

# Flood Control District of Maricopa County

## Flood Control Advisory Board

**Meeting Minutes February 26, 2020**

**Board Members Present:** DeWayne Justice, Chairman; Richard Schaner, Vice Chairman; Gregg Monger, Secretary; Hemant Patel, Ray Dovalina and Kyle Tilghman

**Staff Members Present:** Michael Fulton, Director; Wayne Peck, General Counsel; Kristine Rabe; Clerk of the Board

### 1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Justice called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, February 26, 2020.

### 2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

### 3) **APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 2019 MEETING**

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Schaner and seconded by Mr. Dovalina to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously, and the minutes were approved.

### 4) **INFORMATION ITEM – FISCAL YEAR 2020 MID-YEAR BUDGET UPDATE**

Presented by Karen Scott, Finance and Contracts Division Manager

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

Ms. Scott stated that the District's revenue has been good year to date. We have received more than half of our revenue that we had anticipated from all of our categories except for intergovernmental. While we have the plans ready and a verbal agreement with NRCS for the Buckeye project, we do not have formal, written IGA with them yet. We do not anticipate receiving this revenue this year.

The interest income is a little bit over so we will have more interest than what was budgeted. Our miscellaneous revenue is also a little bit over which is mostly due to our land sales, which is not always predictable and budgeted conservatively.

Most division expenditures are at about 45 percent of their expected budget. The ITC cost are based on actuals. They use what we did a year ago to create the budget and as the actuals come in they charge us what we have actually been spending. The number of help desk tickets are down and there has been some turnover since the budget was created last year.

The other division of interest in expenditures is PPM which has spent approximately 26% of their year-to-date budget. With the economy doing so well it has been more difficult to hire staff and retain them when private companies are paying more and luring them away, creating a significant staffing issue for this division. Other expenditure delays within the Planning branch include the technical with FLO-2D and mapping issues. The Dam Safety branch has some significant work in progress and they expect to finish strong so their expenditure numbers should come up.

The last expenditure that is lagging is the Real Estate department and that is more of a timing issue. The Real Estate function is housed in another County department and they charge us back. The charge backs had not been done fully when this report was pulled and they are currently at 36 percent through the end of December.

Ms. Scott then went into detail regarding the expenditures versus actuals for the one time funding most of which is the HVAC project that was \$1,800,000 which is under O&M. It is about \$300,000 over budget due to items that were not found until the project was well under way that we needed to accommodate. There will be areas where we won't fully expend our budget so we should be able to cover that overage.

Mr. Fulton asked Ms. Scott to clarify that it was the HVAC system overhaul that she was referencing. Mr. Fulton commented to the Board that we are reviewing the mid-year 2020 budget and one of the action items today is to endorse the Fiscal Year 2021 budget proposal. This review is a peek of what goes into the operating budget that they will be asked to approve for 2021 before it goes to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Scott then reviewed the expenditures to actuals for the maintenance and vehicle appropriation unit. This unit was added last year to give more transparency to some of the expenditures we had as well as allow us to fluctuate some of the numbers. The project that was added in 2020 for facility repair which included the emergency stairwells, the breakrooms and restrooms. As the project came together we realized it was going to be more involved than we originally anticipated and that the cost was more than what was budgeted. So, we are going to go ahead with putting together some of the plans for it and the small pieces for it but the majority of the project will be budgeted for 2021.

Other items include vehicle replacements which may look like it is behind, but most of our vehicles come in at the end of the year because they have to be made after we order

them. Therefore, we expect this appropriation to be mostly spent by the end of the fiscal year.

Ms. Scott then reviewed the Fiscal Year 20 budgeted expenditures versus actual for the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) with a focus on any of our projects that were budgeted over \$1 million. This includes the following completed projects: DRCC, Northern Parkway and 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Olney projects. We are working on final billings for these projects. We are currently working to purchase the land needed for the Hidden Valley Basins and Storm Drain project. The McMicken Dam Outlet Channel Improvements Phase 1 is moving along but we won't expend all that money which is good news as the low bid came in less than what we had originally budgeted.

