

MINUTES

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

April 21st, 2015
10:00 A.M.

REGIONAL GOVERNMENT CENTER
101 CIVIC WAY, LAUGHLIN, NEVADA

Members Present: Public Works

Fred Doten
Shawn Escarzaga
Jim Bodley
Steve Collins
Jim DeWoody
Marty Knauss
John Pantages

Other Attendees:

Barbara Bodley, Laughlin Citizen
Julie Fairman, Laughlin Times
Steve Parrish, Flood Control District

1. CALL TO ORDER

- A. **Fred Doten** called the meeting to order 10:00 AM as a quorum was present
- B. The meeting was conducted in conformance with the Nevada Open Meeting Law.
- C. Agenda items were not taken out of order.
- D. The Public Works Committee did not combine two or more agenda items for consideration.
- E. The Public Works Committee did not remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item at any time.

2. ORGANIZATIONAL ITEMS

- A. **Approval of the April 21, 2015 Agenda.**
Steve Collins moved and **Jim Bodley** seconded the approval of the agenda. Motion carried on a vote of 7 to 0.
- B. **Approval of the Minutes of the March 17, 2015 Meeting Minutes**
Fred Doten noted that **Steve Collins** brought to his attention that one page 2 (4A, 5th line) that **Jim DeWoody's** name was misspelled in two place.. He noted that he would be making the change from **Steve DeWoody** to **Jim DeWoody**. **Jim Bodley** moved that the minutes as revised be approved. **Steve Collins** seconded the motion and it carried 7 to 0.

3. **COMMENTS BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC**

There were no comments from the Public reference any of the agenda items.

4. **COMMITTEE BUSINESS**

Prior to discussing the agenda items Fred Doten noted that there was a memorial Service scheduled for **Jon Safranek** at the Catholic Church. This starts at 12pm. He stated that the meeting would end at 11:30am to make sure all had a chance to be there on time. With this said, **Fred Doten** introduced **Steve Parrish** as the person in charge of the flood control district.

A. **Receive briefing from the Flood Control District.**

Steve Parrish started off his briefing with a little background of the organization. He noted that in the 1983-84 timeframe the area was hit by some major storms, and in 1984 was declared a Presidential Disaster Area. This generated interest in establishing a Flood Control program. Local government asked State Legislation to generate laws allowing flood control districts. In June 1985 the Nevada Revised Statutes were amended to allow districts to be formed. In April 1986 Enabling County ordinances were passed. In September of 1986 voters approved a ¼ of one percent sales tax increase to fund the Flood Control program. **Steve Parrish** noted this sales tax amendment was probably the most significant event as it provided a constant stream of revenue. It is the primary funding for the Flood Control District. The sales tax became effective in March of 1987 and in June of 1987 the Flood Control started receiving sales tax revenue.

One thing **Steve Parrish** stressed is that the Flood Control District is separate from Clark County. He noted that the District has its own budget and Board of Directors. Even though the title of the organization is the Clark County Regional Flood Control District (RFCD) they are completely autonomous. With that, he delved into their Board of Directors.

Steve Parrish noted that the District is made up of the incorporated cities within Clark County and Clark County itself. Each city – Las Vegas, Henderson, North Las Vegas, Boulder City, Mesquite and Clark County – has one member on the Board except for Las Vegas. Because of Las Vegas' size they and Clark County have two members each on the Board. Each of these members is appointed by their respective city or Board of Commissioners. The members total eight. **Steve Parrish** noted that each of the Board members is an elected official. As new cities are added they would get a member on the board.

Steve Parrish discussed the committees associated with the District. He noted that there were two. The first one discussed was the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). **Steve Parrish** said that the purpose of this committee was to provide recommendations to the Board on technical matters. The committee consists of Public Works Directors and City Engineers from each of the cities. The committee meets the last Thursday of each month at the District. He went on to say that the committee is made up of 8 appointed members and one member from the other committee. At their monthly meeting they go through the agenda of the upcoming Board meeting. They will comment on agenda items and make recommendations.

The second committee is the Citizens Advisory Committee. This committee is appointed for a two year term. Members come from two sources. Each of the District Board members appoints one and then each of the City Councils and Board of Commissioner appoint one. They meet on the Monday following the TAC meeting.

Steve Parrish spent a considerable amount of time discussing their budget and the sources of income. As he noted earlier, the District's primary source of revenue is the sales taxes they receive. He showed a chart that depicted rolling 12-month total sales tax revenue from January 1989 through January 2015. This chart showed a relative straight line positive growth except for the period from 03 through 07. During this period sales taxes were exceedingly topping out at \$90M and then dropping down to \$55M in 08. **Steve Parrish** noted that the slope of the chart is essentially the same prior to and after the rapid growth. He felt this significant in making future estimates of forth coming revenue.

