



Public Works Department

# Summary Minutes

## REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITIZEN STREET OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

**Monday, September 24, 2012, 7:00 p.m.**  
**El Cerrito City Hall**  
Hillside Conference Room  
10890 San Pablo Avenue

**Call to Order** at 7:00 p.m.

### 1. Roll Call

Present: Chair Al Miller, and Vice Chair Liz Ozselcuk, Committee Member Thomas Miller,

Absent: Committee Members Aurelia Schultz and Lynne Kessler

Other Attendees: Staff Liaison Jerry Bradshaw  
Yvetteh Ortiz, Engineering Manager

### 2. Comments from the Public

None.

### 3. Review Fiscal Year 2011-12 Revenues and Expenditures

#### Revenues

Page 3-1, first group is the sales tax revenues, which came in very close to projections. The dates of the revenue receipts began in September showing the delay in funding from the State. The three final entries were all dated June 30<sup>th</sup>, so it balances out. Interest was negative \$88. This is due to the year beginning with a negative balance and carrying a modest balance throughout the year. The two entries in the third group are a correction of a prior year's revenue accrual. It pertains to a federal project where the final reimbursement is still due from Caltrans.

The large group of revenues on the bottom of Page 3-1 and on to Page 3-2 is from moratorium repairs. These are revenues collected from contractors performing street excavation work in recently paved streets (where an excavation moratorium is in place) to pay for the City to install slurry seal patches as remediation. The large volume of these transactions is reflective of the large number of streets currently under a moratorium. That volume of activity will decrease in the next year as many of the moratoria will expire in late 2012.

Expenditures

Page 3-3, first group is for the annual debt service on the bonds. The difference between this amount (\$737,582) and the total revenue (\$1,519,355) is the amount available for annual work (about \$750,000). Is that adequate..?? Yes, the most recent pavement condition report (2010) shows an annual need of approximately \$500,000. That leaves room for overhead items. The 2012 report is due soon, and we will be able to see how the Measure A work done is holding up and what the new annual needs estimates are. Staff is cautious that the (PCI) pavement condition index may have been slightly inflated after the surge of work in 2009 and 2010. Has City Council established a policy to maintain the PCI at a certain level..?? No specific PCI goal has been established. Without a policy, how do you know how much money to spend on streets...?? The annual Capital Improvement Program is included in the budget document. That is where the City Council makes its annual determination of the paving budget. As an example, the City Council recently approved a re-allocation of paving budget to neighborhood traffic projects. Committee Member Thomas Miller reminded staff that curbs and gutters are eligible for Measure A money, too. Sidewalk repairs are generally a responsibility of abutting property owners, although some street, curb and gutter work may necessitate work on the sidewalk, too. In these cases, Measure A funds have been used to repair sidewalks.

The next group is for financial consultant charges. The charges for Maze & Associates represent the Measure A share of the City's audit effort.

The middle of the page contains payroll expenses for the part-time staff person working on the 2011 paving project. The last non-project group is miscellaneous charges including some planning work performed by Avila Project Management. The charge for MTC-PTAP (\$4,086) is the City's matching share of a PTAP grant of over \$20,000 we received to update our StreetSaver (pavement management program) data. The Geodata Analyticals (\$2,720) was for adding a GIS layer to the StreetSaver program.

The final two entries on Page 3-3 are for an older project (2009 Rubberized Asphalt Overlay). The contractor, MCK, filed a claim for approximately \$88,000. It took until this year through the mediation process to settle on a payment of \$45,000. In addition, Avila Project Management was used to help settle the claim.

Page 3-4, the first item was a correction where the Finance clerk charged the retention payment amounts directly against the project (2010 Pavement Rehab Project) instead of utilizing an existing purchase order. This credit amount corrects the project accounts. This same thing happened on the 2010 Slurry Seal Project as well. The other credit (\$19,296.90) is a reimbursement from the School District for installing traffic calming measures around Fairmont School.

The last group on this page is for the only major paving project performed in 2011 (2011 Pavement Rehab). This includes a reimbursement from EBMUD for performing some paving restoration they were required to do on Schmidt Lane at the Recycling Center project.

Overall, revenues exceeded expenditures by about \$350,000, which will leave a modest surplus going into the next fiscal year. Major work on the streets is nearly complete, and staff will next need to develop a new maintenance program commensurate with the street conditions. There were two streets that were not paved during the major work (Eureka near Fairmont school and Carquinez), and they are candidates for work in the near future. There are also some collectors and arterials in need of overlay work, and they are being planned for an upcoming federal paving grant of approximately \$460,000 plus another grant of about \$350,000 that will require some matching funds.

