

1. Capital Improvements Plan Committee Regular Meeting Agenda

Documents:

[CIP AGENDA.PDF](#)

1.1. 07-19-2018 Capital Improvements Plan Packet

Documents:

[CIP PACKET.PDF](#)

Meeting Agenda

Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) Committee

Oak Point City Hall
100 Naylor Road
Oak Point, Texas 75068

Thursday, July 19, 2018 -- 6:00 P.M.




1. Call to order.
2. Review, discuss and provide direction on project rankings and prioritization.
3. Discuss future meeting dates and topics.
4. Adjourn.

The Committee may vote and/or act upon each of the items listed in this Agenda. Except for items in the Agenda designated as public hearing or otherwise designated for public input, there will be no public input during the course of this meeting without express authorization from the presiding officer. If during the course of the Committee meeting, any discussion of any item on the agenda should be held in a closed meeting, the Committee will conduct a closed meeting in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551, Subchapters (d) and (e).

This facility is wheelchair accessible and accessible parking spaces are available. Requests for accommodations or interpretive services must be made 48 hours prior to the meeting. Please contact City Hall at (972) 294-2312 or FAX (972) 294-1619 for further information.

CERTIFICATION:

I do hereby certify that this Notice of public meeting was posted on the outside bulletin board at the Oak Point City Hall, a place convenient and readily accessible to the general public at all times, and said Notice was posted at 8:35 a.m. p.m. on the 16th day of July, 2018.


Amy Bockes, City Secretary

This notice was removed at _____ a.m. /p.m. on the _____ day of July, 2018.

Amy Bockes, City Secretary

Meeting Agenda

Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) Committee

**Oak Point City Hall
100 Naylor Road
Oak Point, Texas 75068**

Thursday, July 19, 2018 -- 6:00 P.M.



- 1. Call to order.**
- 2. Review, discuss and provide direction on project rankings and prioritization.**
- 3. Discuss future meeting dates and topics.**
- 4. Adjourn.**

The Committee may vote and/or act upon each of the items listed in this Agenda. Except for items in the Agenda designated as public hearing or otherwise designated for public input, there will be no public input during the course of this meeting without express authorization from the presiding officer. If during the course of the Committee meeting, any discussion of any item on the agenda should be held in a closed meeting, the Committee will conduct a closed meeting in accordance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551, Subchapters (d) and (e).

This facility is wheelchair accessible and accessible parking spaces are available. Requests for accommodations or interpretive services must be made 48 hours prior to the meeting. Please contact City Hall at (972) 294-2312 or FAX (972) 294-1619 for further information.

CERTIFICATION:

I do hereby certify that this Notice of public meeting was **posted** on the outside bulletin board at the Oak Point City Hall, a place convenient and readily accessible to the general public at all times, and said Notice was posted at _____ a.m. / p.m. on the 16th day of July, 2018.

Amy Bockes, City Secretary

This notice was **removed** at _____ a.m. /p.m. on the _____ day of July, 2018.

