

FY 2022 Bond Committee Motions & Recommendations

Drainage & Flood Management

Motions & Recommendations submitted via Email		
District	Submission (Y/N)	Motion/Recommendation
1	Yes	<u>Motion:</u> All projects where green infrastructure is noted to be applicable should be required to provide green infrastructure in the final design and construction. If a project is not able to provide green infrastructure, a report provided by both the city staff and civil engineer consultant should be presented to council as to why this was not achievable. <u>Motion:</u> On projects where public art is used, the artist should be integrated into the project's design process from the beginning of design. (ie. the artist should not come into the process after construction documents are issued. This is meant to ensure the art installation is perceived as an integral part of the project) <u>Motion:</u> Provide all projects listed in the Potential Projects List to the below the line list and fund in order of scoring or as leveraged funds become available from other municipalities to help complete an initial phase <u>Motion:</u> City council should appoint citizens to an ongoing drainage committee (minimum 1 member and 1 alternate per district) to meet quarterly to continually refine potential drainage projects, funding mechanisms, scoring criteria, and other information relevant to future bonds. The committee should provide an annual report to the council.
2	Yes	<u>Motion:</u> Remove 2022 Bond Program funding for George Rd. located in District 8 <u>Motion:</u> Remove 2022 Bond Program funding for Oak Haven Area Drainage Improvements located in District 9 <u>Motion:</u> Provide 2022 Bond Program funding for Amity Rd located in District 2 Please see attached D2 Memo for further recommendations and comments
3	No	
4	No	
5	No	
6	No	
7	Yes	<u>Motion 1:</u> To waive the public art 1.5% ordinance for the 2022 Drainage Proposition to ensure the maximum amount of financial resources are available to address flood control projects in the City of San Antonio. The execution of the staff recommended projects for the 2022 Bond Drainage Proposition is projected to generate \$722,250 from five projects valued at \$48,150,000 through the 2022 Bond Streets Proposition, their leverage funding source. This motion will allow \$2,473,000 to be utilized for additional drainage projects identified by the drainage committee. Motions on the new projects for the \$2,473,000 to follow after Motion 1 passes. <u>Motion 2:</u> To recommend City Council evaluate and utilize the Tree Mitigation and Preservation fund, reported during the FY22 City Budget presentation with capacity to

		expand programs, be utilized to increase the tree canopy's in areas of 2022-2027 Drainage Bond Projects. This action will directly benefit the areas of each drainage project and may be executed by planting trees along the reconstructed residential streets receiving new infrastructure, green spaces, and right of way areas. This motion has no impact on the bond funds allocated and seeks to leverage existing and future resources to expand the City's Tree Canopy and achieve the goals of the program. <u>Motion 3:</u> To recommend City Council formulate a standing drainage committee comprised of representatives from within the City's Watersheds (to include Bexar County, respective Municipalities and stakeholders) to review ongoing drainage priorities, development of projects, and transparency in the City's Watershed Master Planning. The 2022 Bond Drainage process identified the following areas of concern due to the technical complexity of formulating drainage projects: estimates were unable to be provided to citizens and committee members due to drainage studies which needed to be performed in identified 100 yr flood plain areas, Stormwater drainage quad sheets (project sheets with scopes and estimates) needed updating to Atlas 14 design criteria for estimating, coordination with adjacent municipalities contributing to identified stormwater runoff areas impacting San Antonio residents, responding to residents' requests for drainage improvements from prior public meetings and bond inputs, and working with Bexar County to ensure COSA leverages funds to remove homes from the flood plain. <u>Motion 4:</u> To recommend City Council evaluate the scoring of all future drainage bond projects as the 2022 bond scoring did not adequately rank the flood risk nor impact of a proposed drainage project to the City of San Antonio's residents. The 2022 bond scoring did not delineate street flooding from flooding in the 100 year flood plain; removing homes from the 100 year flood plain (life safety); evaluate adjacent uses, schools and density, to a project area; evaluate priority for a project when it contained an impassable roadway in a flood event, impacting emergency service access to residents; score SARA identified water quality zones in project areas; and score drainage structures out of TCEQ compliance. <u>Motion 5:</u> To recommend City Council evaluate capital drainage projects located in the qualified census tracts as identified by the Federal government's standards for ARPA funding consideration. With \$3.2 Billion in needs the ARPA funds may alleviate flooding with the City's most vulnerable populations and protect their homes from damage in a flood event.
8	Yes	Please see attached D8 Memo for motions & recommendations
9	No	
10	Yes	<u>Motion:</u> I move that the members of the 2022-2027 Drainage and Flood Control Improvements Community Bond Committee request City of San Antonio Staff favorably consider creation of a standing citizen committee to provide regular citizen input related to drainage and flood control needs in the city. The committee would meet at least once a quarter and have one member from each City Council District. <u>Justification:</u> Trying to digest all the related information once every five years prior to a bond proposal is not realistic. We understand that there is a similar standing committee related to park's needs, so there is already precedence for this kind of input. <u>Motion:</u> I move that City Council waive the requirement to apportion any money towards public art for all Drainage and Flood Control projects proposed for the 2022-