The second group of projects in the CIP program are moving along but had various delays in the beginning so they will not be spending their full budget and will roll over into the next fiscal year. (Second group: East Maricopa Floodway Low Flow Channel, Rawhide Wash Flood Hazard Mitigation, White Tanks FRS No. 4 Outlet and Arizona Canal Diversion Channel Fence Repair.) The third group has had problems with the partners, such as ADWR and NRCS, moving things along and we do not anticipate these projects moving along very quickly before June 30. (Third group: 51<sup>st</sup> Ave and Dobbins Road Drainage, Buckeye FRS No. 1 Rehabilitation, Cave Buttes Dam Modifications, PVR FRS Rehabilitation, McMicken Dam Rehabilitation, and Palm Lane and 30<sup>th</sup> Street.)

Mr. Fulton commented that on some projects you can see there is a big delta between the budget and the actuals in favor of the budget. This has been something that isn't new to the District in terms of trying to predict when expenditures will occur. Projects have many partners that are involved and many approvals that have to occur. We are not happy with this performance and are working to get better projecting expenditures which will help us better plan for and execute projects. It does suggest that we have our own challenges with getting all the pieces of a project moving. Timing wise we are usually a little more optimistic than reality bares out. As the graphic Ms. Scott showed, it's not that projects have stalled but we have hit some obstacles in our critical path of approval from ADWR and in many cases funding from federal partners and others. That's important to look at when we look at our expenditures versus our budget. We try to do what we can to remove the obstacles and get projects moving.

Ms. Scott moved on to discuss the Fiscal Year 20 major maintenance expenditures which was added last year as an appropriation to address some significant structure maintenance issues that we couldn't accommodate within the operating budget. This is designed to expand and contract as maintenance issues arise. A couple of large, planned projects in this funding bucket were found to fit better within CIP, the most notably the ACDC fencing project. We had originally anticipated doing it with job order contracts (JOC) but it ended up being a much larger project than we had planned for and had to be moved to

the CIP. Although the money has not been spent as expected it is anticipated that seventy-two percent of the budget will be spent by the end of the fiscal year as O&M has been pulling other maintenance items in and moving projects around.

Ms. Scott went on to the next slide which showed the fund balance. Fiscal years 2022 – 2024 estimates were not shown because the CIP budget is still being developed. Without the CIP budget it is very hard to estimate the numbers any further out than fiscal year 2021. The fiscal year 2020 actual beginning balance was estimated at \$96 million originally but came in at \$110 million, \$14 million more than estimated. This concluded the mid-year review.

There were no questions from the Board.

**5) ACTION ITEM – FISCAL YEAR 2021 OPERATING BUDGET SUBMITTAL**

Presented by Karen Scott, Finance and Contracts Division Manager and District Staff

**ACTION:** Staff requests that the Flood Control Advisory Board endorse and recommend the District's Fiscal Year 2021 Fund 989 (Flood Control Grant Fund) and Fund 991 (Flood Control District Fund) requested budget.

Ms. Scott clarified that the capital budget (Fund 990) would be discussed at the next meeting. She then described some of the operating budget challenges which included increased costs, most of which are areas over which Flood Control exerts control. The Central Service Cost Allocation is a mechanism by which Maricopa County charges back the all departments for the centralized functions they do such as HR, telecommunications, central finance and procurement, the Treasurer's office, the Board of Directors. All of these items are charged back through the Central Service Cost Allocation. One of the items included in this is the GIS from County's Information Technology department. The methodology changed from last year to this year in regard to the way charges and overhead were calculated. Overhead has been added and that accounts for one of the big increases in that line item.

The Risk Management line item increased, but not that significantly. The telecommunications included an upgrade to the radio system that they have been doing over the last three years. The variable and fixed benefit line item is related to a \$900 per employee increase to benefits and the state retirement system is also going up from 12.11% to 12.22%. Those were some of the significant challenges that we faced with an almost \$1.7 million increase in costs. The budget office asked us to absorb this cost.

