



Flood Control District of Maricopa County

Flood Control Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes for February 26, 2014

Board Members Present: Dallas Tanner, Vice Chairman; Scott Ward, Secretary; Hasan Mushtaq for Ray Dovalina, Ex Officio; Bob Larchick, Ex Officio

Board Members Absent: Hemant Patel, Chairman, Melvin Martin, DeWayne Justice, Ray Dovalina

Staff Members Present: Tim Phillips; Wayne Peck, General Counsel; Amir Motamedi, Christopher Fazio; Scott Vogel; Kelli Sertich, Patrick Schafer; Deb Wilson, Doug Williams, Tom Renckly, Amir Motamedi, Karen Scott, Paula Reiswig, Anna Medina; and Ed Raleigh.

Guests Present: Nathan Ford, RBF; Jeff Minch, Wood/Patel; Raj Shah, Ritoch Powell; Justine Buler, Dibble Engineering; Dave Jensen, Olsson Associates; Pat Wolf, RPA; Teri George, Rainbow; Dennis Richards, Premier; Geoff Brownell, Baker; Kavin Kuglez, RBF; Mike Martinez, AZTEC, Mike Caruso, B&V; Doug Both, Haskin Ryan; Elliot Silverston, VRS; Hasan Mushtaq, City of Phoenix; Bob; Huri Raghavan

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Vice Chairman Tanner called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, February 26, 2014.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3) **APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 22, 2014**

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Larchick and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

4) **FISCAL YEAR 2015 ZERO-BASED BUDGET**

Presented by Christopher Fazio, Finance Supervisor

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING ACTION: Endorse and recommend staff's FY 2015 Zero-Based Budget submittal, subject to adjustments made to reflect Board of Directors policy determinations.

Mr. Fazio explained that the zero-based process is a ground-up development of the budget, grouped along business lines, rather than accounting lines. The budget has been organized into categories or decision packages. There are five baseline decision packages. For each package, a

variety of opinions could be received by the Board, including to fund the package, not fund the package, fund the package at a higher level or fund it at a lower level. Each of the five packages is tied to a mandate. There is an assumption for the baseline decision packages that the Board wants to continue to provide services at approximately the same level they are being provided now. A sixth package, the Enhanced Capital Improvement Program Package will be utilized, should the Board choose to fund CIP program to the level that it was funded a couple of years ago.

Mr. Fazio reviewed the packages, beginning with Operations and Maintenance of Existing Structures. These include routine maintenance and dam rehabilitation and other modifications to non-dam structures. This is the largest package in terms of funding and staff. The total staff position requirement is 106. Also included within the package is the ALERT flood warning system. Funding for this package totals \$12.8 million.

The second package is New Capital Project Delivery. This includes new CIPs and partner projects with cities. Funding for this package totals \$25 million.

The third package, Flood Hazard Identification, consists of floodplain delineation, area drainage master study and area drainage master plan programs. Elements of the package are performed in-house along with project management.

The fourth package is the Floodplain Management Package, which includes enforcement and inspection activities, FEMA coordination, natural flood insurance program coordination, regional floodplain management responsibilities. This package requires 25 staff positions and most costs are attributed to personnel.

The fifth package is General Support and Management Package, which consists of all areas not contained within the other packages.

Mr. Fazio provided a year-over-year comparison, noting that past years have not included a decision package format. He pointed out that new capital projects are going down while O&M costs for structures are increasing. There is an overall proposal of \$1 million in cuts to the operating budget. They are proposing to eliminate 25 positions, 20 of which are currently vacant full-time positions; the remaining five are currently vacant temporary positions.

Board Member Ward commented that this approach was a new one. He asked whether it originated from county management looking at staff to trim or examine costs where possible, in order to become more streamlined. Mr. Fazio replied that this is a pilot program and that the focus is not necessarily on the District. Six agencies were included in the program.

Board Member Ward asked whether the program was being managed or audited internally or whether an external group would look at the results. Mr. Fazio responded that the packages have been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget. County management will concur on the submittal, followed by a recommendation presented to the Board.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Larchick to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

5) **FISCAL YEAR 2015 CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET AND FIVE-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Presented by Patrick Schaefer, P.E., CIP Supervisor

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING ACTION: Endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors of the Flood Control Advisory District of Maricopa County approve staff's proposed FY 2015 Capital Project Budget and Five Year Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Schaefer presented staff's recommendation for a \$40 million CIP budget. There are 43 projects contained in the primary CIP program. Funding also includes the small projects program, totaling approximately \$1.6 million. He reviewed a list of expenditures by project phase: Design \$4.1 million, Right-of-way acquisitions \$1.6 million, Construction \$30.2 million. Other costs are for labor and project reserves. Mr. Schaefer explained how the funding will be spent: 54 percent towards channels, basins, and storm drain projects; 37 percent for the dam safety program.

