

****LOCATION OF MEETING ****

**SARGE LITTLEHALE
COMMUNITY ROOM
22 ORINDA WAY**



CITY OF ORINDA
22 ORINDA WAY
ORINDA, CA 94563
(925) 253-4200

**REGULAR MEETING
CITIZENS' INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION AGENDA**

**Wednesday, September 11, 2019
6:30 P.M.**

- A. Call to Order**
- B. Roll Call (5 Minutes)**
Commissioners: Walter Bell, Jerry Condon, Chris Decareau, Jud Hammon, Bill Hurrell, Terry Murphy, Richard Nelson
- C. Pledge of Allegiance**
- D. Adoption of Agenda**
- E. Public Forum**
The Public Forum provides an opportunity for members of the public to speak on any item within the jurisdiction of the Commission that does not appear on the agenda. A speaker has the option of addressing an item listed on the agenda if the speaker will not be present when that item is taken up. Public comment is generally limited to 3 minutes per speaker. If you would like to speak during the Public Forum, or on any item listed on the agenda, you are invited to submit a Speaker Card. The optional information you provide on the Speaker Card is made available for public inspection upon request and is subject to disclosure. You will be permitted to speak even if you decline to submit a Speaker Card.
- F. Citizens' Infrastructure Oversight Commission (CIOC) Meeting Minutes (5 Minutes)**
August 14, 2019
Recommendation: Approve
- G. Discussion – 2018 Road and Drainage Repairs Plan Status and Next Steps – Sub-Committee Progress Report**
- H. Discussion – Draft Management Report – Arterial and Collector Streets**
- I. Discussion – Policy Revision – Maintenance of Public Roads**
- J. Staff Updates (10 Minutes)**
 - 1. Update – Public Information and Outreach
 - 2. Update – 2019 Pavement Rehabilitation Project
- K. Matters Initiated**
Consideration of matters Commissioners wish to initiate for placement on a future CIOC agenda
- L. Adjournment** – The next regularly scheduled CIOC meeting is October 9, 2019

I, Sheri Marie Smith, City Clerk, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that this agenda has been posted at least 72 hours in advance at the Orinda City Offices. Additional copies are available at the Orinda Library, the Orinda Community Center, and on the City's website at www.cityoforinda.org

Sheri Marie Smith, City Clerk

~ Accessible Public Meetings ~

The City of Orinda will provide special assistance for individuals with disabilities to participate in public meetings upon advance notice. If you need auxiliary hearing aid or sign language assistance at least two (2) working days advanced notice is necessary. Please contact the City Clerk's Office, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, CA 94563 or 925.253.4220 or ssmith@cityoforinda.org with the following information: Name, mailing address, phone number and type of assistance requested.

**CITY OF ORINDA
CITIZENS' INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
MINUTES**

Wednesday, August 14, 2019

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITIZENS' INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION (CIOC) WAS HELD ON THE ABOVE DATE IN THE SARGE LITTLEHALE COMMUNITY ROOM, 22 ORINDA WAY, ORINDA, CALIFORNIA

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Hammon called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

The following documents were provided at this meeting:

1. *Road and Drainage Maintenance Funding Study - Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations* – by Chair Hammon, dated August 14, 2019
2. *Storm Drain Repairs Plan - Assumptions and Limitations* – by Senior Engineer Scott Christie, dated August 12, 2019
3. *Rehabilitation of Orinda's Major Public Roads: Objectives, Expenditures, and Results to Date - 2nd Draft* - by Commissioner Nelson, dated August 13, 2019

B. ROLL CALL

COMMISSIONERS: Walter Bell, Chris Decareau, Richard Nelson, Jud Hammon, Bill Hurrell, Terry Murphy, Jerry Condon (absent, excused)

City Staff: Director of Public Works and Engineering Services Larry Theis, Senior Engineer Scott Christie, Paving Program Project Manager Farah Khorashadi

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – led by Chair Hammon

D. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

MOTION: By Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Decareau, to adopt the agenda. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

E. PUBLIC FORUM – None

F. CITIZENS' INFRASTRUCTURE OVERSIGHT COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Approval of CIOC Meeting Minutes of July 10, 2019

MOTION: By Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Hurrell, to approve the meeting minutes of July 10, 2019. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

G. DISCUSSION – 2018 ROAD AND DRAINAGE REPAIRS PLAN STATUS AND NEXT STEPS - SUB-COMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORT

Chair Hammon informed the Commission that the City Council has requested that a CIOC member attend the next City Council meeting to provide a status update on the Roads and Drainage Repairs Plan. Chair Hammon and Commissioner Bell are both available and other Commissioners are also welcome to attend.