Amy Bockes, City Secretary

Project Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	AVG	Comments
Winchester Lane Improvement (North 1/2 completed by ISD)-Remaining South 1/2 1400 Linear Feet of 10' Lanes		17	19	17	17	15	19	17	17.29	Egress to Martop is the critical need (should this be McCormick?)
Lonesome Dove Drive Improvement (20% in City Limits/80% County)-450 Linear Feet of 10' Lanes		19	18	18	19	14	14	19	17.29	County portion of road in fair-poor condition. Western half, very poor. Again, an opportunity to make existing large lots attractive to investment
Lakeshore Blvd. from Martingale to Max Bowden-3465 Linear Feet of 10' Lanes	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1.63	
McCormick Road/Shahan Prairie/Martop Road Reconstruction (Developers Improved portions, look at unimproved sections)		1	5	4	14	19	15	14	10.29	Compleat the last 200 yards. Improvement east of Wildridge entrance not needed
Crescent Oaks Beach Estates Unit I Roadway Improvements (see engineer notes-This includes the northern poriton of Crescent Oaks-all roads)-13950 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		10	11	9	12	10	11	12	10.71	
Crescent Oaks Beach Estates Unit II Roadway Improvements (see engineer notes)-This includes the Southern portion of Crescent Oaks-all roads-11075 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		11	12	6	11	5	12	11	9.71	
Eagles Landing Roadway Improvements (see engineer notes)-This includes some of the roads in Eagles Landing including the entrance and roads where the edges are deteriorating-11315 Linear Feet of 10' lanes	4	5	14	7	10	4	7	10	7.63	Surprised at the poor condition of these roads
Emerald Sound Roadway Improvements (see engineer notes) This includes all roads within Emerald Sound-26815 Linear Feet of 10' lanes	5	6	13	8	13	16	6	9	9.50	Roads in better condition with lower traffic than other areas
Yacht Club Estates Roadway Improvements (see engineer notes)-4300 Linear Feet of 10' lanes.	6	12	10	5	9	18	8	8	9.50	"Improvement" to Yacht Club Estates would require significant disruption
McDaniel Drive Improvement (about 20% in City limits/80% County)-200 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		18	17	19	18	7	13	18	15.71	This road is a minefield and nearly impassable in places. It has over twenty properties. With large lots. Improvement might draw investors
Baycrest Drive Improvement-300 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		14	15	12	16	13	18	16	14.86	
Crescent Drive Improvement-300 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		15	16	13	15	12	17	15	14.71	
Bronco Trail Improvement 2825 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		16	4	16	5	17	16	7	11.57	Very limited use
Lakeshore Boulevard (Yacht Club Road to Martingale) Improvement-5160 Linear Feet of 10' lanes	2	4	2	3	6	3	1	4	3.13	
Emerald Sound Boulevard Improvements-7450 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		7	7	11	8	9	4	6	7.43	Road in good conditon up to Pearl Cove. Please refer to comment on Agua Marine
Martingale Trail (Yacht Club Road to Lakeshore Boulevard) Improvements-2300 Linear Feet of 10' lanes	1	3	3	2	2	2	3	1	2.13	
Eagles Landing Boulevard Improvements-4500 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		9	9	10	4	6	5	3	6.57	Oak View Dr. west

Aqua Marine Drive Improvements-4370 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		8	8	15	7	8	10	5	8.71	Consider grouping Aqua Marine and Emerald Sound Blvd west of Aqua Marine as a project
Corinthian Drive Improvements-440 Linear Feet of 10' lanes		13	6	17	3	11	9	13	10.29	

Amy Bockes

From: Matthew Gauntt
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 10:07 PM
To: Weikert, Michael; Amy Bockes
Cc: Luke Olson; Alan Anderson; Clair Preston; Duane Olson; Mary Haler; Michael Sjogren; Rennie Dickson; Thom Tremblay; City Operations; Dena Meek; Donald Lindemann; John Lusk; Keith Palmer; Lynn Harpold; Tim Freeman
Subject: Re: CIP Project List

Amy,

As mentioned, I will not be at the meeting Thursday night. I will add a few comments.

I echo much of what Michael said below. A few projects could easily take up all of the funds available.

That said, the amount of money that has been set aside is woefully inadequate, in my estimation. In general, roads need some attention every 13-15 years. I am not exactly sure the total length of roads in the community. My guess is that we are around 50 miles. There are a significant amount of roadways that need full-depth reconstruction/reclamation. As presented in the previously distributed material, that will cost about \$1 million/mile. A 2" overlay is about \$350k/mile. Unfortunately, the City has vastly underfunded roadway repair for years, so we are in the position of needing a lot of costly repairs.

If we are at 50 miles of roads, we would need about \$1.2-1.5 million per year to do mill and resurface to keep the roads in good shape. That keeps status quo. As mentioned, we probably have \$10 million in deferred maintenance, which is now requiring major reconstruction.

My point is that I think everyone is looking at this "bonanza" of \$5 million to save the City. That is simply not going to be the case.

