



**Powerline, Vineyard Road, Rittenhouse FRSs
Rehabilitation or Replacement Project
Work Assignment No.3
FCD 2008C041**

**Stakeholder Meeting No. 1
Minutes**

Location: Flood Control District of Maricopa County
Operations Conference Room

Date: August 26, 2010 (Thursday)

Time: 9:00 am – 11:00 am (2.0 hours)

Attendees: Felicia Terry – Maricopa County Flood Control District
Ken Rakestraw – Maricopa County Flood Control District
Diana Stuart – Maricopa County Flood Control District
Bob Eichinger – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
John Klamut – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Jennifer Simpkins – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Heather Smith – Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
Dino De Simone – Natural Resources Conservation Service
Don Paulus – Natural Resources Conservation Service
Patrick Kernan – Central Arizona Project
Mike Hutchinson – Superstition Vistas
Nicholas Blake – City of Apache Junction
Nicole Spence Gibson – Arizona Department of Water Resources
Ken Mouw – Maricopa County Parks and Recreation Department
Mike Park – EPG Inc.
Janelle Moyer – HDR
Tony Regis – J2 Design
Mike Chax – Stanley Consulting (ADOT)
Manny Patel – Arizona State Land Department
Lillian Moodye – Arizona State Land Department
Michelle Green – Arizona State Land Department
Chris Wanaman – Pinal County
Shahir Safi – City of Mesa
David Carson – Arizona Game and Fish Department
Joe Shildmeyer – AECOM

The following meeting minutes set forth our understanding of the discussion and decisions made at this meeting. If you have any questions, additions or comments, please contact the writer immediately. If we do not hear from you within 5 business days of the submitted date, we will assume that our understandings are the same. We are proceeding based on the contents of these meeting notes.



Purpose: Introduce Alternatives Planning Phase of the Project

Discussion Notes:

1. Welcome and Introductions

- a. The project team and stakeholders introduced themselves.

2. Project Overview

- a. A summary of the project was presented by the Flood Control District (FCD). The project team has begun the second phase of the project, which involves developing alternatives and ultimately selecting a recommended alternative to rehabilitate or replace the dams. The District currently owns 22 dams. This project consists of rehabilitating 3 dams which include the Powerline, Vineyard Road and Rittenhouse Flood Retarding Structures (FRSs). Powerline is located to the north, Vineyard Road is in the middle, and Rittenhouse is at the southern end of the project. These dams were originally built between 1967 and 1969 by the SCS (now the NRCS).
- b. The study area for the project is located within the FCD modified easement. All alternatives will be identified to stay within the modified easement area. Since the dams were built, there has been evidence of cracking and foundation issues. Earth fissures have been found in the Powerline structure and there are land subsidence issues.
- c. The objective of this phase of the project is to come up with various alternatives for different solutions for the dams. The project team wants the stakeholders to be involved in this process. The request was made that the stakeholders make sure others in their organizations are aware of the project.
- d. The team plans to go through an array of alternatives. The team is requesting feedback and input from the stakeholders on various opportunities the project may present. The project is approximately 12 miles long and can present opportunities for multi-use recreation and other activities. Public meetings will be held, as well as 1-on-1 meetings with NRCS, ADWR and ASLD. The project is being completed through a partnership with the FCD and Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), with a 65% NRCS cost share for the total project which includes planning, design and construction.
- e. To notify the public of the upcoming public meetings, there will be advertisements and articles in the newspapers. HOA's will be contacted. Mass mailings will be used as there will be so many people affected. There will be a total of 4 public meetings held, 3 of which will occur during Work Assignment 3.
 - 1) The first public meeting will be an introductory meeting in October.
 - 2) The second public meeting will be to narrow down the alternatives being presented.
 - 3) The third public meeting will be to present the draft of the recommended alternative and the draft Environmental Assessment.



- 4) The last public meeting will be to present the final plan and Environmental Assessment.
- f. There is a potential to incorporate multi-use and other recreational opportunities into the project. Although the FCD may not fund parks and certain types of recreational facilities, they may make the land area available for stakeholders if identified in this planning process. A regional context plan, including open space areas and wildlife corridors, was provided to the attendees.
- g. The goal is to have the project constructed within 10 – 15 years (depending on funding).

3. Work Assignments

- a. The Work Assignments (WA) associated with the project are as follows. To date, WA1 and WA2 have been completed. WA3 is currently underway and WA4 is being scoped.
 - 1) WA 1 – Data Collection/Workplan and Planning Formulation
 - 2) WA 2 – Geotechnical and Geohazards Investigation
 - 3) WA 3- Alternatives Formulation and Recommended Plan
 - 4) WA 4 – NRCS Supplemental Workplan and Environmental Assessment
 - 5) WA5 – Preliminary Design (once the plan has been determined).

It will take approximately 1 ½ years for final design. After that, the project would go to construction which would take place in phases.