Director Theis asked if Chair Hammon was planning to provide handouts; if so, the documents could be included in the City Council packet.

Chair Hammon replied that the update will not be ready in advance, as revisions are still being completed. However, a document will be submitted to the City Council at the meeting and he could provide copies.

Senior Engineer Christie distributed handouts and spreadsheets with cost data and a summary sheet with a list of drainage pipes that are recommended to be replaced or lined; he provided the following information:

The latest study from Drake Haglan and Associates was focused on detailed cost estimates for larger diameter pipes, (42 inch diameter and up), and resulted in a cost estimate of approximately \$9 million, slightly less than earlier assumptions. Smaller diameter pipes, (36 inch diameter and less), are tabulated by number of segments and total footage, covering pipes within City right-of-way only. Subtotal for these pipes is approximately \$11.8 million. To this amount is added pipe replacements for capacity increases (non-corrugated metal) at approximately \$1 million, construction contingency of \$3.2 million (25%), and regulatory permit cost contingency of \$1.37 million (10%). Pipe replacements done with the ongoing paving projects have typically been smaller pipes and have not required regulatory permits; one exception being Daryl Drive, which is expanding capacity at a culvert where pipes are being added in a waterway that is considered regulatory.

One next step to further refine the smaller diameter cost estimates would be to determine which locations likely require permits. (This would reduce the permit contingency). Locations on major creeks would require permits, while conveying water from a drainage ditch via a pipe under the road to another drainage ditch would not require permits.

The total cost estimate for all of the pipes recommended for repair or capacity upgrades amounts to approximately \$27 million, which is less than the last estimate of \$29 million. Although some more work and feedback is required, staff is fairly confident that the number is somewhere between \$25 and \$30 million.

Assumptions in the current repair plan estimate were reviewed, including the following:

- Excludes comprehensive pre-construction CCTV
- Reinforced Concrete Pipe (RCP) is assumed to be in good condition. The consequence of this is there will be small issues that will have to be fixed. RCP has a service life of 80 to 100 years, while Corrugated Metal Pipe (CMP) has a service life of around 50 years.
- Further discussion will be required to assist in determining the reasonability of not including money for non-metallic pipes.

Drake Haglan's study of larger diameter pipes includes an accurate priority list; however, scores for smaller diameter pipes will need to be added. Size, road types, and capacity increases will affect the scores, but the most influential factor on scoring is the pipe condition score. Money could be distributed on a scale of 0-5 with 0 being perfect pipes and 5 being the worst pipes, with 20% of the money on each number after 0. This is a good way to figure out cash flow and projections, but would not assign ratings to specific pipes unless a survey is implemented which would cost additional money (CCTV survey); a 5% escalation total is included in the cost estimate. No schedule has been created yet, which could be done in the future, but the next step is scoring. If a bond measure was successful, it would take approximately two years before the work gets underway.

Chair Hammon requested a rough time estimate to replace the majority of listed pipes and asked how long it could be tolerated to put off the pipe replacements. He suggested that by stretching out the length of time needed to replace pipes over a longer period of time, money could be gained for the project through some sort of tax; this would allow the work to be completed without a bond measure.

Commissioner Nelson asked how fast the project could be completed if all the money was available.

Senior Engineer Christie advised that the project would have to be spread out for two reasons: 1) Regulatory permits could take two years to receive, so replacement of the larger, most important pipes could not begin for two to three years; and 2) With a shorter duration contract, the price would be more expensive and massive traffic delays would result.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the job was to be spread out, how it would be prioritized and what the risks and benefits would be. It is an important question to address whether the job be done all at once or spread across longer periods of time.

Senior Engineer Christie responded that this is where the scoring has an impact, especially through the road condition aspect, in figuring out which pipes should be prioritized.

Commissioner Nelson suggested that the next question to address is the probability of a failure and decreasing probability of failure over time; and whether that would justify spreading the project out to decrease the probability of failure. Another important issue is how long it would take to fix any possible failure that could possibly create traffic problems for the public; residents need an idea of benefits, costs, and the reasons to implement this project.