		2027 Bond. The funds made available by waiving the art apportionment requirement should be put back into the drainage and flood control improvements funding budget. <u>Justification:</u> Of the \$6.6B documented infrastructure needs for the City of San Antonio, nearly half of that (\$3.1B) is needed to address drainage and flood control improvements. The next most pressing need is for streets, bridges and sidewalk improvements at \$2.4B. I will note that the City of San Antonio has historically disproportionately underfunded drainage and flood control. 2017 Bond proposed streets funding at 3.2x the funding for drainage and 1.4x for parks. This year again reflects streets funding at 3x the funding for drainage and 1.7x for parks. While we support the installation of public art in general, our basic needs for drainage and flood control projects are so pressing that they MUST be prioritized, and we cannot afford the luxury of contributing to public art at this time. <u>Motion:</u> I move that the Committee Members request City of San Antonio Council to establish Drainage and Flood Control Committee to contribute real-life experience input of citizens and to prioritize Drainage and Flood control projects. The proposed Committee should meet quarterly and have at least one member from City Districts. <u>Justification:</u> There is a great need for such committee to help Public Works Staff in understanding and prioritization of flooding and drainage and to have our citizens to be heard. It is impossible to meet once every 5 years to reasonable address flooding in San Antonio and to provide assistance to City Council in managing Bond Funds. <u>Motion:</u> I move that The Committee Members request City Council to suspend the requirement for money allocation to the public art from Drainage and Flood Control Funding proposed for the 2022-2027 Bond. <u>Justification:</u> Of the \$6.6B documented infrastructure needs for the City of San Antonio, nearly half of that (\$3.1B) is needed to address drainage and flood control improvements and need is rising due to ongoing developments in Northeast area. <u>Motion:</u> I move that The Committee Members request City San Antonio Council to redistribute current Bond 2022-2027 Fund to additionally allocate financial support to Drainage and Flood control budget. <u>Justification:</u> San Antonio is a flash flooding zone, and we are lacking \$3.1B as of today to address the flood control. San Antonio is second among 15 fastest-growing cities by population number in USA from 2010 to 2020. We need to restore and to improve our flood control to assure well-being of our current citizens and to secure settlement of newcomers, prior to spending taxpayers' money on recreational and economic development projects.
--	--	--

FY 2022 Bond Committee Motions & Recommendations

Drainage & Flood Management

1. Approval of the recommended 19 projects for bond funding totaling \$162.9 million.

- Recommended motion from
 - Committee Co-Chairs – Chris & Suzanne
 - D7 Committee Member – Bianca Maldonado
 - D8 Committee Members – Christopher Fullerton, Mario Aguilar, Gib Hafernick

Justification: The recommended projects have been reviewed by the committee and the benefits of the projects have been assessed and endorsed. The flood and drainage issues within the city far exceed the level of investment allocated in the bond. It is difficult for the committee to choose the need of one neighborhood over another when so many areas of the city regularly experience threats to property and safe transportation during rain events which have gone unaddressed for years. The city must accelerate the investment in flood and drainage infrastructure to address the urgent need and protect life and property from the impact of current and future flooding and local drainage. The current five-year bond cycle of putting flood and drainage projects “in competition” with other capital needs within the city is inadequate to make real progress to addressing the existing flooding threat nor does it allow the city to get ahead of the growing threat from increased development and climate change. The city must revisit its current approach and prioritize investment in this critical infrastructure need to make our community safer and more resilient.