He provided detail regarding individual project efforts for fiscal year 2015. These include 30 percent design progress toward the Watson Drainage System outlet portion, McMicken Dam and the Power Line Vineyard Rittenhouse Rehab Replacement. There will be 60 percent design efforts on the Cave Buttes Dam Modifications, Phase One. The District will proceed with final design on the following projects: 115th and Union Hills Drainage Improvements, Phase One and the final phase of the White Tanks FRS Number Four Rehab Project.

Throughout the year, there will be six projects in various construction phases. There will be three new construction starts. During this time, they will also be in the final phase of the Sonoqui Wash Channelization Project. This is anticipated to begin at the beginning of the second quarter. The Ashbrook Wash Improvements will begin midway through the year. Phase two of the White Tanks Four Projects is scheduled to go to construction in the fourth quarter of next fiscal year. There will be three ongoing projects, including the Loop 303 Project, Phase I FRS Number One Rehab Project and the Upper Camelback Wash Project.

Mr. Schaefer reviewed the small projects component, noting that seven projects were approved for funding. Four are municipalities, one by the City of Scottsdale, four by the City of Phoenix and one by the City of Surprise. These projects will benefit 12 structures which are prone to frequent flooding.

In the Five-Year Program, staff recommends a \$200 million five-year CIP, \$40 million for each year, including funding the Small Projects Program.

Mr. Schaefer discussed program challenges, in particular revenue from the flood control secondary tax. Currently, the District has a total of \$48 million, the same as the previous year but not to the level it was four to five years ago. Currently 77 projects with an estimate cost of \$725 million have been identified and approved through the prioritization procedure.

Board Member Tanner asked whether municipalities contribute towards the costs of the Small Project Program. Mr. Schaefer confirmed that municipalities do participate in cost sharing,

including 25 percent of construction costs and all design and right-of way costs. The District has a cost share of 75 percent of construction costs up to a maximum of \$250,000.

Board Member Ward asked about the budget of \$40 million per year and how this was arrived at. Mr. Schaefer replied that it was based on guidance from the long range funding model and the Office of Management and Budget. Board Member Ward further commented that development has already started in Maricopa County, including existing infrastructure and that in approximately two years, there will be need, especially on the west side, for further CIP projects to take vast amounts of land out of floodway and floodplain. He asked whether the five-year CIP takes this into account. Mr. Schaefer replied that staff has recognized that development is under way and needs will arise. He stated that the projects are funded in the five-year program, but project partners need to be prepared to share in the costs.

Board Member Ward asked whether this would dictate a change in policy from a 50/50 cost share to more of a cost participation from the municipalities? Mr. Schaefer replied that it very well could, if there is competition for several projects. Mr. Phillips added that the five-year CIP is based upon what is known of the 15 year project, which includes assessed valuations increases. This policy represents the amounts that the District can afford, based on a flat tax rate over five years.

Board Member Ward asked for confirmation that each year, the Districts gets \$40 million. Mr. Phillips countered by saying that each year, the District develops a budget based on assumptions. The guidance this year was that the tax rate would remain flat. Staff looks at revenues coming in, the fund balance that they currently have and the total expenses. After this analysis, they determine that they can support a \$40 million CIP this year. Mr. Schaefer added that the \$40 million CIP total for fiscal year 2015 assumes a flat tax, as well as deleting the fund balance. For future years, the number may increase due to tax rate changes or other sources of revenue.

Board Member Tanner asked for confirmation that the five-year plan is subject to modification. Mr. Phillips confirmed this. He clarified that the Board only approves a one-year budget. However, by statute, staff is obligated to plan out a five-year CIP.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Mushtaq to approve the item as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

6) FISCAL YEAR 2014/2015 DAM SAFETY PROGRAM

PURPOSE: Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

Mr. Renckly identified the location of the 22 dams managed by the District. Sixteen were built by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). They were generally designed to protect agricultural areas. However, they are now more commonly designed to protect residential areas. The four dams located on the major river courses were generally designed to protect urbanized areas. Five dams were built by the Corps of Engineers and one by the District in Wickenburg. Four dams located in Pinal County protect portions of east Mesa.

Mr. Renckly reviewed the goals of the dam safety program. First and foremost, they endeavor to stay ahead of dam safety issues. They also address risk through the Dam Rehabilitation Program. With significant flood protection in Maricopa County, the District does not want to allow a situation in which a dam must be taken out of service for safety reasons. The final goal is the operation and maintenance of dams.

The dam safety budget consists of two basic elements. These include recurrent dam safety activities as well as structure, assessment and repairs. He explained that dams must be surveyed in order to understand the changes occurring to elevations. For 2015, the schedule includes surveys for 10 of the 22 dams. He discussed the importance of surveying and evaluating potential earth fissures. Four dams undergo regular monitoring, due to the presence of active land subsidence. As dams are reviewed, potential seepage issues are identified and addressed. Other dam safety issues are addressed according to need and priority.