Director Theis stated that if the funds were available, the project would take approximately five years. The project would have to deal with permitting and planning for larger pipes over 2-3 years, while working on smaller pipes simultaneously; then working on pipes in terms of neighborhoods and the effects on traffic which could be spread out to minimize risk. The risk has been quantified to a certain amount with information from the Schaff and Wheeler report by providing a scale of 1-5, noting which pipes are the highest priority.

Commissioner Nelson suggested using the 1-5 scale and describing what would happen at each level on the scale in case of a possible failure; however the scaling system is sorted by corrosion level, not by location.

Commissioner Hurrell noted that the Drake Haglan report has explanations of all of the weights that could be summarized.

Senior Engineer Christie confirmed that roads which are the only access points to certain areas have weight values that reflect this.

Commissioner Nelson asked if the costs include the expense of repaving the roads and repairing trenches.

Senior Engineer Christie responded that the costs cover repaving the trench and repairing the road, but not repaving the entire roadway.

Director Theis added that the probable course of action would be to time the work so that the roads needing slurry seal are worked on first so that those pipes should be done before the slurry and to balance with utility replacement as well.

Senior Engineer Christie said that he would have the scorings done in about a month and any City Council comments at next week's meeting would be reflected in the scores.

Chair Hammon stated that the City Council intends to conduct a citizen survey, which requires time to prepare and implement, and then subsequently analyze the results. If it is to be moved onto a measure that has to go through the ballot process, the City Council would need the report by September.

Chair Hammon reviewed the *Road and Drainage Maintenance Funding - Summary of Conclusions and Recommendation* which he, and Commissioner Bell and Hurrell, had drafted. The report discuss a new funding profile that can be presented to the City Council in accordance with the discussion at the last CIOC meeting with some additions.

Commissioner Nelson commented that the original bonds were for drains but the document is unclear and therefore could be unclear to normal citizens who are uninformed. He asked how the drains that were part of the original road funding were being separated versus new drains being treated as deferred maintenance.

Chair Hammon responded that drains have been repaired and replaced on a continuous basis since 2015 as residential and smaller diameter drains that were close to the surface were replaced; this is why a list of drains that have been recently replaced is needed.

Director Theis said that the previous Road and Drainage Repairs Plan estimated drainage in the \$15 million range, however, there was no comprehensive study. The numbers that were used included estimates from Streetsaver by pavement surface and adding the \$15 million for the total plan. Three phases of that plan have been implemented: 1) Half-Cent Sales Tax in 2012; 2) \$20 million Bond in 2014; and 3) \$25 million Bond in 2016. The next phase is a \$22 million Bond and at the end of this year, when the bond funds are mostly expended, there will be a small amount of money from year-to-year Sales Tax of approximately \$1.2 million. A rough estimate for deferred maintenance of \$27 million, plus Arterials and Collectors, which is \$11 million, totals \$38 million. The estimated Phase 4 Bond is \$22 million, so there is an increase in a refined cost of drainage, but some money in terms of Sales Tax to covers this. The cost appears to have increased by about \$10 million over the previous estimate of four years ago.

Commissioner Nelson stated that in the previous drainage plan in December 2017, there was a draft that was not released - \$15 million was the budgetary cost estimated for the storm drains likely to need near-term repairs, specific large drains; it was not expected to cover all drains.

Director Theis responded that the \$15 million was based off previous lists and estimates, and the most critical culverts were selected.

Commissioner Bell stated it should be explained to the City Council that the scope of the original estimate was much smaller than the scope of the current estimate which causes the numbers to change.

Commissioner Murphy commented that the cost is an estimate because the scope was limited in some way; only large drains that crossed Arterials and Collectors that would greatly affect the community if they failed were included. His concern is the rising costs and that residents may want to wait until the prices go down. With the information at hand, the City Council can adequately be informed of the scope of the problem and

potential funding sources. The \$22 million Bond grew, but also now encompasses more area and work. With a cost of \$27 million instead of \$22 million, specifying to the public what the money pays for would be very important; when the public understands the purpose of the money they have supported the past measures.

Commissioner Nelson thought that it is essential to convince the public of the benefits of the drainage programs because, unlike roads which were successful, drains are less known to the public.

Commissioner Hurrell stated that some number of Arterial and Collector streets did not have funding and that, along with deferred maintenance, must be considered.

Commissioner Bell stated that the message to the public must be very clear, not just what is planned, but also expectations to be met.