After showing the chart of Sales Tax revenue, **Steve Parrish** provided a chart that showed their projected budget resources for the coming year. He noted that their budget was separate from the County. Their budget is submitted to State; however, it is given to Clark County who submit both to the State. They go as separate entities. **Steve Parrish** then discussed the sources of income in their budget. This chart showed that 95.5% of their resources came from tax revenue, 1.6% from interest and 2.9 from "Build American Bonds" which is a federal bond program that are taxable municipal_bonds that carry special tax credits and federal subsidies for either the bond issuer or the bondholder.

After looking at the resources available, **Steve Parrish** discussed there expenditures. He noted that whereas their resources were \$97.4M there expenditures were budgeted for \$314.3M. He then went on to explain that the expenditures were based on monies in hand and not resources generated for the year. **Jim DeWoody** asked when their fiscal year started. **Steve Parrish** stated it starts on July 1 and ends on the following June 30th. **Steve Parrish** went on to explain that they had available for expenditure funds allocated in previous years that had not been spent. He gave as an example that a project could take 4 to 5 years to get through design and construction. The money collected in a given year is not always spent but kept as a reserve so when a project needs money it is available. He noted that for this year's budget the \$14.0M for repair and the \$7.8M would come out of the \$97.4M but the rest would be held in reserve to fund future projects. This money is held in their PAYG Funding. In addition to this money, the District also has bonds that they use to expedite projects. At the present time they have 7 bonds with a total value of \$790M with \$539M outstanding. For this year budget, \$40.0M is for debt service. The maintenance budget for this year \$14.0M. He noted this was a little higher than the normal \$10M, but the Mount Charleston fire generated 800 tons of debris in their catch basins that needed to be cleaned up. **Steve Parrish** covered their operating expenses. He noted that this covered facility upkeep, salaries, benefits, professional services, etc. The professional services include such things as their advertising effort to make the Public aware of flooding and its associated risks. **Steve Parrish** noted that their desire is to keep operating expensed less than 10% of the Resources. Their goal is 8% which is the \$7.4M showing on the chart.

Steve Parrish next discussed Project Expenditures. He discussed the next chart showing \$252.5M for Project spending. Of this total, \$214 is what is called "Old" money. This is money collect in prior years and not yet spent. The remaining \$38.5M is "New" money which is what is left once you subtract the debit service, maintenance and operating expenses from the \$97.4M Resources money. As further explanation, **Steve Parrish** stated that there were 30 design projects and 28 construction projects ongoing with a total projected cost of \$516M. Estimated expenditures to date are 302M which leaves \$214 to pay for the remaining work. He noted the 38.5M "New money" would be used to pay for future projects that were on the 10-year plan. **Jim Bodley** asked if the money in reserve was invested. **Steve Parrish** responded that these funds needed to be liquid; however, did draw interest. He then noted this was the 1.5M interest resource.

Jim DeWoody asked if this work was done in house or contracted out. **Steve Parrish** stated that the design work was contracted out to different engineering houses. He said that presently there were 11 firms working on various aspects of the projects. **Shawn Escarzaga** asked if they factored in escalation when estimating projects. **Steve Parrish** respond by stating they continually adjust out-year projects based on projected inflation rates.

Steve Parrish next covered how new money was distributed. As explanation he said that each of the district's entities have a number of projects in their area. Each of these projects has a cost to complete. If you take all the projects say in Las Vegas it has a total cost for all projects. Each of the entities has a list of project which has a total cost to complete. If you take each entity's total cost and add them up you will get the total cost for the district. The method District uses to distribute new money is based on the percentage of a given entity's total cost to the District's total cost. For example, if the District had \$100M of outstanding work and Las Vegas had outstanding work valued at \$20M, then they would get 20% of the new money for their projects. This money is only provided after certain criteria are met.

Steve Parrish next covered how the prioritized list of projects is generated. He started this by stating that the District has a set of criteria to determine each project's priority value. These criteria are listed in order of importance. They are:

- **Population Affected**
- **Assessed Land Value Impacted**
- **Public Perception of Need**
- **Emergency Access and Public Inconvenience**
- Availability of Other Funding Sources
- Interrelationship to Other Projects
- Timing and Implementation
- Environmental Enhancement
- Annual Maintenance
- Cost Avoidance

Steve Parrish noted that each of these criteria is reviewed for each project which results in a number. Based on these numbers, the projects are rearranged so that the project with the highest number is listed first. **Fred Doten** asked who did this analysis. **Steve Parrish** responded that Public Works establishes the prioritization list for Clark County. Each of the cities does their own. He did note that the District does provide guidance. He further explained that this prioritization is basically used in the big four in the Las Vegas Valley area. Clark County realizes that if these criteria were used for the rural areas such as Laughlin, Sandy Valley, etc., they would never get a project, so Clark County works the rural projects into their prioritization list.

