Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Procedure

For Fiscal Year 2018

Flood Control District of Maricopa County, 2801 West Durango Street, Phoenix, Arizona 85009 (602) 506-1501

Capital Improvement Program Prioritization Procedure

Purpose of the Procedure

In accordance with Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) Resolution 2010R008, the District evaluates and prioritizes potential Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects through its annual CIP Prioritization Procedure.

As its name implies, this procedure applies only to the allocation of CIP resources: funding for final design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of flood control capital projects. The District continues to seek input from the municipalities of Maricopa County regarding planning study priorities; however, requests for District planning or floodplain delineation funding support should be communicated by correspondence independent of this CIP Prioritization Procedure, preferably in sequence with the CIP Prioritization Procedure schedule. District staff listed under the "Points of Contact" section of this document will coordinate these requests.

Additionally, the recommendation of a potential CIP project through the CIP Prioritization Procedure does not guarantee District funding; funding follows the approval of pertinent resolutions and inter-agency agreements and is at the discretion of the District's Board of Directors. District staff proposes its Five-Year CIP to its Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) in February of each year, incorporating projects recommended through this prioritization process where feasible. The District's Planning Branch coordinates MOUs and agreements with cooperating agencies for completing pre-design studies and serves as point of contact for project status prior to inclusion in the CIP.

Procedural Summary

The CIP Prioritization Procedure involves seven steps:

- Project submittal by requesting agencies;
- Submittal review and evaluation for recommendation by the District's Prioritization Evaluation Committee (PEC);
- Recommendation by the District's Chief Engineer and General Manager;
- Recommendation by the FCAB Program and Budget Committee;
- Recommendation approval by the FCAB; and,
- Annual budgeting by the District, advancing projects based on project merit, with District funding prioritized for partner agencies providing the highest cost share.

The recommendation of a project through the CIP Prioritization Procedure precedes final project approval by the District's Board of Directors (in the form of a Resolution); however, this final approval is not inevitable. Moreover, a recommendation under this procedure does not, at any level, constitute agreement to cost share in a proposed project. Once a recommended project is fundamentally ready to move forward, intergovernmental agreements are still subject to approval by the District's Board of Directors and project partners' governing boards.

Project Submittal Process

The District sends requests for project submittals to appropriate agencies on the second Friday of each May and concurrently publishes the applicable CIP Prioritization Procedure (this document).

Submittals may be made electronically by means of email or CD, including a signed letter of intent (LOI) (per the template contained within this instruction). Project submittals should clearly address the project evaluation criteria listed herein and re-established annually under this procedure. Maps and similar graphic aids demonstrating prospective project elements are recommended. Additionally, where local (non-District) master plans are referenced, copies of those master plans should be included for reference by District staff. Where discrepancies exist between a LOI and the supporting submittal, the information contained within the LOI is considered overriding. The LOI is not a legally binding document, but it assists in establishing a common starting point for negotiating future project MOUs and IGAs.

In addition to new projects, the District requests agencies resubmit projects that were previously reviewed but have experienced notable changes since their initial submittal. This may include, for example, significant cost changes, changes in project substance following a CAR, changes in project priority to the submitting agency or changes in area benefited due to development.

Previously submitted projects that have *not* experienced a material change should not be resubmitted.

Project submittals must be received no later than the third Friday in July.

Recommendation Reversals

Previously-recommended projects that are not maturing into completed capital projects in a timely manner may revert to a "not recommended" status. In conjunction with the District's annual May notice of intent mailing, the Chief Engineer and General Manager will formally notify sponsor agencies of previously-recommended projects being considered for this action. This notification is intended to initiate a dialog between the District's and partner agencies' staffs to ensure viable projects do not revert in status. After gathering agencies' input, District staff will present recommendations to the FCAB each October for informational purposes, and each December for approval.

Sponsor agencies are encouraged to resubmit such projects after addressing the District's identified concerns. Resubmitted project are re-scored under the most recently revised scoring criteria.

Prioritization Criteria

Established prioritization criteria allow District staff to uniformly evaluate District-generated and agency-requested CIP projects.

Project submittals that do not incorporate LOIs per the District's template are disqualified from consideration. Each request that meets the District's minimum administrative standards will be evaluated by District staff and scored. Through the weighted criteria listed below, a maximum total of 100 points per project is possible. If insufficient data is provided for a particular criterion, no points will be awarded in that category. No set point threshold exists for determining the PEC's recommendation decisions; the threshold is established following evaluation of a given year's submittals.

Evaluation criteria, maximum point value and associated submittal requirements are listed below:

0. Project Description (0 Points)

A summary of the proposed project, including a location map and information concerning project goals, problems to be addressed, anticipated project features, and relationships to any other planned, ongoing or completed infrastructure projects.

1. Funding Commitment and Agency Priority (12 Points)

Rank in priority (from first to last) among the agency's current fiscal year submittals. A number of integrated projects required to improve a particular watershed may be consolidated and classified as a single, phased project.

Demonstration of financial commitment and timing to the project. The submittal should answer some or all of these questions:

- Is the agency ready to fund and implement the project and enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement?