Commissioner Nelson reviewed some of his concerns with the report. It is confusing that the categorization of roads in the PTAP Report was *Failed, Poor, Fair, Good, and Excellent*, and PCI of 51-70 is considered *Fair*. The 2013 P-TAP report categorization was *Poor, Good, Very Good, and Excellent* where PCI 50-69 is *Good*. The language used in the previous report stated that the goal is to return all roads to *Good or Excellent* condition with PCI of 50 or above. The cause of confusion is the changing standard and the communication issue due to language used in these reports. Another issue he noted was that when looking at the \$1 million increment of the Half-Cent Sales Tax, the budget documents say there will be \$1.2 million this year, which is a large difference. Additionally, Streetsaver always puts in a cost increase of some percentage. The issues are that there is no cost increase on revenue and Gas Tax revenue is changing; the numbers must be further reviewed

Director Theis confirmed that the revenue side of the CIP is \$1.2 million, but not all of the money goes into construction; for example, the salary for the Paving Program Project Manager comes out of this money; the numbers to look at are the numbers that are being invested only into construction.

Chair Hammon and Commissioner Murphy clarified that the Bond measure was clear that the Paving Program Project Manager would be paid out of the Bond funds.

Director Theis stated that Streetsaver accounts for a 3% inflation, but also accounts for a 3% interest which balances out. There are inflation costs associated with the dollars for costs over a course of 20 years and some assumption of increase in dollars over time for revenue as well.

Commissioner Hurrell pointed out that the assumption for the Half-Cent Sales Tax was that approximately \$780,000 would be received, however over \$1 million is coming in on a yearly basis.

Director Theis stated that the budget estimate for the \$1.2 million is a two year budget.

Commissioner Nelson presented more issues with methodology, questions regarding what the objectives are, how to be clear about them, and how to interpret the Streetsaver program. It is interesting to note that funding Scenario C comes out as the lowest total cost with the proposal of keeping the Half-Cent Sales Tax for ten years and then doubling it after year 2032. His understanding of deferred maintenance is defined in Streetsaver as relative to an objective and this objective could be an objective that the City of Orinda may or may not want to achieve.

Commissioner Murphy stated that Streetsaver does not do policy - it was made to maximize return for the dollar. This is not very useful for the CIOC, which created its' own policy and sought approval by the City Council on how to spend the money. He recommended not to look at Streetsaver for policy and questioned what the community and the City Council want. He would like the City Council to look at what change in policy will happen, because worst and most traveled roads first is no longer a policy. However, Streetsaver can now help figure out what to do in the future. He requested that identifying the necessity of a policy change be incorporated into the report and emphasized. The reason Arterials and Collectors were started on was because that was all there was funding for; after that, the policy became worst and most traveled first in the residential areas, and the policy afterwards became average PCI of 70 and nothing below 50. He would like to know what the policy will be after achieving average PCI of 70 and no roads under PCI 50, and what the community and the City Council want.

Commissioner Nelson agreed that the goals are close to being achieved and a new goal should be created. He suggested a new goal of minimizing long term costs, which relates back to the question of what Streetsaver means by *deferred maintenance*.

Paving Program Project Manager Khorashadi explained that *deferred maintenance* consists of pavement maintenance that is needed but cannot be performed due to lack of funding.

Chair Hammon noted that 20 years from now if the Sales Tax is allowed to expire, there would be a deferred maintenance of \$54 million, bringing the PCI back to the level of 2012.

Commissioner Nelson asked what algorithm Streetsaver uses and if it is a relevant algorithm.

Chair Hammon commented that if nothing is done until a road is PCI 50, it will cost \$50 a square yard more than if maintenance is done to bring a road back to PCI 85.

Commissioner Nelson stated that he is concerned with minimizing the cost of keeping all roads above PCI 50.

Director Theis asked what information in the charts made Commissioner Nelson think that in the next 40 years it would be cheaper to let the roads deteriorate before fixing rather than of doing light maintenance repeatedly over time.

Commissioner Nelson stated that Streetsaver has objectives and assumptions built into it and cost minimization is not a Streetsaver policy.