In my estimation, we should do some of both. Look at a few roads that are really bad and do the full depth treatment. We should also look at some roadways that are marginal, do some mill & resurfacing so they DO NOT become like the really bad roads that we are looking at now. We need to look to putting the City on a footing that normal milling & resurfacing will be the rule, not the exception. We can only get there by starting that program while bringing some of our worst roads to a good condition so they can eventually be on a program of mill & resurfacing.

I agree with Michael that we have some very long sections of roadways that would not need the same treatment. For those roadways, you might look at some sections where a full-depth treatment is required and other sections where we just mill & resurface. This way, we spread the dollars and have logical termini for the improvements.

In terms of the length of the improvements, I will disagree with Michael a little. Instead of looking at specific lengths of improvements, I think you want to look at logical termini such as intersections. The traffic control will be easier and it will give you clear direction on where to start the next section.

I will echo previous comments and say that I don't think any of us on the committee are really qualified to come up with which roadways need to be part of the CIP. I have been a transportation engineer for 27 years and I don't think I am qualified to do this. I would think that this should be a staff recommendation on what roads should be improved first. The committee can look at the policy of spreading the improvements by mainly doing mill and overlay, concentrating improvements to our worst roads or a hybrid as I laid out above. After that decision is made, I would be comfortable with our city engineer and maintenance supervisor creating a list with the given funds and the overall direction.

In addition, I think the City really needs to come to grips with just how much money is really needed to bring the roads up to where we want them to be. I'm a fiscal hawk, but this comes down to just figuring up what is really needed and doing what is necessary.

Thanks

Amy Bockes

From: Weikert, Michael
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2018 12:40 AM
To: Amy Bockes
Cc: Luke Olson; Alan Anderson; Clair Preston; Duane Olson; Mary Haler; Matt Gauntt; Michael Sjogren; Rennie Dickson; Thom Tremblay; City Operations; Dena Meek; Donald Lindemann; John Lusk; Keith Palmer; Lynn Harpold; Tim Freeman
Subject: RE: CIP Project List
Attachments: Weikert Scoring Sheet.xlsx

Attached is my ranking, with the following qualifiers:

- This is essentially the same list we had from the prior CIP, but even more consolidated into even larger road portions, which I think is the wrong direction.
- I will re-state from my last communication since I was out of town for the last meeting, that we should modify the “projects” to be more targeted at the worse portions of the listed roads (not the entire road), thus we should not be prioritizing the list as given. This list could easily end up prioritizing a line item that we don’t even have enough budget to complete, leaving many issues across other city neighborhoods never touched. For example:
 - The two listed Crescent Oaks line items are for 2-3 miles of roads each, either one of these would like consume much of our budget and leave many other needs unaddressed.
 - The Emerald Sound has 2 line items one for over 5 miles of road, another for 1.5 miles, these two would likely consume the entire budget or a large portion leaving other areas unaddressed.
 - The Eagles Landing has 2 line items, one for over 2 miles of road another for almost 1 mile, again these two would consume much or maybe the entire budget leaving other areas unaddressed.
- Where Oak Point’s portion of a road is land locked by county roads we should not invest in it until the county fixes the substantial issues they have and upgrade to the same level we are considering (Lonesome Dove and McDaniel)
- Where the improvement touches only a couple or few driveways it should be low priority for improvement, continue ongoing maintenance
- Where a new development is eventually the biggest benefactor, that improvement should be funded by that developer not this bond issue (Winchester)
- I think we should be targeting the 10 year repair design approach unless it is a major thoroughfare, which none of these roads are. Upgrading any of the roads in CO, EL, YCE or EL to curb and gutter should not even be a consideration, I suspect those neighborhoods would even fight it if asked.
- I am not proposing a lot of small patches, but rather strategically fixing the worst sections it might be 100 feet or 500 feet or even 1000 ft at a time....but not 11K or 26K feet. My final rankings used the principles above and then the largest projects listed got lower priority over something more targeted.....but I think this is the wrong list for us to consider for priorities.

Mike Weikert
GPDO