The only real increase in revenue was in property taxes and that was due to an increase in property values, not that we are increasing our tax rate. The other large increase in our revenue is interest income which was increased to \$1.5 million.

Ms. Scott then shared a pie chart showing that property tax the largest portion of the revenue we collect. She then commented that normally the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) revenue would also be included, which is also another significant area, but because we do not have the CIP numbers ready to present the IGA numbers are not reflected but will be discussed at the next meeting.

Ms. Scott then moved on to the Requested Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2021. The first line item being the “Transfer from Flood Control (Fund 991) to Capital Projects (Fund 990)”. All of the District’s property tax revenue comes into Fund 991 and we transfer over to the Fund 990 to fund capital projects. The vehicle replacement has gone down. The major maintenance for our facilities is going up and the non-recurring is going down. When we did the HVAC project to replace the chillers on the building, we did not have this appropriation for the facilities. The facilities money for next year is for the emergency stairwells, the restrooms and some of the landscaping that we will be redoing around the District office.

The Operating portion is staying flat. If you take out the transfer of funds our appropriation has gone down by \$442,000. Overall, the District is holding their expenses on the operating side pretty steady.

There were no questions from the Board for Ms. Scott.

At this time the different divisions in the District came up to present on Fiscal Year 2021.

**Engineering Division Fiscal Year 2021, Presented by Stephanie Gerlach, P.E., MEP, Special Projects Branch Manager**

Ms. Gerlach talked briefly about what the Engineering Division does. The Engineering Division performs a wide variety of work which includes a lot of technical aspects. They develop computer models, test computer models, and provide training to other staff regarding the use of the models. The Engineering Division also has a River Mechanics group, as well as a Levee Safety group that manages 25 different levees. There is also a group that looks at the right-of-way use permits any time someone cross the land that the District owns. The Engineering Division also has an In-House Design and Review group who look at construction plans. There are two different groups that develop emergency action plans, one for dams and one for levees. There is also the Flood Warning Program that manages over 400 different gages in and around Maricopa County.

Ms. Gerlach then went on to discuss one of the special programs the District has, which is Exercises and why the District does them. Ms. Gerlach then discussed how we exercise our plans and programs, which test us so that we make sure we are ready for the next flood event. One of the reasons we do this is because Wickenburg was hit in 2015 by a

rather large storm event. The Sunny cove FRS had water rise 32 feet in the impoundment area within a two-hour time frame. Another nearby dam had water come within one foot of the emergency spillway release, and again, that was in less than two hours. We don't really have the time to fumble with plans, try to figure out procedures, or try to fix equipment. We need to be ready to manage a flood event at any time, especially for our 22 dams.

Ms. Gerlach went on to state that because of Arizona state law we are also required to exercise plans associated with high or significant hazard dams. The term high or significant hazard does not mean the dams are unsafe; it means they have the potential for loss of life or high economic damage due to flows from the dams. We have 22 high hazard dams that we manage. Some of our operation and maintenance agreements with our federal sponsors that we use to build the facilities also require us to exercise, such as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Lastly, the National Flood Insurance Program Community Rating System requires the District to hold at least an annual flood exercise in order to gain any points through that program.

Ms. Gerlach went on to explain what an exercise is. An exercise is a simulation of possible flood scenarios to test anything from making sure we understand our roles and responsibilities to understanding the various manuals that we use, such as emergency action plans for various dams. We test the various means of communication, not only from our field crews to ALERT Operations Center (AOC), but also from the District to other agencies, such as local, state, and federal agencies. Our exercises typically start simple and work up to more complex scenarios to make sure capabilities increase throughout the year. The most complex exercise is held during May or June. The official start of the Monsoon is June 15 and this is typically our busiest time of year.