4. Stakeholders Involvement

- a. The next step for the Stakeholders is to develop goals for the project.
- b. In the 2nd stakeholders meeting the group will develop alternatives. The meeting is planned for September 13 to be held at FCDMC and will be an all day meeting. Within the next 1 – 1 ½ weeks, the draft Existing Conditions Report will be distributed to the stakeholders that will explain the information and issues we discovered in the previous tasks. KHA will determine seed alternatives prior to the meeting and then open it up for alternative ideas. The goal of the 2nd stakeholders meeting will be to reduce the initial list of alternatives to 10 alternatives for further evaluation. After this step, a public meeting will be held to present the project to the public.
- c. The 3rd stakeholders meeting will be held following the October public meeting. At this meeting, KHA will present information on the alternatives analyzed. The alternatives will be narrowed down to 4 alternatives. The 2nd public meeting will be held regarding these 4 alternatives.



5. Stakeholders Issues

- a. CAP: Close to the structures, right-of-way is a concern. In addition the CAP overchutes need to be carefully considered. CAP has a couple of projects going on in the area:

- 1) Sonoqui Detention Dam (south of the project) – CAP maintained and currently undergoing/planning improvements.
- 2) North of Queen Creek Wash – new 6W groundwater recharge project (2 recharge basins are being built).

CAP is currently completing a hydrology study for the canal. The study should be completed by the end of 2010. The goal of the study is to evaluate/compare existing hydrologic information and the original hydrologic information from the 1960's when the CAP was built.

- b. ASLD: Currently preparing master planning for the Portalis project and conceptual planning for Superstition Vistas. ASLD is interested in a minimal footprint (improvements and inundation). They are also interested in the potential uses within the footprint. The Portalis project affects the Powerline area. The Superstition Vistas project affects the Rittenhouse Rd. and Vineyard areas.
- c. AGFD: Concerned about the Mesquite Bosques and vegetation on the east side being impacted by the heavy equipment being brought in for the job. They would like to see the disruption to vegetation minimized and the footprint reduced.
- d. City of Mesa: No detrimental impact to existing downstream hydrology facilities.
- e. ADOT: 802 Freeway System – ADOT is concerned about potential impacts to the future 802 Drainage Channel and additional restrictions to the capacity of Powerline Floodway.
- f. HDR/ADOT: N/S Corridor – requested they be kept informed of easement area changes so they can accommodate the project. This is a 2 year project which they have not yet finalized the alignment for. All 3 dams are in the opportunity area.
- g. Apache Junction: Would like to maximize any recreational opportunities. As Portalis develops there is the possibility of ball fields or equestrian trails. Most likely, improvements would be development driven. They would like the frequent inundation pool to be minimized to increase the potential for recreational opportunities.
- h. Superstition Vistas: Expressed the same concerns as ASLD; they would like to see the open space increase and the footprint minimized.
- i. ASLD: Concerned if the dams are being designed for future conditions. Eventually, ASLD will be developed. They are counting on Pinal County retention requirements. Presented a goal of considering existing vs. future requirements. KHA noted that they are studying existing and future land uses for the existing conditions hydrology.
- j. ADOT – AECOM: AECOM is working on the DCR for the 802. The 802 will cross the Powerline Floodway. In Phase 1, the 802 bridge over the floodway will



be built based on the current assumptions. If this project changes the assumptions, it could be a problem so ADOT needs to stay informed on the progression of the alternatives. The alignment for 802 is final up to Ellsworth Road. The rest of it is close, but it is on hold (up to Ironwood Road).

- k. Pinal County: The County noted that their retention requirement is the 100-year 2-hour storm using the upper 90% confidence level NOAA 14 precipitation. The county would like to remap the floodplains around the PVR FRSs.

6. Stakeholders Goals

- a. NRCS: For a federal project such as this, we have very clear guidelines. From a federal perspective, the following must be met:
 - 1.) Technically sound alternatives that meet the project purpose
 - 2.) At the least cost
 - 3.) Minimize or mitigate adverse environmental impacts
- b. ADWR: Dam Safety Program – Ensure safety to the public, fix current safety deficiencies and comply with state rules and regulations.
- c. ASLD: Integrate future land uses into the project.
- d. ADOT: Not have additional restrictions on what ADOT can discharge into the Powerline Floodway.

7. Prior Stakeholders Meeting Goals and Issues

- a. Coordinate plans with future transportation corridors (*Goal*)
- b. SRP's new 260KV powerline construction through the area. (*Issue*)
- c. Preserve Mesquite Bosques (*Goals*)
- d. Accommodate Wildlife Enhancements (i.e. water holes). (*Goal*)
- e. Coordinate with Apache Junction for utility crossings. (*Issue*)
- f. Allow the project to be used as a regional amenity (*Goal*)
- g. Allow for future park and recreation opportunities (*Goal*).

8. Stakeholders Expectations

- a. Project Team will keep Stakeholder's involved. Stakeholders to provide names of any additional people who should be invited to the next meeting.
- b. Don't just plan – get project designed and built on time. Implement the plan and address Stakeholder's issues.



9. Closing

- a. The Power Point presentation will be on the website. The Alternatives Report CD's will be sent out within 1 – 1 ½ weeks or will be uploaded to an FTP site. The next Stakeholder Meeting will be held Monday, September 13 at Maricopa County Flood Control and will be an all day meeting.