Director Theis asked if getting streets to PCI 85 the CIOC's objective and whether it is something to do now. Streetsaver is a tool to come up with numbers and budgeting and if it is not followed then the end result will differ from the Streetsaver outcome. Based upon Streetsaver, doing the worst roads first under PCI 25 costs more in the long term; roads that were teetering could have been fixed but a policy decision was made to fix the worst roads first which saved less money. Streetsaver has been updated over time as roads were completed, which means that if streets that Streetsaver identifies to work on are not done, the issue is bigger than objective policy because all planning tools are based off of Streetsaver.

Commissioner Nelson preferred to use Streetsaver with the objective built into it that the CIOC wants and to use Streetsaver to avoid letting roads deteriorate to a point where it will cost more to repair them to minimize costs.

Chair Hammon agreed that an objective is necessary, but that the objective is not to decide on a certain PCI, but to minimize long-term costs. The cost can never be zero because maintenance is always necessary, since short-term zero costs will lead to a long-term higher costs. Many roads would fall under disrepair and the City would have to acquire many large bond measures as opposed to following Streetsaver and minimizing long-term costs without needing bond measures. Total money spent with maintenance will be less than minimum plus repairs.

Commissioner Murphy concurred that Streetsaver's objective should be questioned, however Streetsaver does work. With some roads having been finished, information can be plugged into Streetsaver and the results will be accurate. He reiterated that the question is what does the City Council and the voting public want. There are intended and unintended consequences. The consequences of not doing the deferred maintenance is that all Residential roads will need heavy maintenance and that the citizens of Orinda will be driving on these roads. The public needs to understand what it is like to drive on failed roads and that if there is no funding source for the deferred maintenance the road conditions will be back to those in 2012; and consequently, large bonds will be required for large sums of money.

Director Theis stated that if deterioration is not a goal, Streetsaver has the data that is necessary to keep roads at the desired level.

Commissioner Bell commented that after making a major investment to get a road up to a certain number and working optimally, it is necessary to keep the system maintained at that quality because it would be a waste to let a good transportation system deteriorate to minimize costs. He recommended that the goal be to keep the system maintained at the current efficiency while at minimum cost.

Chair Hammon presented an informational chart that reflected if funding is limited to \$1.6 million per year; by allowing the Half Cent Sales Tax to expire, the roads would degrade and more than 60% of roads would have PCI less than 70 by 2039. With funding at a level of \$2.6 million per year, less than 80% of roads will have PCI greater than 70 20 years from now.

Commissioner Murphy agreed that the use of a PCI 70 or greater on the charts is a good goal that residents would not mind living with and driving on.

Commissioner Nelson suggested to pointing out to the City Council that the budgets for different scenarios in the report are very preliminary.

Director Theis explained that the \$2.6 million is based off of the original estimate which was around \$1 million in Sales Tax, \$600,000 for the Vehicle Impact Fees, and \$1 million between a Return-to-Source and Gas Tax combination, with no grants.

Chair Hammon reviewed the revenue assumptions in the report which are based upon Gas Tax, CCTA Return-to-Source, and potential Federal and State Grants; this assumes that the Half-Cent Sales Tax would generate approximately \$1 million per year, and a One-Cent Sales Tax would generate approximately \$2 million per year.

Commissioner Murphy commented that it does not matter where the money comes from; it is more important to know how much money is required. It is up to the City Council how much tax is received. He questioned whether the other sources of income such as the Gas Tax and Return-to-Source will continue to apply to the program. He recommended that the comments and numbers by Senior Engineer Christie be included in the report to the City Council. He would be satisfied with the report if these comments and numbers can be clearly explained to the City Council at the meeting.

Commissioner Bell mentioned that a crucial part of maintaining property values in the community is the condition of the roads and streets; he suggested that this fact should be emphasized to the Council.

Commissioner Murphy stated that the issue is not just how much money the City Council wants to spend, but also unintended consequences of not spending the money. He suggested incorporating charts and information about the drains provided by Senior Engineer Christie along with the numbers. The City Council can be presented with a number of options and it is their job to figure out where the money is going to come from

and how it will be received. If the City Council tells the CIOC at what PCI level they want the roads to be maintained, this number can be plugged in and figured out, but that is a policy decision.

Chair Hammon suggested looking at the chart for Funding Profiles; \$1.6 million per year if the existing Sales Tax were to expire in 2022; \$2.6 million per year if some additional Sales Tax would be approved in 2022; \$2.6 million until 2032, and \$3.6 million until 2032. Some additional revenue is necessary.