2. Recommend that the City Council waive the requirement to apportion the “percentage for the art” in the Drainage and Flood Control in the 2022 bond and authorize the reallocation of the 1.5% within the bond category, \$2.47 million, to a flood and drainage project.

- Recommended motion from
 - D10 Committee Member – Patrice Melancon
 - D10 Committee Member – Paul Royal-Priest
 - D7 Committee Member – Bianca Maldonado

Justification: The committee supports the benefits of public art and appreciates the goal to invest in the funding and installation of public art; however, with the \$6.6 billion documented unmet infrastructure need for the City of San Antonio within nearly half of that, \$3.1 billion, identified to address drainage and flood control improvements. The public safety needs to address the threat to life and property from flooding and drainage is so urgent that every dollar available must be dedicated to actual infrastructure improvements and we cannot afford the luxury of contributing to public art from the allotment for drainage and flood control at this time.

3. Recommendation that city staff require the analysis, use and application of green stormwater infrastructure/nature-based solutions in the scope of all recommended bond projects in all categories to manage the stormwater and increase green space to benefit water quality, slow runoff flow velocity, improve habitat protection/restoration (including natural channel design), add trees and native vegetation, and enhance recreational use. Increasing the use of green infrastructure is a recommended strategy in the SA Climate Ready Plan and is an effective strategy to improve the resiliency of the city.

- Recommended motion from
 - Committee Co-Chairs – Chris & Suzanne
 - D1 Committee Member – Caleb Etheredge
 - D2 Committee Member – Debbie Reid

Justification: The use of green infrastructure/nature-based solutions can provide many proven benefits to capital projects including mitigation of impact of impervious cover; manage stormwater runoff; reduce heat island impact; add native vegetation to promote biodiversity and habitat protection/restoration in an urban environment; and enhance recreational opportunities. Adding the requirement of the analysis and use of green infrastructure in the scope of all projects will promote consultants to become more knowledgeable in the use and benefits of these techniques and promote greater application of these practices. In addition, the city will set the example for the standards of development the private sector should be expected to achieve. If the city expects private development to increase the use of green infrastructure/nature-based solutions, the city must set the example within its capital investments programs.

4. Recommendation for City Council to establish an official city committee comprised of citizens representing all watersheds and council districts within the city to inform and engage residents and advise city council and city staff in the creation of a comprehensive flood management and drainage master plan with project priorities. The development of master plan and tracking achievement toward defined outcomes to build resiliency will provide a transparent process to prioritize city investments from various public funding sources to address the current threat of flooding to life and property, while also exploring policies and action that can reduce the future impact to flooding from development and climate change. Membership on the committee should include relevant experts (e.g. civil engineer) and liaisons from partner entities (e.g. the San Antonio River Authority and Bexar County).

- Recommended motion from
 - Committee Co-Chairs – Chris & Suzanne
 - D10 Committee Member – Patrice Melancon
 - D10 Committee Member – Paul Royal-Priest
 - D7 Committee Member – Bianca Maldonado
 - D1 Committee Member – Caleb Etheredge
 - D8 Committee Members – Christopher Fullerton, Mario Aguilar, Gib Hafernack

Justification: The committee members are unified that the bond process is not adequate to completely understand and assess the flood and drainage needs; project benefits and determine investment priorities. Trying to digest all the related information once every five years prior to a bond proposal is not realistic. The committee members believe the bond process results either in a “rubber stamping” of projects proposed by the city staff or a determination that one district’s residents are more worthy of investment to address flood/drainage threats than another. Neither of those options promotes a comprehensive committee analysis that factors in, for example, the complexities of the upstream/downstream dynamics of a watershed; the ability to assess options in capital projects approaches; maximize project benefits; and understand the impact of changing floodplains; increased development and future challenges to adapt to climate change. More importantly, the current bond process lacks a meaningful way to truly conduct a technical and cost analysis and/or evaluation of the comments shared by the citizens. If citizen comments during the bond process refer to a threat or project the city staff is not prepared to present, the committee cannot make a meaningful determination to consider recommending the project.

