



Flood Control District of Maricopa County

Flood Control Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes for January 28, 2015

Board Members Present: Chairman, DeWayne Justice; Melvin Martin, Vice Chairman; Hemant Patel, Secretary; Gregg Monger, Hasan Mushtaq for Ray Dovalina; Bob Larchick, Ex Officio

Board Members Absent: Ray Dovalina

Staff Members Present: William Wiley; Wayne Peck, General Counsel; Ken Proksa; Mike Duncan, Gary Wesch, Patrick Schafer; Mike Jones, Analia Summers, Anna Medina; and Ed Raleigh.

Guests Present: Dave Jensen, Olsson Associates; Raj Shaff, RPA; Elliot Silverston, AECOM; Teri George, Rainbow; Elaine Mercado, City of Scottsdale; Todd Williams, Michael Basket.

1) **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Justice called the meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board (FCAB) to order at 2:04 p.m. on Wednesday, January 28, 2015.

2) **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

3) **APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2014**

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

4) **GRANITE REEF IGA WITH SCOTTSDALE**

Presented by Mike Duncan, Project Manager

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING ACTION: Endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors of the Flood Control District of Maricopa County approve IGA FCD2014A015, or the Granite Reef Watershed Drainage Improvements Project.

Mr. Duncan identified the project location in southeast Scottsdale with the east boundary at the 101 Freeway and the south boundary at the Salt River. A ridge line at Hayden separates the watershed from the Indian Bend Wash watershed. The floodplain extends from Thomas to a quarter mile north of McKellips Road, with approximately 700 homes in the floodplain. In 2010, the related resolution was endorsed by FCAB in April of 2010 and adopted by the Board of Directors in July of 2010. At that time, it was expected to cost \$40 million, which included a large underground storm drain or box culvert along Pima Road. Scottsdale has completed an assessment, resulting in a more affordable project with a total project cost of \$10 to \$15 million.

Existing features include storm drains that carry flows to Indian Bend Wash at four locations as well as a storm drain under various roads at the floodplain. The city's consultant determined that the addition of inlets and laterals would allow these to be filled, taking advantage of that capacity to carry flows to Indian Bend Wash. Two detention basins will also be added. The City of Scottsdale will complete a separate IGA with the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community to handle the outflow at the Salt River.

The estimated cost includes \$400,000 for design of the storm drain improvements, \$3 million for the two detention basin sites and \$100,000 for the conceptual design for the outfall. The total cost is approximately \$3.5 million. The cost share will be 50/50.

Board Member Martin asked whether this does away with the previously passed IGA. Mr. Duncan replied that the 2010 resolution granted the right to enter into an IGA, but that IGA never came together with the components of the project, primarily because of the cost.

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

5) WATSON DRAIN DESIGN IGA WITH BUCKEYE

Presented by Gary Wesch, P.E., Project Manager

STAFF RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING ACTION: Endorse and recommend that the Board of Directors of the Flood Control District of Maricopa County approve IGA FCD2013A004 for the Watson Drainage System Outfall Final Design.

Mr. Wesch reviewed that in 2009 the District completed the Buckeye Area Drainage Master Plan (ADMP). In 2010, the City of Buckeye requested prioritization in the District's capital improvement plan, which was endorsed by the FCD. In 2011, 2011R006 was adopted by the Board of Directors and in 2012, an IGA for the pre-design was approved between the District and the City of Buckeye. By March 2014, the pre-design level was completed, along with 50 percent level set of plans. The project location is in eastern Buckeye, centered along Watson Road. When completed, it will drain a 22-square mile drainage area bounded on the north by Interstate 10, on the east by Dean Road, on the west, west of Miller Road. It drains from north to south down to the Gila River. Existing floodplains are delineated along the Roosevelt Canal and the Buckeye Canal. Currently the flows sheet across the land and pile up behind the canals, and are then distributed through breakouts on the south bank.

The components of the drainage system include five detention basins with over 10 miles of culverts and channels with design flows from 50 to 1,100 CFS. The system will cross a corridor that includes the Union Pacific Railroad, the Buckeye Canal, the APS Palo Verde pipeline, a Kinder Morgan petroleum pipeline as well as numerous communication fiber optic facilities. The subject of this IGA is the outfall portion of the system.