Commissioner Nelson pointed out that the numbers do not increase over time, which they are actually likely to do; that is something that would have to be worked on eventually. This is a reason for presenting the numbers as *preliminary*. There is a problem with costs going up but revenue not increasing, because if the costs are going up over time, more money is needed over time as well.

Commissioner Murphy agreed that the issues addressed by Commissioner Nelson are important and should be addressed, but not in the report to the Council. Those issues should be addressed in the actual Plan, but the Progress Report does not require these items to be fixed yet.

Chair Hammon suggested that a reasonable goal is to minimize long-term costs, with the follow up question of how specifically to minimize long-term costs. It should not be a goal to have a PCI of a certain number and the Plan should not say to never let any road fall under a certain PCI. Defining any PCI as an average goal is forcing a budget that is unknown; the lower the PCI is set, the higher the costs will actually be.

Commissioner Murphy stated that the City Council only requires a Progress Report and if there is any missing piece that they would like to have, they will ask the CIOC to include it.

Chair Hammon asked if the sentence stating: *“We suggest that the City adopt a new road management objective, minimize the long-term costs of maintain our public roads...”* should be left in or removed from the report.

The Commissioners concluded to strike the sentence from the report but to verbally pose it in the City Council meeting.

Commissioner Hurrell stated that by objectives the City Council means no deferred maintenance or no streets beneath a specified PCI or maintaining the current average Citywide PCI.

Paving Program Project Manager Khorashadi advised that the City Council wants to know the CIOC’s recommendation so that they can weigh the information and make a decision.

Director Theis agreed that the CIOC should make a recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Hammon stated that it will be very clear that the charts and funding profiles are for roads only and not for drains. There is not much information on the drainage issues and there is not yet all of the information that is needed to create a funding profile for the drains.

Commissioner Bell requested a copy of the revised documents from Chair Hammon,

Chair Hammon confirmed the documents will be distributed when completed by e-mail and that comments on the documents can be sent to him.

This item was continued to the next CIOC meeting.

H. DISCUSSION – DRAFT MANAGEMENT REPORT – ARTERIAL AND COLLECTORS STREETS

Commissioner Nelson presented the *Arterial and Collector Streets Draft Management Report*; the report was revised with the items in blue added from last month. The report is preliminary and subject to revision.

A meeting with Director of Finance Paul Rankin on August 19, 2019, will include a discussion on data which needs to be verified and understood, and input on whether the focus will be on pavement management only and not on other projects related to roads.

Director Theis stated that the other costs such as Gas Tax and Return-to-Source can be used for other projects that are not pavement related but for the streets.

Commissioner Nelson stated that the Management Report could be expanded to focus on goals other than pavement, but preferably not. It should be clear that all the money is not necessarily going into pavement rehabilitation so the decisions to be made should be understood.

Director Theis stated that the Gas Tax will be paying for a Senior Engineer that the City is currently recruiting. As an example, some Gas Tax is being allocated to internal staff costs as opposed to strict construction costs.

This item was continued to the next CIOC meeting.

I. STAFF UPDATES

Paving Program Project Manager reported on the following items:

- *Update – Public Information and Outreach* – The Miner Road Paving Project is almost complete; weekly construction notices are posted on Nextdoor and Outlook

- *Update – 2018 Pavement Rehabilitation Project* – Negotiations with Bay Cities Paving and Grading were completed in July and the Final Pay Estimate is being processed; the total construction cost is below contract amount by more than \$1 million.
- *2019 Pavement Rehabilitation Project* – Desilva Construction completed the Glorietta Project and Sleepy Hollow Road prior to opening of school; the contractor is currently working in north Orinda.

J. **MATTERS INITIATED**

The Commissioners requested that a discussion on a change of policy for the maintenance of public roads be agendized for the next meeting.

Items for the next CIOC Agenda:

- Discussion - 2018 Road and Drainage Repairs Plan Status and Next Steps – Sub-Committee Progress Report
- Discussion - Draft Management Report - Arterial and Collector Streets
- Discussion – Policy Revision - Maintenance of Public Roads

K. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: By Commissioner Murphy, seconded by Commissioner Bell, to adjourn the CIOC meeting. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The Citizens’ Infrastructure Oversight Commission meeting adjourned 9:00 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Citizens’ Infrastructure Oversight Commission will be 6:30 p.m., September 11, 2019, in the Sarge Littlehale Community Room, 22 Orinda Way, Orinda, California.