Flooding is the greatest threat to people and property. Recognizing this real threat has resulted in improved collaborations between governmental partners through the Bexar Regional Management Program, but also requires more on-going involvement by the citizens of San Antonio. The technical complexities involved in identifying flood and drainage projects and establishing priorities requires a more educated and involved citizenry to increase awareness and understanding of the engineering approaches, while also promoting more proactive and comprehensive policies and city actions to address flood and drainage challenges. The city has standing citizen committees to advise of parks and linear trails, housing, development review, and others, establishing an official citizen committee will add more transparency and accountability for the public investment and tracking of the benefits from those investments.

The timing for the creation of a citizen committee to review and advise on flood and drainage project priorities also aligns with the recently initiated State Flood Planning process and increased interest in the State to establish state standards to address flooding threats as well as increase the availability of state funding. In addition, the recently enacted Federal Infrastructure legislation has identified significant funding to mitigate flood threats and build more resilient communities.

5. Recommendation for additional project priorities to guide future allocation of local, state, and federal funding that could become available soon to support investment in flood and drainage projects.

- a. To be consistent with the evaluation of the recommended bond projects, the same scoring criteria should be used to rate the additional projects, with an improved evaluation of the potential public safety benefit of each project to include the number of homes/structures a project would remove from the flood plain and/or reduce the impact to homes from local drainage challenges.
- b. Other considerations for next level funding priorities include:
 - i. Expanding the scope and/or limits of a recommended project to provide additional benefits feasibly and efficiently to maximize the benefit from an existing project.
 - ii. Investment in green infrastructure/nature-based solutions that can feasibly and economically support additional benefits of a project

Justification: Although the committee has expressed concerns regarding the rating criteria used for the flood and drainage improvements (addressed below), until the criteria can be assessed and improved, consistency in the use of the current criteria should be used to evaluate and establish priorities for investments that could be made by the city from other funding sources. The committee requests that the city staff do a better assessment of the public safety benefit of each project by quantifying the number of homes/structures a project will remove from the flood plain and/or will benefit from the improvements of local drainage infrastructure.

The cost of each new flood and drainage projects is very significant. If funding from other sources is sufficient to fully fund a scoped project to address the flooding needs in other prioritized areas, the committee would support the funding of the next tier of prioritized projects. However, if the funding that may become available through other sources is limited, then the committee would advise the city to assess if adding funding to existing recommended bond projects could extend the scope and benefit of the project, taking advantage of economies of scale and maximizing the value of the investment in the area where the recommended bond project is to be implemented.

The Flood and Drainage Bond Committee offers the following observations and considerations for future community bond process:

- a. **Align guiding principles and rating criteria to the unique characteristics of each bond project category.** The established guiding principles approved by the City Council remain applicable, however, the application of each principle to the respective project categories could be refined to better reflect the specific attributes and benefits of the projects in each respective category.
- b. **Expand the bond meeting schedule:** The information provided is very technical and would benefit from more time for the committee to analyze and have dialogue with the staff. Additional time in the schedule would enable committee members to gain further understanding of the justification and benefits of the projects. In addition, this will provide staff more time to conduct additional analysis that may be requested by the committee during the project review process.
- c. **Create more opportunities for citizen engagement:** Due to various equity issues ranging from transportation options to the digital divide, more opportunities for citizen input from throughout the community should be added to the process prior to the bond committee appointments when the staff is compiling the list of recommended projects and during the committee's bond deliberation process.
- d. **Provide technical evaluation and project scoring in advance of the first meeting and expand the orientation meeting to include more detail on the staff recommended projects:** Providing the "quad" sheets and project scoring sooner will enable the committee to be better prepared to engage with the staff on the projects. Information such as the history of the flooding in the area targeted by the project and within the watershed, the documented community concerns, and the proposed project benefits (i.e.: structures removed from the floodplain, roadways impacted, etc.) along with videos or photos of flooding in the areas would help to inform and prepare the committee.
- e. **Promote multi-benefit projects:** The committee has learned that streets and drainage projects are inextricably linked in San Antonio as streets are part of the drainage infrastructure. Similarly, some flood and drainage projects can provide recreational benefits, green space/shade, and promote the use of nature-based solutions. The committee encourages the city to explore multi-benefit projects to maximize the value of all public infrastructure projects.