Steve Parrish next covered how funding is provided to the various entities once a project is entered on the 10-year plan. He explained that there are four prerequisites that must be met before construction funding is provided. These prerequisites are as follows.

- Project must be programmed for construction in years 1, 2 or 3 of the Ten Year Construction Program
- Design must be a minimum 90% complete
- All permits including environmental must be in hand

— All rights-of-way necessary to construct the project must be in hand

Once all these criteria are met, then the project will be brought before the District Board and approved. Once approved an interlocal contract will be generated between the District and the entity, which is required before money is provided.

Steve Parrish next discussed the projects for Laughlin. On a large scale map he showed what flood control projects had been completed, what was proposed and what was within the 10-year plan and presently being worked. He noted that the Casino Drive project was closing in on meeting the four criteria for construction money. He noted that this project would probably go out for bid within the upcoming year.. **Jim DeWoody** brought up the area at the intersection of Bruce Woodbury and Thomas Edison. **Steve Parrish** discussed this area briefly. He noted that the pipes on Casino Drive that go to the river can handle about 2800 CFP; however, the water feeding the pipe was rated in the vicinity of 4000CFP. The project would be to build a detention basin at this corner and then release the water at a rate that the casino pipes could handle. A question was asked reference the detention basin above the intersection of Bruce Woodbury with Needles Hwy, **Steve Parrish** commented that the plan was to put a retention wall along needles Hwy to collect water coming off the flood plain west of Needles Hwy and diverting it into the detention basin. However, before this could be done, the detention basin needs to be expanded. Once this project is complete then the flood plain east of Needles Highway would be greatly reduced and would alleviate the issues at Bruce Woodbury and Thomas Edison. **Julie Fairman** asked if the red meant it was within the 3-year window. **Steve Parrish** said no. He stated that it means it is in the 10-year plan. He then summarized the activities in Laughlin. Starting with the Casino Drive project, he noted that funding of \$650K was earmarked for construction in FY16/17. The Hiko Spring Detention Basin design of \$110K was scheduled for FY19/20 with construction of \$1.2M in FY22/23.

Steve Parrish next covered maintenance. He started this discussion by stating District does not do maintenance work on any of the flood control assets. He noted that they only have 26 employees and 50% were admin or financial. What District does is fund maintenance efforts. They fund this through the various entities and their Public Works departments. He stressed that only flood control assets that are on their Master Plan are eligible for funding. He pointed out the three box culverts on Needles Hwy between Bruce Woodbury and Hwy 163 and stated these were the only ones they covered. After a question by **Fred Doten**, **Steve Parrish** stated that the culverts south of town were the responsibility of Clark County as it was a County road. Funding for this maintenance is the responsibility of Clark County Public Works. **Steve Parrish** continued with how the budget was provided to the various Public Works. He noted that they would look at all the flood control assets within their area of responsibility and estimate the cost to maintain them. This is sent to the District for review and if reasonable funding would be provided. **Steve Parrish** noted that all work must comply with the District's Operation and Maintenance Manual. **Fred Doten** asked if the County has to use this manual when they are working on county assets. **Steve Parrish** responding by saying the District does not dictate to the County what they use; however, they have no issue with them using this manual.

Julie Fairman asked to go back to the detention basin expansion. She wanted to know if the retention wall was within the 10-year plan. **Steve Parrish** stated that it was not in the 10-year plan. He then went on to explain that during the design effort it would be realized that the retention would be needed. It would then be processed into the plan and eventually get funded. **Steve Parrish** also noted that once the detention basin was expanded and the retention wall build they would review the flood plain east of Needles

Hwy and submit their recommendations to FEMA. Once approved by FEMA, this would open this area to development and other uses.

Steve Parrish next covered Public information. He noted that they have quite a program for the public. He started off by discussing the Flood Control Show that they generate. This is a half hour show that appears on the Public TV Channel 4. He also noted that they do Public Service announcements; have billboards and radio and TV ads. **Steve Parrish** also said they have flood awareness press conferences just before Monsoon season to make people aware of the danger associated with these storms. As a last subject of this area, he noted that they have staff that go to schools and discuss floods and the do's and don'ts associated with them. These presentations are geared to 2nd and 3rd graders who are the most receptive to this information. He mentioned that they had visited Bennett Elementary 2-3 weeks ago.