Ms. Gerlach then went on to explain that we can hold several types of exercises. Workshops are the simplest type of exercise where we can discuss changes to a plan, or new plans with existing staff or new staff. We use tabletop exercises to test whether or not the plans can work for various scenarios. This could involve not only internal staff, but we also invite other agencies. The most complicated type of exercise is called a full-scale exercise, where we have boots on the ground (where people are actually out in the field looking at a structure), and responding to what may happen at that structure. They are communicating with our AOC here, and the AOC is communicating with County Emergency Management, and other local or state emergency centers involved in the exercise.

Ms. Gerlach shared several upcoming exercise dates which included several tabletop exercises, a workshop in April and a full-scale exercise in May.

There were no questions from the Board.

**Floodplain Permitting Division Fiscal Year 2021 Program Highlights, Presented by Mr. Afshin Ahouraiyan, P.E., Hydrology & Hydraulics Branch Manager**

Mr. Ahouraiyan went over some of the highlights that happened in the branch over the last year as well as some of the upcoming projects.

The Floodplain Permitting Division consists of three branches: The Floodplain Permits branch who review and issue permits for 14 of the incorporated communities in Maricopa County, they also review and issue sand and gravel floodplain use permits for Unincorporated Maricopa County and the 14 communities. Last year we started taking permits through an online portal, issued 284 floodplain use permits in 2019 and received 322 new floodplain use permits applications in 2019 compared to 214 in 2018 which indicates there is a lot more development occurring.

Mr. Ahouraiyan then went on to the Code Compliance and Customer Assistance Branch which conducts code compliance for Unincorporated Maricopa County and 14 of the incorporated communities. They responded to 87 citizen complaints on code compliance matters, opened 65 new cases to resolve compliance issue, performed 421 site inspections in 2019 and assisted approximately 2500 customers with floodplain, permit and general questions.

The Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch provides hydrologic and hydraulics modeling and review for all District studies and projects. They also conduct floodplain delineation analysis based on community needs and requests. Last year they completed the Fountain Hill Channel Delineation in the Town of Fountain Hills and are currently in progress with the re-delineation of Hasayampa floodplain from Gila River to Jackrabbit Wash which should be completed by the end of Fiscal Year 2020.

Mr. Ahouraiyan went on to discuss the process improvement analysis that the division went through this past year. Existing steps were identified with all the current processes that exist within each of the branches. They then went on to identify ways that the processes could be improved by elimination of unnecessary steps or adding new steps, to make sure that our customers are assisted properly and in a timely manner. All staff was included in this process improvement effort and everyone gave input into ways we could improve these processes. One of the improvements that was identified was to divide the Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch into two separate areas: Hydrology-Hydraulics Branch and Floodplain Delineation Branch.

Mr. Ahouraiyan then shared some of the highlights for Fiscal Year 2021. The Floodplain Permits Branch will be making enhancements to the online permit submittal portal as there are some glitches that need to be improved. The Code Compliance Branch will

continue to provide code compliance for 14 of the incorporated communities as well as Unincorporated Maricopa County. The Hydrology and Hydraulics Branch will be focusing on providing reviews and doing in house modeling for all District studies and projects. The Floodplain Delineation Branch will continue to conduct Floodplain Delineation Analysis based on community needs and requests as well as assist customers with general questions and questions on floodplains.

There are three new floodplain delineation studies budgeted to start in Fiscal Year 2021: Sunland Avenue Floodplain Re-delineation Study, North Gilbert Flood Studies, and Floodplain Delineation Study in Mesa to remove Zone D.

Mr. Ahouraiyan briefly went over each study. The Sunland Avenue Tributary Floodplain is a re-delineation of Zone AE. It is all in Unincorporated Maricopa County. The staff looked at this delineation and because of some improvements that have occurred in the City of Phoenix to a channel upstream of this area, the flows that would normally come to this area have been reduced, potentially reducing this floodplain.

The next study is from a request that came from Gilbert to look at all of their floodplains along the canals and along Ray Road. We will be looking at the delineations to see if they are still valid or they need to be reviewed and updated.