- Is the project a part of or consistent with an articulated, short or long-range CIP program or departmental strategic plan? If so, the component of the plan indicating the project should be included in the submittal.

- Does the project have a current schedule of funding, implementation, including anticipated milestones and deliverables?

Project partners are encouraged to re-confirm their standing interest in projects that have been previously recommended by the prioritization process but have not yet entered formal MOU or IGA processes. This correspondence is most appropriately submitted, in letter form, in conjunction with the agency's new-year prioritization process submittal.

2. Flood Control / Drainage Master Plan Element (8 Points)

Relationship to existing or ongoing flood control, storm-water management or drainage master plans. Points will be awarded on the basis of the project's relative significance or priority within the overall plan. If the associated master plan was formally adopted (e.g., through council action) by the submitting agency, this should be indicated on the LOI for the project submittal. <u>If the associated master plan was completed by an agency other than the District, then a copy of the plan, or an executive summary, must be provided with the project submittal to receive points in this category</u>.

3. Flooding Threat (15 Points)

Existing threats to property (excluding roadways) that will be mitigated by the proposed project. The submittal should answer some or all of these questions:

- Fewer points will be awarded to those projects that are intended to resolve flooding threat issues caused by inadequate regulation by the requesting agency.

- Is the project intended to address an existing flooding hazard?

- Has documented flooding of structures occurred that would be prevented or lessened in the future by the project? If so, on how many occasions has documented flooding occurred? What was the extent of the damage caused? If citizen flooding complaints are available, copies should be included with the project submittal.

- Will the project mitigate flooding hazards in a delineated floodway/floodplain? If so, was the floodway/floodplain delineated before or after development in the affected area?

- What are the peak discharges and frequency of flooding events?

- What are the depth, velocity and duration of storm-water flow?

- What are the characteristics of the contributing watershed (size, slope, land use, etc.)?

- Does an outfall exist? If so, is it undersized, at full capacity, or capable of handling additional flows?

4. Level of Protection (10 Points)

Flood return frequency protection in comparison to protection under existing conditions. Preference is given to projects offering higher flood return frequency (10-year to 100-year) protection. When applicable, information regarding both the anticipated design level of protection and the effective level of protection, such as that provided by storm drains combined with curb and gutter roadways, should be provided.

5. Area Protected (25 Points)

Characteristics of the geographic area protected by the proposed project. The submittal should answer these questions:

- What are the numbers and estimated values of benefitted residential, commercial and industrial buildings that are located in delineated floodways or 100-year floodplains?

- What are the numbers and estimated values of benefitted residential, commercial and industrial buildings that are not located in delineated floodplains?

- What is the number of benefitted public buildings (schools, libraries, churches, etc.)?

- What amount of infrastructure (roads, drainage/flood control or wastewater facilities, etc.) would benefit or be enhanced (e.g., storm drain capacity increase from 2-10 years.)?

- What is the amount of benefitted cultivated acreage?

- What is the acreage of developed, agricultural and undeveloped land to be removed from the 100-year floodplain?

- What population would directly and indirectly benefit from the project?

- What is the age of area development, and how long has the flooding problem existed?

- Would a floodway/floodplain be reduced and/or the community's floodplain rating be improved through project completion?

6. Ancillary Benefits (12 Points)

Non-flood control benefits of the submitted project. Benefits may include:

- Community Economic Impacts (Earn 2 additional points to the points that may be earned by other identified ancillary benefits as described below, if one of the following is applicable; Does the project provide a benefit needed for economic development? Will the project enhance economic diversification, business expansion and economic growth? Is the project consistent with the agency's development general plan?);

- Water quality implications (e.g., will storm-water be managed through basins or wetlands prior to its discharge to the receiving waters?);

- Water conservation/recharge opportunities (e.g., will the project work to sustain or increase ground water levels and improve aquifer quality? Will the project promote the efficient reuse of storm water?);

- Vegetation and wildlife habitat implications (e.g., will an existing wildlife corridor be maintained/enhanced, or will new habitat areas be created through the provision of dedicated drainage/open space areas?);

- Environmentally sensitive areas (e.g., designated wildlife areas or riparian corridors) to be protected;

- Multiple-use features, benefits and contributions such as ground water enhancement (either through groundwater percolation or direct recharge), support for alternative forms of transportation such as trails and bike paths, support for recreation opportunities, restoration of riparian and other habitats, and other open space uses and activities;

- Contributions to the visual quality of the environment through preservation or enhancement of the natural character of the landscapes of Maricopa County and/or enhancement of local community character;

- Improvement of quality of life indicators such as preservation or enhancement of cultural and historic resources, and opportunities for conservation education within the community;

- Low impact development (LID) (e.g., will the project include low impact development methods or structures?

- Qualification for grant funding such as transportation enhancement funding, water protection funding or wildlife habitat improvement funding.