Drainage Bond Committee Comments: December 8, 2021

Debbie Reid, District 2

Overall Comments

1. Quad sheets should be included in initial binder.
2. Quad sheets need to include # structures/low water crossings removed from 100 yr floodplain and or local flooding.
3. Alternative approaches using green infrastructure, natural channel design, velocity and debris remediation should be included in engineers comments in quad sheets.
4. All recommended bond projects including streets, facilities and parks should be reviewed for Green infrastructure, applicability for LID and compliance with Climate Ready goals, not just sub watersheds identified with impaired water quality within SARA's maps.
5. Projects need to include facilitated points for collecting and mechanically removing sediment and debris.
6. Estimated increased discharges at the outfall of the project need to be quantified and included in the quad sheets to determine impact to receiving drainage areas.
7. Channel improvements should be avoided unless natural channel design and vegetation restoration is used as these improvements eliminate flood resiliency and increase flows downstream that create additional negative impact to natural systems.
8. It is recommended that if not already completed, the entire Leon Creek watershed be reviewed to identify areas where constructed natural flood mitigation features (especially on tributaries) can be located. Purchasing needed property can be funded with not only regional flood control funding, but also EPA and State funding. Identify property owners within the upper reaches of this watershed that have properties containing large amounts of impervious surfaces can be approached to retrofit their sites to reduce their stormwater runoff and utility fees. It is also recommended that no new floodplain development permits be issued or zoning cases to increase density over the recharge zone be approved in this watershed along with mandatory on-site detention required. Flooding in this watershed cannot be addressed solely with the below types of flood control projects.
9. Infiltration/LID projects throughout residential areas may be of use to increase dispersed infiltration thus reducing stormwater runoff locally.
10. There seems to be a very non-equitable distribution of funds especially with District 9 receiving

Project Comments

Project Name	Council District	Staff Recommendation	Other/Potential Funding Sources	Comments by D Reid District 2
Barbara Drive Phase 3 (Dellwood Drive and Shadywood Lane to Oblate Drive and Barbara Drive)	1	\$ 5,430,000	\$8,600,000 FY 2022 Storm Water Regional	What will be the increase and cumulative discharge into the natural portion of Olmos Creek in Olmos Park? Energy dissipators should be included along with debris catchment systems. Include Phase 7 for a hybrid creek restoration within the park.

Elmira (Cameron St. from Cadwallader to Santa Rosa St.)	1	\$ 6,050,000	\$6,050,000 FY 2022 Storm Water Regional	-
Peggy Drive	2		\$29,080,000	What is the need for real estate funding? Incorporate GI within the residential properties/new curbs and streets to move water from homes.
Pine Street	3		\$21,025,000	-
Brookside Outfall (Esma Phase 2) (Lebanon Street to San Antonio River)	3	\$ 4,150,000	\$4,150,000 FY 2022 Storm Water Regional	Question the need for channel improvements on Zachery property as it appears that it would exacerbate downstream issues. Appears some type of detention or natural channel design in this area would reduce flows so that we do not pay for "improving" unnamed tributary on Zachery property.
Medina Base: Valley Hi Area Drainage (Ray Ellison from Medina Base Road to Old Valley Hi Dr.)	4	\$ 5,700,000	\$5,700,000 FY 2022 Storm Water Regional	Use of green infrastructure is recommended within school property and on receiving tributary. Excellent opportunity to purchase this property with school that is for sale to use for local detention and long term solution to issue.
Marbach Road Area Drainage Improvement (IH-410 to Horal)	4, 6	\$15,800,000	\$15,000,000 2022 Street Bond	Look at discharge rates to reduce impact on receiving drainage.
Cumberland Drainage Area	5		\$11,230,000	Look at discharge rates to reduce impact on receiving drainage.
Wilcox Street and Drainage Improvements	5		\$15,410,000	Look at discharge rates to reduce impact on receiving drainage. Incorporate GI within the residential properties/new curbs and streets to move water from homes.
Lower French Creek Improvements (Low Bid Ln to Leon Creek)	6, 7	\$ 6,500,000	\$6,500,000 FY 2022 Storm Water Regional	This projects appears to be a Band-Aid for a much larger issue and