The Zone D study in Mesa is from a request from the City of Mesa. Zone D has the highest rate if you are in it and the City of Mesa asked that we relook at this and identify the delineation in a better way. Currently, the District is working on the area between Guadalupe Road and Elliot Road and next year we are moving down to continue from Elliot Road to Ray Road.

Mr. Fulton commented that due to the location of this study we would have the opportunity to talk with Pinal County and other towns that are nearby about possibly doing other flood hazard assessment studies in this area or expanding current studies.

There were no questions from the Board.

**Planning and Project Management Fiscal Year Program Highlights, Presented by Hasan Mushtaq, PhD, P.E., CFM, PMP, Planning Branch Manager.**

Mr. Mushtaq stated that he would be discussing the Fiscal Year 2021 planning projects and give an update on the current and ongoing planning studies the District is involved in.

Maricopa County is broken up into many different watersheds. Every year the District starts studying or re-studying an existing watershed and we look at the hazards in that watershed, do hydrologic and hydraulic modeling and identify flood hazards for that area. The second step of that process is to come up with some plans to mitigate those hazards.

That is the Area Drainage Master Study/Plans (ADMS/P) portion. Every year we start about three studies, new studies or restudies, as staff and budget allows. Currently, the District is involved in about eight ongoing studies.

In Fiscal Year 2021 the District will start three new studies: Queen Creek/East Mesa ADMS/P Update, North Peoria ADMP Update and Adobe Dam/Desert Hills/Apache Wash ADMS Update.

Mr. Mushtaq then went on to give updates on several of the ongoing studies. The San Tan ADMP, a 45 square mile watershed in the southeast part of Maricopa County, will identify alternative solutions to mitigate some of the flooding hazards which include an evaluation of the Farmer's Dike.

The Wittmann ADMS is on the northwestern part of the watershed of Maricopa County. The study watershed is approximately 285 square miles and the District is coordinating with the Cities of Surprise and Peoria. Study should start in March of this year.

The Queen Creek/East Mesa ADMS/P is a 64 square mile watershed study. There is a transportation corridor expansion in the area. Mapping of the watershed will be completed in Fiscal Year 2020 and the study will commence in Fiscal Year 2021. The District is coordinating with the City of Mesa, Towns of Queen Creek and Gilbert and Pinal County.

The North Peoria ADMS is in the north part of the County and is approximately 84 square miles of watershed area. The previous study was conducted in 2001. Watershed mapping will be completed in Fiscal Year 2020 and the study will commence in Fiscal Year 2021.

Adobe Dam/Desert Hills/Apache Wash ADMS/P has a study watershed of approximately 145 square miles. The District is coordinating with the City of Phoenix and the community of New River. New mapping for the watershed will be completed in Fiscal Year 2020 and the study will commence in Fiscal Year 2021.

There were no questions from the Board, but Mr. Fulton did ask Mr. Mushtaq to explain how they pick year to year which studies will be new. Mr. Mushtaq responded that each watershed has a number, an ID if you will, and colorization of the watershed signifies ranking. Each year the District goes through a ranking process and the rank depends on how old the last study was, how old the mapping was when the study was done, what methodology and computer modeling was used, population in the area, projection by MAG, requests from the cities/towns/communities, etc. These are the types of things we look at and score them to come up with the ranking/prioritization of the studies.

## **Planning and Project Management Fiscal Year 2021 Program Highlights, Harry Cooper, PLA, ASLA, Landscape Architecture and Water Conservation Branch Manager**

The Landscape Architecture and Water Conservation Branch has four main program areas: Landscape Architecture, Water Conservation (Water Resources), Native Plant Nursery, and Water Quality.

As far as project involvement, Mr. Cooper stated that they are responsible for the inclusion of landscape architecture and water conservation elements into District projects. This includes everything from landscape restoration/construction mitigation/sediment and erosion control to native tree and hydro-seeding as well as alternative stormwater management and recharge and structural aesthetics and multiple-use opportunities.

