

**Hackmann, Richard**

---

**From:** Mark Harris [MRHGOBLUE@AOL.COM]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 08, 2010 5:10 PM  
**To:** IBRC  
**Cc:** Mark Harris  
**Subject:** Comments on Attachment B from 12/2/2010 Meeting

Dear All,

Here are my comments as we committed to provide at our last meeting.

**Part II - Sub-committee Recommendations**

In general, these titles are not helpful because we do not know what the person who suggested them was thinking in terms of the scope of a particular committee. However, it is beneficial to get a sense of everyone's interest and I think the sub-committees suggested fit into 4 categories.

**Finance** - If I interpret the listing correction, it appears that 5 commissioners recommended a finance committee. I see 5 other topics that fit nicely under finance. They are: General Fund funding, potential funding mechanisms, financing and tax alternatives, budgeting: debt and revenue and Strategic financing & operating alternatives. Also, if the idea "Utilities Enterprise Fund" is meant as a financing mechanism, it could fall under here as well. Again, I don't quite know what the suggester meant - financing or capital projects or both.

**Infrastructure and Capital Projects** - About 10 items fall into this category. These include: Project priorities and large new project prioritization (strikes me as pretty much the same thing), parks and recreation (I am assuming concentration on infrastructure in this area, but I do not see justification for a full sub-committee just for this), technical, capital assets, infrastructure backlog, capital projects, new facilities and maintenance of existing facilities. It may be possible or even desirable to break this sub-committee into 2, so I am very open to thoughts on that.

**Infrastructure Marketing in the Community** - There were 2 sub-committees related to getting the word out and advocacy. I think it is an important element that deserves pursuit. This sub-committee can be small and need not start right away.

**Report Writing** - Clearly a critical deliverable and we should decide how it will be done. The fewer people the better. Maybe this is simply a co-chair responsibility or co-chairs plus one member from each sub-committee.

**Part III - Questions**

**1) Questions to be Immediately Answered** - Look fine. I think we are starting to address them. I have nothing to add at this time.

**2) Questions to be answered in the future** - For the most part they look worthwhile and relevant. Just a few comments: Towards the bottom of page 2, there is a dot point that reads "Does a consensus of projects need to occur or does page 297 of Attachment C of the IBRC Briefing Materials constitute a sufficient census?" I am not quite sure what that means. Does it mean that these are the projects that we are to take under consideration? I'd like to know what the author had in mind here. Since we were told there is an approximate "backlog" of \$ 500 million in projects, page 297 outlines at a high level about \$ 300 million. So what about the rest?

The last dot point on page 3 requests significant data for the past 50 years. Strikes me as a huge undertaking and I am not sure what 50 years tells us. Going back 10 years should be sufficient to establish a feel for the trends that will affect the future and much easier to attain. What am I missing here?

#### **Part IV - Comments**

**1) Comments on Process** - I think they are all good suggestions that we should consider and pursue.

**2) Comments on Presentations** - With one exception, I think they are all good. On page 5 there is a suggestion for a presentation on the City's investment policies. Although I agree that it is an important issue, I believe it is outside the purview of this commission. The question related to possible arbitrage or public/private partnership is a very good one that should be taken up by a Finance Sub-committee.

That's it! Please acknowledge that you have received my e-mail so we can see if the system is working. I have no additional suggestions on the agenda. I would like to know what is happening in terms of releasing and posting our personal information (e-mail and phone number). I would like to see that info on the website or as a handout to us so we can easily contact one of our colleagues if we have a quick thought or question that is not quite ready for universal distribution through this e-mail address.

Thank you.

Mark Harris