinson cited the request from Tim Crouch on the 2012 street construction.

Crouch stated his interest in knowing the current condition of the roads that were rebuilt under the old standards or before the new standards were put in place at the next Committee meeting.

Estes confirmed there will be an assessment provided on that request.

Puente reminded the Committee of the commitment to meet every three months and asking for a February meeting date with the same meeting time.

Robinson advised the February 20 Meeting date would work.

Puente will send meeting notice for the February 20, 2014 Bond Committee Meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:12 p.m.

The 2014 Bond Oversight Committee approved the November 12, 2018, Meeting Minutes on February 20, 2018.
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