Mr. Cooper shared some of the notable projects they would be working on in Fiscal Year 2021 which included the McMicken Dam Outlet Channel Phase 2, Metro ADMP Update, Cave Buttes Dam Modifications as well as several others.

Mr. Cooper then went on to highlight a couple of water conservation/water resource management activities that they are engaged in which include the Durango Campus Water Conservation Retrofit. The District is also working on reducing potable water use on outdoor landscape by 50% from the 2014 levels which includes the Durango campus, Arizona Canal Diversion Channel and Upper East Fork Cave Creek. There will also be coordination with Operations & Maintenance to address priority areas as well as public agency and community outreach in Fiscal Year 2021.

Mr. Cooper also shared that they have a goal to evaluate 50% of existing structures and all new structures for water conservation potential by 2022. In Fiscal Year 2021 efforts include water resources on-call consultant to evaluate existing structures for water conservation potential and continuing to include water conservation strategies on all new project designs as applicable.

Board Member Gregg Monger asked Mr. Cooper who does the District benchmark against in the nation to see how we compare in these recharge programs. Are there other counties that have successfully done this or are we groundbreaking in these efforts? Mr. Cooper replied that we are not the first to try these methods. There are a number of agencies in California that are engaged in these efforts but in slightly different ways. These ideas are not new, but they are not happening in Arizona at the level we'd like to see. Mr. Fulton commented that there are two types of water conservation efforts we can engage in and one is how do we better mimic a natural waterway to reduce our maintenance costs and our vegetation expenses for using potable water. The other is recharge opportunities.

Mr. Cooper then went on to share information on the Tall Pot Tree Nursery program which has been around since the early 2000's. In Fiscal Year 2021, the tall pot nursery will propagate over 4,000 additional native trees, monitor El Rio Pilot Test Site for tree recruitment and survival, work with Operation & Maintenance on continued nursery improvements and continue educational outreach on native tall pot trees as a water conservation strategy.

Board member Hemant Patel asked if there was any plan to work conservation efforts into development standards for all development that goes on and not just on District property. Mr. Cooper responded that yes, he thinks it is a very important next step and we have proof of concept where we are building some facilities, we are testing, and we are doing it. There are case studies and examples that exist elsewhere, and we are looking at those. Our next step would be to introduce development standards into the annuals we manage such as our Drainage Policies and Standards.

Board member Hemant Patel's next question was for Mr. Fulton and he asked if the state was providing any leadership in water conservation in terms of scaled facilities that we can work with them on. Mr. Fulton replied they are, but he is not part of the governor's task force on water augmentation and while we are not participants, we are prepared to provide information. The state has this topic on top of its mind if you have been reading the news or watching legislation. Water supply, conservation and water augmentation are big issues right now driven by two decades of drought.

Vice Chairman Schaner asked Mr. Cooper if he was aware of any private nurseries using the deep (tall) pot method to grow? Mr. Cooper replied that there were but there are not any now that he is aware of. In the past we did have private contractors that helped us grow the plants.

There were no other questions from the Board.

**Operations & Maintenance Division Fiscal Year 2021 Priorities, Charles Klenner, O&M Division Manager, Greg Browne, Maintenance Branch Manager, Erik Arntz, Work Control Branch Manager, Andres Garcia, O&M Supervisor.**

Mr. Klenner introduced several of his key personnel. Mr. Greg Bowne, O&M Maintenance Supervisor, shared that they have 67 full-time personnel who report to four yards in the Maricopa County area. They perform regular maintenance and repairs to 90 flood control structures to keep them safe and operational. They perform landscape and irrigation maintenance and repairs, welding and fabricating, and concrete installation and repairs within their group as well as address citizen concerns. There are also a group of equipment operators that maintain and repair erosion, move a lot of sediment and maintain our structures. The ecology group mainly does vegetation and rodent mitigation. The instrumentation technicians are responsible for maintaining the ALERT System,

which is a series of weather gages and collection equipment, that are located not only in our county but in the six surrounding counties as well.