Mr. Renckly stated that two projects have been completed and seven projects are under way at various stages of completion. One project for modification is under way. The Powerline FRS project addressed an earth fissure. To mitigate the problem, a segment of the dam was segregated. A new structure was built to allow the dam to remain in service until such time that an overall rehabilitation and replacement can be completed. The structure is equipped to last at least 15 years. NRCS funded approximately \$4 million of the structure.

Board Member Ward asked about the project location, particularly the impact of the fissure on the CAP Canal. Mr. Renckly confirmed that it is a concern to CAP, which has reinforced the canal in vulnerable areas.

Mr. Renckly discussed the White Tanks FRS Number Four, stating that the first phase was completed in 2012. This consists of the center filter. Work continues on the final design. Regarding Buckeye FRS Number One, with NTP recently completed on the first phase of the construction. The first phase consists of work on two miles west of the dam. Phase two will complete the other five miles with a new filter, emergency spillway and various other work on outlets. Powerline, Vineyard and Rittenhouse has finished the planning stage. The basic plan is to replace Powerline with a channel, to raise Vineyard Road FRS and to change Rittenhouse FRS into a levee. There are two IGAs with NRCS on this project with a total cost of approximately \$80 million. McMicken Dam is in the final design stages. This project totals \$90 to \$100 million. For the Saddleback FRS, conceptual studies are being completed. For Cave Buttes Dam, they are looking at adding an auxiliary outlet to the structure, which will help with the draw-down and reduce the loading time on the structure. The total for the dams in the CIP for 2015 is approximately \$15 million. Approximately \$35 million in funding for NRCS has been received. Approximately \$23 million has been reimbursed, with the other \$12 million being obligated.

Board Member Larchick asked about the amount of subsidence and frequencies of fissures in the area. Mr. Renckly replied that with White Tanks FRS Number Three, staff identified a land subsidence effect of approximately four and a half feet. He added that in many cases, it does not occur across the whole structure. The south end remained stationary, while the north end subsided four and a half feet. As staff looks at rehabilitating the structures, they estimate the future subsidence and raise it higher to compensate. As far as frequency of fissures, he noted that there are signs that fissures are present. Staff uses satellite data and other instrumentation to identify fissures around structures.

Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

7) FISCAL YEAR 2014/2015 PLANNING PROGRAM

Presented by Doug Williams, AICP, Planning Branch Manager

PURPOSE: Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

Mr. Williams reviewed that there is a mandate and enabling legislation, requiring the District to identify flood hazards and prepare plans to mitigate those hazards. The District has a strategic goal by 2020 to reduce or eliminate the effects of flooding for residents and visitors. General objectives are to protect the public through flood hazard identification as well as to evaluate structural and nonstructural alternatives for mitigation. Approximately half of the program objectives are to address longstanding urban flooding issues.

Significant time is spent on design concept reports, which are focused studies that generally lead to design and construction. Significant time and effort is also spent to obtain high quality mapping, which results in a better quality hydraulic model. Mr. Williams provided a map identifying the study areas.

Mr. Williams reviewed the anticipated budget, explaining that the program is based on a two plus year cycle of projects. He reviewed the list of studies completed to date.

Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

8) FISCAL YEAR 2014/2015 PLANNING PROGRAM

Presented by Amir Motamedi, P.E., Hydrology/Hydraulics Branch Manager

PURPOSE: Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

Mr. Motamedi reviewed the purposes of the Delineation Program. Among the reasons for this program are state statutes that require delineation, as well as a desire to remain in good standing with the National Flood Insurance Program. Other goals include minimizing loss of life and property. He next displayed a map which identified the locations of all floodplains delineated within Maricopa County. Just over 4,100 miles of delineation have been completed, out of a total of 6,000 miles that need delineation.

Some of the floodplains that have been previously delineated are approaching 20 or more years of life. Staff continues to review these delineations, including changes and activities within the river and riverbed, changes in vegetation growth and development encroachment. Based on this review, there may be a decision to make revisions to previous development. This year, staff anticipates completion of approximately 123 miles of delineation. He reviewed the list of projects, including three major projects that will either continue or be started next fiscal year.

He noted that FEMA published new floodplain maps for all of Maricopa County last October. Staff has noticed that in a handful of areas, the map has shifted up or down by 10 to 20 feet. This has placed some homes in the floodplain that were previously out of it. Staff will be working with FEMA to correct these errors.

Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

9) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Presented by Timothy S. Phillips, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager

PURPOSE: Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

10) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

Presented by Timothy S. Phillips, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager

PURPOSE: Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

11) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS

Presented by: Timothy S. Phillips, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager

PURPOSE: Information and discussion item only. No formal action is required.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.