7. Level of Partner Participation (12 Points)

Proposed cost-share contribution by the submitting agency or other non-District agencies. The District typically requires a fifty-percent cost share contribution from its partners. <u>Preference is given to projects with maximum external agency participation.</u> If the project has an economic development component, the agency and the development beneficiary is expected to contribute a higher level of cost share participation, with the District contributing the least cost share among the project partners and/or beneficiaries. If a future bond election is identified as a source of funding, this should be reported in the submittal. Forms of cost-share participation may include:

- Direct agency funding (e.g., bonds, or property/sales tax revenues);

- Ad-valorem tax contributions to the District;

- Non-cash contributions (e.g., rights of way);

- Previously-acquired land required for the project (not to exceed 30% of an agency's cost share credit); and

- Third-party funding sources (e.g., federal funds or private contributions).

8. Operations and Maintenance Costs to the District (6 Points)

Total operations and maintenance costs *to be borne by the District*. Maximum ratings are assigned to requests with minimal operations and maintenance costs to be borne by the District.

Note: The information provided in criteria 7-9 above will be used to evaluate and rank the requested projects and will be considered for negotiation of project partnering agreements. However, specific partner responsibilities and cost-sharing amounts will be determined during the IGA negotiation process with District staff on a project-by-project basis.

Points of Contact

Planning and Project Management Division Manager: Don Rerick, P.E., 602-506-4878

For questions concerning the Prioritization Procedure and capital project submittals:
Capital Improvement Program Supervisor: Kim Belt, CPM, 602-506-3639
Prioritization Evaluation Committee Chairman: Scott Vogel, P.E., 602-506-4771

For questions concerning flood control studies, planning or floodplain delineation requests:
Planning Branch Manager: Doug Williams, P.E., 602-506-8743
Floodplain Delineations Branch Manager: Catherine Regester, P.E., 602-506-4001

Fiscal Year 2018 Prioritization Procedure Schedule

May 13, 2016	Agency Notices Mailed
July 15, 2016	Agency Proposals Submittal Deadline
August, 2016	Evaluation Committee Review and Evaluation
August, 2016	Evaluation Committee Recommendations to PPM Division Manager and Chief Engineer
September, 2016	Staff Recommendations Forwarded to Agencies
September, 2016	FCAB Program Budget Committee Review
October 26, 2016	Staff Recommendations Presented to the FCAB for Information
December 7, 2016	Final Staff Recommendations Presented to the FCAB for Action
December, 2016	Prioritization Procedure Results Published
February, 2017	Proposed FY 2018 - 2022 CIP Presented to FCAB for Endorsement
March, 2017	Proposed FY 2018 - 2022 CIP Forwarded to County Management & Budget

Prioritization Procedure Process Flowchart

Prioritization Procedure Distribution List

Name	Position	Agency
Mr. Alan Thomas	Environmental Program Mgr, Luke AFB	Department of the Air Force
Ms. Chaun Hill	Asst. State Engineer, Urban Project Mgt.	Arizona Department of Transportation
Mr. David Janover	City Engineer	City of Avondale
Mr. Scott Zipprich	City Engineer	City of Buckeye
Mr. W. T. Gladden	President	Buckeye Water Cons. and Drainage District
Mr. Gary Neiss	Town Administrator	Town of Carefree
Mr. Dave Peterson	Town Engineer	Town of Cave Creek
Mr. R.J. Zeder	Transportation & Development Director	City of Chandler
Ms. Jorge Gastelum	City Engineer	City of El Mirage
Ms. Bernadine Burnette	President	Fort McDowell Indian Community
Mr. Randy Harrel	Town Engineer	Town of Fountain Hills
Mr. Michael Celaya	Town Manager	Town of Gila Bend
Ms. Kimberly Antone	Director of Land and Water Resources	Gila River Indian Community
Mr. Tom Condit	Development Engineer	Town of Gilbert
Mr. David Beard	Engineering Director	City of Glendale
Mr. David Ramirez	Engineer	City of Goodyear
Ms. Rose Mary Arellano	Interim Town Manager	Town of Guadalupe
Mr. Darryl Crossman	City Manager	City of Litchfield Park
Mr. Jennifer Toth	Director	Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Mr. Chuck Williams	Capital Improvement Program Manager	Maricopa County Department of Transportation
Mr. Lance Webb	Supervising Engineer	City of Mesa
Mr. James Shano	Town Engineer	Town of Paradise Valley
Mr. Andrew Granger	Engineering Director	City of Peoria
Mr. Bill Mattingly	Public Works Director	City of Peoria
Mr. Hasan Mushtaq	Floodplain Manager	City of Phoenix
Mr. Troy White	CIP/Environmental Division Manager	Town of Queen Creek
Mr. Michael Leonard	General Manager	Roosevelt Water Conservation District
Mr. Bob Larchick	Manager, Water Engineering	Salt River Project
Mr. Brian Meyers	Community Manager	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community
Mr. Ashley Couch	Stormwater Management Director	City of Scottsdale
Mr. Karl Zook	Director of City Engineering	City of Surprise
Mr. Andy Goh	City Engineer	City of Tempe
Mr. Reyes Medrano Jr.	City Manager	City of Tolleson
Mr. Joshua H. Wright	Town Manager	Town of Wickenburg
Mr. Douglas Nelson	Attorney	Woolsey Flood Protection District
Mr. Marty Mosbrucker	Public Works Manager	Town of Youngtown