Mr. Erik Arntz, Work Control Branch Manager described his areas duties as conducting inspections in order to document and identify any deficiencies or issues with structures. The purpose is to maintain operational capability of the structures as well as maintain compliance with sponsoring agency regulations. The team also conducts the right-of-way inspections for the Engineering department. They review the requests to ensure operational capability as well as maintenance capabilities remain intact after a project is complete as well as going out to inspect the project as it is being built to make sure it is being constructed as per the approved plans from the District. The team also participates in storm event operations with the Engineering department by developing training specifically for the Operations & Maintenance field crews targeting communications from the field crews into the office as well flood fighting techniques. This also includes practical applications such as building sandbag walls and ring dikes. We have a lot of turnover, so we are constantly training on these techniques.

Mr. Arntz went on to discuss the Major Maintenance Program. There are 20 projects planned for Fiscal year 2021. They are focusing on safety improvements and major deferred maintenance. Mr. Arntz also discussed the deputy sheriff program that the District has been participating in since 2010 and was originally started to deter trespassing and off-road activity on District property. Since then we've added additional duties which include providing security for county employees out in the field, participating in the Emergency Management Flood Drills and acting as the Critical Infrastructure Liaison Officer. About 42% of the time the deputy is out in the field patrolling structures.

Andres Garcia, O&M Supervisor discussed vehicle and equipment replacement for Fiscal Year 2021. There's a total of 17 purchases that will be made which include a hydro blaster graffiti remover, a 10-yard dump truck, water trucks, Gannon tractor, Toolcat Utility Work Machine, equipment trailers, portable light tower, and crew vehicles. Mr. Garcia also went over the facilities and maintenance improvements which include remodeling restrooms and locker rooms to include ADA accommodations, remodeling of break areas, safety improvements for stairways and audio video system improvements for various conference rooms.

There were no questions from the Board.

Ms. Scott asked the Board to approve the following action item: Staff requests that the Flood Control Advisory Board endorse and recommend the District's Fiscal Year 2021 Fund 989 (Flood Control Grant Fund) and Fund 991 (Flood Control District Fund) requested budget.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Patel and seconded by Mr. Monger to approve the Fiscal Year 2021 Fund 989 (Flood Control Grant Fund) and Fund 991 (Flood Control District Fund) requested budget. The motion carried unanimously, and the budget was approved.

**6) ACTION ITEM – INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT (IGA) WITH THE COUNTY FOR SUPPORT SERVICES**

Presentation by Karen Scott, Finance and Contracts Division Manager

ACTION: Endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors of the Flood Control District of Maricopa County approves IGA FCD 2020A011 between the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) and Maricopa County (County) for support services.

The partnership between the District and the County started in the 1960's with a resolution. The original Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) was enacted in 1999 and is expiring in June 2020. The County provides various services to the District so that we don't duplicate effort: The Treasurer, the Assessor, the Board of Directors, Finance and Procurement, Risk Management. These are all things that are billed through the central cost allocation. The Telecommunications and Information Technology is billed back through an internal service fund. The District has some things that we do for the County that are included in the IGA such as providing equipment if the County needs the equipment, the small engine mechanic in O&M can repair small engines for other agencies, we work with Emergency Management to provide them the expertise that they need during emergency events related to flooding, the District trains others about flood specialties like the FLO-2D and we also allow other departments to use contracts we have in place. The relationship between the District and the County is mutually beneficial.

The Board had no questions for Ms. Scott.

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Schaner and seconded by Mr. Patel to approve the IGA FCD 2020A011 between the Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) and Maricopa County (County) for support services. The motion carried unanimously, and the IGA was approved.