				will reduce flood resiliency. See above comment #8.
Seeling Drainage Improvements Phase 4 (Lowery Drive to St. Cloud and Placid from Sage to Pardo)	7	\$ 7,880,000	\$6,850,000 FY 2022 Storm Water Regional \$4,000,000 Bexar County \$6,000,000 Prior Storm Water Regional Funds	What will be the increase and cumulative discharge into Woodlawn Lake? What remediation for velocities, debris and sediment will be included in the project?
Broadview and Oak Haven	7		\$10,380,000	Look at contribution of stormwater/flooding by Walmart. Did Walmart comply with fee in lieu of? If so, this funding should be used. Work with Walmart to retrofit site with LID and stormwater detention.
Gardendale (Wurzbach to Bluemel)	8	\$ 3,360,000	\$3,000,000 2022 Street Bond	Look at discharge rates to reduce impact on receiving drainage.
Southwell Rd. North Area Drainage Improvement	8		\$5,930,000	This is a red flag discharging to existing natural low. Ensure discharge rates do not impact the receiving natural low. Incorporate GI within the residential properties/new curbs and streets to move water from homes and reduce runoff.
George Rd	8		\$18,880,000	Recommend to remove this project. It is not clear on funding and scope as it appears to be a reduced project as requested by residents and not build to standards that would alleviate original issue.
Evans Rd Drainage Improvements (EncinoRio to Bulverde Rd)	9	\$8,450,000	\$19,500,000 2022 Street Bond	How do we avoid point source discharges from private properties onto public roads and drainage systems that exacerbate their deterioration?
Oak Haven Area Drainage Improvements (Kentwood Phase 2 – Parkstone, Copper Hill, Parhaven & 1931 Town Oak LWC)	9	\$7,900,000	\$7,900,000 2022 Street Bond	Recommend to remove this project from consideration as it appears to support a very local existing concern

				that should have been obvious when residents purchased their properties. All over SA many folks are having to build berms on their properties to direct stormwater from structures. The total for District 9 within this bond cycle appears to exceed funding and number of project for other districts at 3 project for \$30,150,000.
Perennial Area Drainage (Heimer to Dutch Myrtle)	9	\$2,750,000	\$2,750,000 2022 Street Bond	What improvements caused this increase flow? Incorporate GI within improvements to meet pre-improvement flow rates.
Eisenhauer and Northwood	10 with potential impact to D2		\$11,150,000	It appears this project will not only impact the resident at 123 Pike Rd but will continue into D2 and negatively impact properties along Eisenhaur between Vandiver and Rainbow where property owner at 3040-3050 added fill in unnamed tributary that appears will receive some of the increase flow from this project. What are future projects to be included in this outfall. Please clarify
Include Amity Rd flood control project	2			District 2 has the fewest projects with just 1. It is recommended to include this project at this time where it is a documented site for on-going flooding even in smallest events.