The ADMP originally proposed several crossings of the corridor with the canals and the railroad. In the pre-design, the design was evaluated and reduced to one consolidated crossing. It also developed alternatives for the outlet to the Gila River.

The estimated cost of the entire Watson system is estimated to total \$70 million. This includes \$40 million of construction costs, \$6 million for various utility, irrigation, canal relocation and railroad crossing costs and \$24 million in right-of-way. Because it is designed to be out ahead of future development, some portions of the project will be implemented by future development, where the system components lie within subdivisions and commercial industrial development. The developers will work with Buckeye to complete final design components.

The outfall portion includes \$15 million of the construction cost, plus design costs. It provides a collector for all upstream reaches as well as providing crossings of the corridor with the railroad crossing, Buckeye canal, and also builds the outlet to the Gila River. The design for the IGA is the next step in the implementation of the project. Staff anticipates bringing to the Advisory Board future agreements for construction, right-of-way acquisition, utility relocations and possibly an IGA that could handle Gila River outfall in coordination with sand and gravel operations property owners and the Buckeye Water Conservation and Drainage District as well as Arizona Game and Fish.

Also included would be potential participation in the acquisition and construction of basin sites upstream. The IGA proposes a 50/50 cost share of the outfall final design cost. The estimated cost is \$1.5 million. Buckeye would ultimately be responsible for operation and maintenance of the system, using homeowner's associations for maintenance for those components that travel through subdivisions. The District will be the lead on the final design and would review future development plans to ensure that the components of the system have no impact on function.

Board Member Patel referred to the outfall portion in the cost estimate and asked whether there were right-of-way costs. Mr. Wesch confirmed that construction costs are approximately \$15 million and the right-of-way costs total \$5.5 million, if all right-of-ways had to be purchased. Mr. Patel asked for additional clarification. In some areas, the proposed alignments travel through areas of future development. From the Gila River north to Monroe, the system is superimposed on the existing Watson Drain, which is within an easement that Buckeye Water Conservation and Drainage District owns. Therefore, there may be an agreement for them to take over this footprint. Right-of-way costs are based on the anticipated acquirement needs. However, staff is seeking reduced costs wherever possible.

Board Member Ward asked about the status of Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) involvement. Mr. Wesch stated that there have been several meetings with UPRR regarding the project. Some reviews by UPRR have been completed on design up through the 15 percent design. The process will continue during final design. Staff is in the process of completing the 303 channelization project, which crossed the same corridor to the east, in the Cotton Lane area.

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

6) CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PRIORTIZATION PROCEDURE MODIFICAITONS

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

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

Mr. Schaefer stated that District staff, at the request of the Board of Directors, has modified the CIP prioritization procedure, in order to incorporate certain additions into the criteria as well as the process itself.

Resolution 2010R008 directed the use of the program, which allows staff to evaluate projects, score them and eventually populate the CIP program. Prioritization criteria was developed in the past to promote a balanced approach to evaluating projects submitted by project partners. Staff recently completed a lengthy strategic planning process with the Board of Directors and the Office of Management and Budget. The Board stressed several important criteria and recommended several modifications.

Nine criteria used by the evaluation committee for evaluating projects, of which six are currently being modified. The first is funding commitment and agency priority. The available points have increased from 10 to 12. The Board would like staff to emphasize readiness and commitment by the project and its project partner. There are two scoring ranges included. The evaluation committee scores projects based on the information provided in the letter of intent. The range of points is being redistributed currently. For the criteria on flooding threat, the point distribution was not changed and remains at a total of 15 points. However, as the evaluation team reviews projects, fewer points could be earned for flood hazards issues caused by inadequate oversight by the requesting agency.

Board Member Patel asked for a more detailed explanation. Mr. Schaefer stated that the Board's main concern was that as development goes in, that the project partners, cities and towns ensure that development does capture storm water and convey it through the property. The Board also addressed delineations, stating that there may be known flood hazards in an area that has not yet been delineated. The evaluation committee would take this into consideration and issue their scores appropriately.

Mr. Schaefer then addressed ancillary benefits, noting that the total points have increased from 10 to 12. This is in order to acknowledge potential impacts on future development. In addition to development impacts, additional points could be earned if the project brings water conservation opportunities.