**7) INFORMATION ITEM – PROJECT UPDATE – OAK STREET BASIN AND STORM DRAIN PROJECT**

Presentation by Frank Hakari, P.E., Project Manager

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

Mr. Hakari discussed the needs and benefits of the Oak Street Basin and Storm Drain Project. It is a drainage element for the Spook Hill Drainage Area Master Plan and

involves the construction of a basin at Oak Street and Hawes Road as well as storm drains along Oak Street and north and south along Hawes Road. The project will provide 100-year protection to residents in Unincorporated Maricopa County as well as City of Mesa residents.

The project is located in northeast Mesa just north of McDowell Road. Design plans and specifications (P&S) were completed in 2012 but the project was not moved to construction due to lack of funds from the City of Mesa. The P&S are being reviewed and updated. Any utility conflict issues and ROW issues to be reviewed and resolved. The P&S should be ready to advertise for construction in May 2020 as a low bid project and we anticipate construction to start in the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2021.

In 2008, just over nine acres was acquired at the northeast corner of Oak Street and Hawes Road for the detention basin.

There were no questions from the Board.

**8) INFORMATION ITEM – CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) EVALUATION UPATE**

Presentation by Michael Fulton, Director

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

Mr. Fulton stated that last year we evaluated the Small Project Assistance Program (SPAP) and we are doing the same thing with our Capital Improvement Program. The District surveyed 28 communities (cities and towns) and six agencies (DOT, Indian Communities) and received 19 responses. There were five questions on the survey. One was, “Has your community submitted a project for funding under the District CIP?” There were 16 responses of “yes” and three that answered “no”. This was followed up by the question, “If not, why not?” The answers included that the cost share requirement was difficult/impossible to meet and city revenue sources for drainage/flooding needs were absent or unpredictable. Mr. Fulton stated that there is a cost share requirement of 50/50 but there are examples of where the District has moved off this number.

Mr. Fulton then went on to the next survey question, “If you could modify the CIP program or its Prioritization Criteria to better meet the needs of your community, what would you do?” Several answers regarding cost share included that the District should bear a major portion of the cost of certain projects, variations from 50/50 should be possible, increase cost share to 75% District, 25% municipality, cost share credit in exchange for partner O/M commitment, and partner cost share via installment payments – the District funds up front, city reimburses later. Some answers were directed towards project eligibility. Answers included that roadway/bridge/culvert of wash dip crossings

should be eligible, why not fund feasibility studies and designs and fund projects that don't meet 100-year protection.

Mr. Fulton stated that the theme was similar to what we saw with SPAP. If the District was able to increase our share, we would probably see more projects. Mr. Fulton stated that the District has some education to do with cities/towns on what eligible projects are. Mr. Fulton asked that if anyone had any other ideas to share to please do so.

There were no questions from the Board.

**9) COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR**

Presented by Michael Fulton, Director

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

Mr. Fulton thanked all the staff for their updates/presentations today. The intent of the presentations were to share to capital budget as well as the operating budget. There is a lot of important things that happen in the operating budget that's of value to the community in terms of studies, the ALERT, etc. It is important to see that detail.

**10) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Presented by Michael Fulton, Director

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

At the December 11, 2019, the Board approved Bids and Awards for Haquahala FRS Erosion Hazard Reduction Project in which this construction contract will result in mulch slope protection and erosion hazard reduction for Harquahala FRS, thereby reducing dam safety risk reducing the cost of maintenance in the long term.

At this same meeting the Board also approved the On-call Services Contract for Wittmann Area Drainage master Study Plan Update. The Wittman ADMS/P Update will update and refine the findings of the original Wittmann ADMSU completed in 2005 and the Wittmann ADMPU completed in 2009. The purpose of the Wittmann ADMS/P Update is to identify flooding problems due to recent land use changes within the watershed using updated 2-foot contour mapping.

Mr. Fulton also mentioned the Resolution for Repairs and Improvements to the Channels of Sun City and Sun City West that was also approved by the Board at the December 11, 2019 meeting.

**11) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**

There were no comments by members of the public.

Chairman Justice stated that the meeting was adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.