



**Contra  
Costa  
County**

To: Contra Costa County Flood Control District Board of Supervisors

From: Julia R. Bueren, Public Works Director/Chief Engineer

Date: February 10, 2015

Subject: Report on 2014 Status of Flood Protection Infrastructure, Countywide. (100% Flood Control District Funds)  
Project No. 7505-6F8135

### **RECOMMENDATION(S):**

ACCEPT the attached report from the Contra Costa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (Flood Control District) on the 2014 Status of Flood Protection Infrastructure and;

DIRECT the Chief Engineer, Flood Control District, or designee, to implement the Action Plans in the report, with a follow-up report to this Board annually and;

REFER the Flood Control District's efforts to develop sustainable funding for flood protection to the Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC).

### **FISCAL IMPACT:**

Preparation of this report cost \$25,000, which was funded by Flood Control District Funds. Implementation of the recommended action plans and assessment studies over the next fourteen years will cost approximately \$9,000,000 to be funded by Flood Control District and Flood Control Zone Funds, with efforts to offset expenses with grant funds.

☒ APPROVE

☐ OTHER

☒ RECOMMENDATION OF CNTY ADMINISTRATOR

☐ RECOMMENDATION OF BOARD COMMITTEE

Action of Board On: **02/10/2015** ☒ APPROVED AS RECOMMENDED ☐ OTHER

Clerks Notes:

#### **VOTE OF SUPERVISORS**

AYE: John Gioia, District I Supervisor  
Mary N. Piepho, District III Supervisor  
Karen Mitchoff, District IV Supervisor  
Federal D. Glover, District V Supervisor

ABSENT: Candace Andersen, District II Supervisor

I hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of an action taken and entered on the minutes of the Board of Supervisors on the date shown.

ATTESTED: February 10, 2015

David Twa, County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

By: Stacey M. Boyd, Deputy

Contact: Tim Jensen (925)  
313-2390

## BACKGROUND:

On November 5, 2013, the Flood Control District presented to the Board its first annual report on flood protection infrastructure in order to understand its history, condition, and future needs. The attached report entitled “2014 Status of Flood Protection Infrastructure” provides information regarding the Flood Control District’s accomplishments since the 2013 Annual Report and recommends pursuing sustainable funding for flood protection.

In summary, our community outreach events were successful, our capital programs made progress, and our studies of aging infrastructure and unsustainable service levels continued to highlight some major concerns, primarily regarding sustainability.

A more detailed look at the Flood Control District’s financial picture was performed this past year. Maintenance funding for regional Flood Control District facilities comes primarily from a percentage of the 1% ad valorem property tax. Maintenance funding for community drainage facilities comes from annual assessments from each stormwater utility area, formed in 1993. Prior to that time, the County’s community drainage maintenance was paid for out of County General Funds. Road system drainage maintenance is funded by a portion of the local share of gas tax. Each city funds their own community drainage systems, typically with their stormwater utility fees.

We found that the Flood Control District regional flood protection facilities and unincorporated community drainage facilities funding is inadequate. Historical expenditures have been capped due to limited revenue, resulting in service levels being at the bare minimum. After several years of this practice, the outcome has been poor facility conditions and an increasing backlog of deferred maintenance. The current funding level for our regional and community drainage maintenance is about \$5 million per year, which is about 0.4% of our infrastructure value. To meet the industry standard for sustainable maintenance of 2% of infrastructure value, the funding need is about \$24 million per year.

When regional planning, capital improvement, and capital replacement needs are added to the maintenance need, the annual funding shortfall is approximately \$78 million, as compared to the current revenue of about \$8.9 million. We are now including capital replacement needs in our financial planning, because in 2029, the first regional flood protection facility reaches its expected service life of 75 years and will need replacement or major rehabilitation soon thereafter.

Historically, Flood Control District regional flood protection has not needed County General Fund support. Inadequate funding has been managed by reduced service delivery, deferred maintenance, deferred capital improvements, and loans from the Flood Control District. This is not sustainable as the Flood Control District fund is projected to be depleted in less than 10 years. Once that occurs, there is no backstop source of revenue other than County General Funds. Due to increases in community drainage maintenance costs, the need for County General Funds (provided prior to 1993) has

returned.

Most flood protection, drainage, and stormwater agencies statewide suffer from inadequate funding. Proposition 13 froze tax rates at low levels, and Proposition 218 made it difficult to increase revenue. The County has been working with the California State Association of Counties and the County Engineers Association of California on a Statewide Stormwater Funding Initiative to exempt stormwater agencies from Proposition 218 voter requirements, similar to the exemption that water and wastewater utility districts have. Support is building across the state, and legislation will be introduced in early 2015 to initiate this funding measure. We recommend that the County continue to support the legislative effort to get this funding measure into place.

The Flood Control District will continue implementation of the action plans outlined in the 2013 Annual Report. The key action for the next few years will be to focus on developing sustainable funding for regional flood protection and community drainage.

Staff recommends that the Board accept the attached 2014 Status of Flood Protection Infrastructure Report from the Flood Control District, direct the Chief Engineer to continue with the Action Plans recommended in the Report, with a follow-up report to this Board annually, as well as refer the effort to develop sustainable funding for regional flood protection and community drainage to the TWIC.

#### CONSEQUENCE OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

The County's flood protection and community drainage infrastructure funding issues will not be adequately addressed, which will lead to lower levels of flood protection for our communities in the future.

#### CHILDREN'S IMPACT STATEMENT:

Not directly applicable.

#### ATTACHMENTS

2014 Status Report