For the criteria related to level of partner participation, the points have increased from 10 to 12. It is a goal to meet a 50/50 cost share for every project with project partners. The greater the cost share participation, the more points given. The Board also advised that if the project has an economic development component, the submitting agency and development beneficiary are expected to contribute a higher level of cost share participation.

Total points for operation and maintenance costs to the District criteria has been decreased from seven to six, since greater emphasis has been given to other criteria.

The final change in criteria was in the category of total project cost, which has been removed completely. It had been previously assigned a point value of five.

Staff is currently working on modifying resolution and expect to take the proposal to the Board to be adopted in March or April. The modified procedure will go into effect in the Fiscal Year 2017 prioritization procedure, which begins on May 8th. Cities, towns and agencies will be notified shortly of the modifications.

Board Member Patel asked about the requirement for the partner to include the project in their CIP. He asked whether the partner agency would be allowed to assume that the District would be participating. Mr. Schaefer explained that he has advised the partner entities to include this description in their letters of intent.

Board Member Martin commented that when a city wants to perform the maintenance on a project, the scoring is higher. Mr. Schaefer explained that entities want to obtain as many points as possible. If a project will include no maintenance responsibility on the part of the District, the project will earn the highest points available. Board Member Martin agreed that a project should receive greater points if the partner entity will be responsible for maintenance.

Board Member Monger asked for the rationale behind removing the total project cost criteria. Mr. Schaefer replied that the District strives to complete regional projects, which tend to be very expensive in nature. Lower cost range projects are no longer common. He added that the total project cost is embedded within all the other existing criteria.

7) COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER

Presented by William Wiley, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager

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

Mr. Wiley stated that there have been substantial discussions with the Board of Directors, which have been occurring since September. These discussions have included strategic planning and funding. He reviewed that the revenue rate has been lowered over the past several years and that opportunities for other revenues have dropped. The Board has been actively involved in attempting to be of assistance. The strategic planning process is complete and staff is currently in the budgeting process with the Board of Directors. It is hoped that by August, the Board of Directors will adopt a budget that may provide some relief.

Chairman Justice asked about projects that involve the county and how they rank in there when there is no additional funding available. Mr. Wiley replied that there will remain the opportunity for these projects to be 100 percent funded. However, if there is a partner, the partner will be expected to bring a 50 percent funding contribution. He added that there will also be an opportunity for hardship cases, in which staff can approach the Board of Directors with a recommendation of the District and the Advisory Board to move forward with a less than 50 percent cost share.

Mr. Wiley announced that Steve Gallardo was sworn in on the 13th as the new supervisor in District Five. Mr. Gallardo has visited the District offices, was given a tour and provided relevant information. There is also a new Chairman of the Board, Steve Chucuri.

He next discussed the ad hoc committee, which was formed to come up with ways to improve District operations. Seventeen items were identified and approximately 14 to 15 have been completed. One of the items in progress is the development of a new website. Another item was for the District to work with sand and gravel permitting. Therefore, a task force was formed to address sand and gravel floodplain use permitting. Three meetings have been held thus far. The results will be brought to the Advisory Board when completed.

He next discussed a recent meeting on the 22nd to address El Rio, the Lower Gila. A proposed delineation of the Lower Gila was recently completed. Due to Salt Cedar, there is an additional seven square miles and 200 homes that were not originally in the floodplain but now are in the floodplain. The affected home owners have questions about property value and flood insurance requirements. The meeting addressed the District's proposed actions to solve the issue. The District has hired a contractor to assist in evaluating alternatives. The results will be presented at the end of March, beginning of April. He added that there is an El Rio steering committee with members from Avondale, Goodyear, Buckeye and Maricopa County, who are working on this on a larger scale.

Chairman Justice asked whether the Buckeye districts were participating. Mr. Wiley replied that representatives are attending the meetings.

Mr. Wiley addressed the storms from the summer of 2014. He stated that debris is still being cleared from the storms. Contracts with landfills have been extended to handle the debris.

He noted that the task force has identified areas for improvement of operations. As result, staff has developed process improvement events. The first involves right-of-way use permitting and will begin next week. The results will be presented to the Advisory Board. Staff will also be working on its floodplain use permit process the following month.

The 2014 annual report is nearly complete and will be presented in February.

8) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Presented by William Wiley, P.E., Chief Engineer and General Manager

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

There were no recent actions by the Board.

9) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

There were no comments from the public.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m