District 8 MEMO

Feedback on the Bond Review Process

Certain factors have notably influenced the course of the Stormwater and Drainage Bond Review Committee deliberations, including:

- (a) A truncated and highly constrained timetable for the Committee to complete its tasks;
- (b) Citizen concerns that this process lends itself to a “rubber-stamped” approval result, based in part on the narrow timetable and the structure of the Committee;
- (c) No current standing Municipal Citizens’ Board on stormwater and drainage matters currently exists that could serve as a reservoir of collective Citizen knowledge and institutional expertise on these matters, advise the City between Bond cycles, proactively solicit and receive public comments on an ongoing basis, or assist City Staff in the preparations for an upcoming Bond referendum;
- (d) The current or imminent availability of federal funds amounting to “once-a-generation” transformational infrastructure investments that could soon be directed toward San Antonio’s stormwater and drainage projects;
- (e) The growing scientific evidence highlighting trends toward more extreme precipitation events and the increased associated risks to life and public safety;
- (f) The expanding aggregate amount of impervious surfaces, and associated increases in stormwater, in the metro San Antonio area as the City continues its rapid projected growth in the coming decades.

As a result, the **following four (4) recommendations** are made to address some of these challenges and opportunities:

- 1) Based on energized citizen feedback, there is a critical need for a robust and extensive Public Comment & Engagement process for each selected project after a successful Public Bond election in order to allow affected neighborhood residents (and all citizens) to co-create the actual project design with City Staff and any contracted outside engineering/planning support parties to ensure appropriate considerations of public safety, environmental impacts, neighborhood access, construction-related limitations, and process management generally.
- 2) In consideration of the complexities of drainage projects, the learning curve for Committee members, the need for adequate time for the review of public comments, and the demands on City Staff’s time from five simultaneously-operating Bond Review Advisory Committees, the City Council should create future Bond Review Advisory Committees significantly earlier in the process as well as allow for more time between the last public comment (“Citizens to be Heard”) meeting and the final Committee meeting establishing the list of recommended/prioritized projects.
- 3) Given the unique topography of the City of San Antonio, its vulnerability to extreme precipitation events, the life-threatening dangers of flash flooding in this watershed, and the historic geographic inequities in public investment in water management infrastructure, the Scoring Matrix for stormwater and drainage projects should be carefully retooled to reflect these realities, and the explanatory reasoning behind this revised system should be made easily accessible for all citizens.

4) The City Council should strongly consider the creation of a standing Metropolitan Drainage & Flood Control Citizen Board (a.k.a., Resilient Watershed Citizen Board). Responsibilities of the Board may include the following:

- (A) The Board shall, as the voice of the community, regularly advise the Public Works Department and City Council regarding stormwater management, urban drainage projects, equitable allocation of infrastructure funds, low impact design, flood mitigation, water quality improvement, and the integration of watershed management principles in planning processes.
- (B) The Board shall promote citywide public awareness of, and encourage community participation in, sustainable water management planning, including the areas of water conservation, watershed educational programming, landscape design, and neighborhood resiliency.
- (C) The Board shall regularly solicit comments through multiple public engagement processes to gather feedback from all residents regarding existing or emerging water management problems across the City. These comments shall be reviewed in consultation with City Staff on any necessary response measures, with subsequent recommendations to City Council, when appropriate.
- (D) Ex-Officio Board Members could include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - 1. Texas Council on Environmental Quality
 - 2. Texas Department of Transportation
 - 3. San Antonio Emergency Management Department
 - 4. San Antonio Metropolitan Health District
 - 5. San Antonio Parks and Recreation Department
 - 6. San Antonio Public Works Department
 - 7. San Antonio River Authority
 - 8. Edwards Aquifer Authority

Sample Language for Further Reference:

“Sustainable infrastructure enhances the long term economic, social, and environmental outcomes of development and infrastructure within the greater West Houston Association region. The committee’s mission is to advocate for the use of sustainable infrastructure concepts through the education of members and stakeholders and recognition of projects and practices.”

Source: <https://www.westhouston.org/sustainable-infrastructure-committee/>

+++++

Final Comments: We three D-8 representatives are in agreement that we would like to give our full support to the existing list of twenty (20) Staff-recommended projects. This would allow us all to work together and invest the majority of the meeting in reviewing and prioritizing the Below-the-Line list of projects.