Chair Al Miller – How does staff know that Council has approved the work done since not all projects have their own resolution..?? Liaison Bradshaw answered that, with the exception of specifically scoped projects (such as grant funded projects), the CIP budget has a line item for general paving work with no specific streets included. However when a project is taken to Council for award, the scope is specified at that time. Chair Al Miller went on to state that there was a time when citizens were very skeptical of City staff's work, and documentation of the scope of each project's work would have been required to accept the expenditures report. The knowledge that there is documentation to correlate the actual work done with the expenditures in the report is adequate at this time.

#### **4. Staff Liaison Report**

##### Street Moratorium Program

Liaison Bradshaw introduced Yvetteh Ortiz, Engineering Manager for the City, who presented a summary of the program. In general, once a street is paved, an excavation moratorium is put in place that forbids anyone from excavating the street usually associated with underground utility work. The moratorium is 5 years for overlay streets and 3 years for slurry or cape seal streets. If a utility asks permission to excavate for planned work in a moratorium street we require them to devise a way to do the work without excavation, or come back when the moratorium expires. However, for emergency work we cannot put them off, and they are allowed to do the work with additional restoration conditions on the permit. For EBMUD, this is usually for water main breaks, and for PG&E it is for gas main leaks. The restoration requirement is to put a slurry seal patch over a sizable portion of the street to help re-seal the pavement that was excavated. Their choices are to either install the slurry themselves to our standards, or to pay a fee (currently \$570) for us to slurry the spot during our next slurry project.

In addition there is sewer lateral compliance program begun by Stege Sanitary District, and that has now been taken over by EBMUD. For properties that need to replace their sewer lateral on a moratorium street, we require them to confer with Stege to determine if a cured-in-place option (trenchless) is feasible. If Stege determines that the lateral must be excavated, then we will issue a permit with the restoration conditions mentioned above. Experience shows that most laterals must be excavated due to badly deteriorated condition.

Chair Al Miller – what do other cities with similar conditions charge for restoration work..??  
That is not known.

Committee Member Thomas Miller expressed concerned that Measure A funds are diverted to funding emergency repairs of utilities. Liaison Bradshaw answered that is not the case. Our only extra work is to add a slurry seal on top of their work, and they pay us for that extra work through the fee.

Chair Al Miller – biggest hit on the street improvement program is the public perception that the “new” streets are getting all dug up. But nothing can be done about it. Staff routinely notifies residents prior to a paving project that they may want to consider replacing their lateral prior to the paving work to avoid the added expense of the restoration work and to avoid a patch in the “new” street.

Committee Member Thomas Miller – what percentage of laterals do not need any work..??  
Chair Al Miller (who is also a board member of Stege) answered that it is about 30%. In newer and flatter parts of town, it could be higher.

#### Work Plan for Fiscal Year 2012-13

The summer/fall paving program has been deferred until spring of 2013. This is due primarily to lack of staff resources. Staff hopes to get a contract out in April or May of 2013. The project has not yet been scoped out.

#### City’s Strategic Planning Process

This past Saturday the Council met to begin the process. The process to date has included several public meetings, focus groups, soliciting input at other venues and hosting an on-line survey. Now the values and vision has been drafted. The next step would be to develop goals and objectives. Committee members are invited to contribute their thoughts.

### **5. Approval of Minutes**

Chair Al Miller – first line of paragraph 3, excerpts from the “City’s CAFR”. He asked for CAFR to be spelled out (comprehensive annual financial report).

**Action taken:** M/S Thomas Miller/Ozselcuk to approve minutes as corrected. Approved unanimously.

### **6. Committee Standing Rules**

Chair Al Miller – Rule 15 states that versions shall be numbered and bear that date they were adopted. The Rules as presented are dated, but not numbered. He suggested they be numbered in the manner of year and version, e.g. 2012 – 1.

**Action taken:** Approve Standing Rules as written with the number “2012 – 2” added as suggested. M/S; Thomas Miller/ Oszelcuk. Approved unanimously. Clarification: the revised version shall bear this date.

## 7. Future Agenda Items and Meeting Schedule

The next regular meeting is scheduled for November 12, 2012. Staff confirmed that no business is planned for that meeting.

**Action taken:** Cancel the November meeting: M/S; Thomas Miller/ Oszelcuk. Approved unanimously.

The next meeting will then be on January 28, 2013. Items planned for that agenda include

- Review Auditors Report
- Staff Liaison Report
- Election of Officers
- Approval of Minutes

Committee Member Thomas Miller – concerned about viability of the committee. He suggests that the chair bring the matter to the attention of the City Council.

Chair Al Miller understands the concern, but does not believe it rises to the level of Council involvement. Ms. Schultz admitted that she made a calendar error, and will not likely repeat that. Ms. Kessler had surgery scheduled, which was beyond her control. He also offered to communicate more regularly with committee members on schedules.

If any committee members would like to agendaize any other items, they can notify the Chair or Liaison Bradshaw.

## 8. Adjourned at approximately 8:24 p.m.