Julie Fairman asked who should be called if say there is dirt on the highway. **Steve Parrish** said that CCPW were the ones who should be called. However, if you call into District then District will relay the message on to CCPW.

Over the next few minutes **Steve Parrish** responded to personal questions. The most significant point of these questions is that curbs and gutters are valuable assets in controlling dirt on the road way and keeping drains from clogging up. After the question and answers period **Fred Doten** thanked **Steve Parrish** for an outstanding presentation and wished him a safe drive home.

B. **Receive an update on recent traffic studies in Laughlin and recent work orders submitted to Public Works and take any action Deemed appropriate**

C. **Fred Doten** started the discussion by asking all to get out their copy of the work order sheet.

Sewer plant turn lane: **Fred Doten** noted he still had to do his job here.

Street sign at wrong place along Thomas Edison: **Fred Doten** noted that he sent an email to **Marvin Hoggard** and ask him again to remove it. He commented that he has seen cars that pass the sign turn into the right turn lane for the Riverside parking area and realize they must continue and come back on Thomas Edison.

Marking of El Mirage: **Fred Doten** stated that he had taken pictures along El Mirage and was generating his report. Part of the report would talk about the missing signs

No Sidewalk along Mesquite Lane. **Fred Doten** said that he received an email from **Gary Laswell** stating that the road belonged to Clark County. He said that **Gary Laswell** was planning to be in town this week and would go there and look at it. **Fred Doten** said he has asked **Gary Laswell** to contact him so they both could review the road. **Gary Laswell** also said in his email that they did not have an easement on the south side of the road and that he was checking into whether they had an easement on the north side.

Restriping of white lines on Needles Hwy: **Fred Doten** noted that he has written to **Kaizad Yazdani** about these solid lines several times and has not had an answer. He will answer the other questions but ignores this specific one.

Inoperable Street lights: **Fred Doten** said the Street light replacement is working well. He commented that any time **John Koksha** is notified of lights being out he will send folks down within a day or so to fix them. This led to a discussion of various lights that were out. **Marty Knauss** asked if the lists are consolidated. **Fred Doten** said no and that he sends the list provided to Intheworks and they in turn send it to the appropriate departments for rework.

New sign for Chamber Access Road: Fred Doten said that a message was sent to find who has to pay for the signs. He has not heard anything about it.

El Mirage Drainage at Banyon: Fred Doten stated that when Gary Laswell is down here he would like to get with him and review with him how CCPW worked this drainage issue.

School sign for Bennett Elementary is pointing incorrectly: Fred Doten noted that this sign was gone. He noted that he does know if someone took it down or if it fell off the light pole. John Pantages stated that he believes someone took it as the bands are still on the street light Pole..

Urgent Care Sign on 163: Fred Doten said he had not checked to see if was gone. Julie Fairman noted that she had not checked either. She commented that it is hard to see it is so small.

Business Sign on Needles Highway: Fred Doten said the signs are up; however, they are pointing in the wrong direction.

Missing Turtles on Needles Highway: Fred Doten said he believed these had been replaced.

Yellow striping coming Loose: Jim Bodley interjected that the stripes were no longer on the road and that they had brought one into the meeting. Fred Doten stated that all the pictures Jim Bodley sent him were sent to Angelo Santovito who in turn sent them on to Kaizad Yazdani. Fred Doten said he had not received back any status from either.

Bus Stop Signs: Fred Doten stated that when he was running his route he had a difficult time locating the bus stop sign. Tom Bartelmy commented the issue was not the sign. He followed this comment by stating what was requested of him was that a yellow Warning sign be placed before the bus stop sign warning drivers that there was a bus stop ahead. This will be going to Intheworks as part of this report.

Sign hidden on El Mirage: Fred Doten stated he understands the issue and took several pictures in the area. This will be sent in as part of his route report.

Street Sweeper in Bilbray Ranch Area: Fred Doten addressed his comments to Steve Collins and told him that about a week ago he sent an email to Gary Laswell about sweeping Bilbray Ranch. Gary Laswell responded saying he was checking the roads. Steve Collins said that to date no street sweeper had been in their area.

Further Issues: Fred Doten asked if there was anything that needed to be added. Julie Fairman brought up the call she received from a town member who was concerned about the bus stop at Crown Point Apartments. The issue is that the bus stop is in the right turn lane to James A. Bilbray. This was discussed and it became very evident that there was not an ideal location for this bus stop at this intersection. The only possible solution would be to reduce the length of the turn lane so that it does not start until after the bus stop. Fred Doten noted that there was a similar issue with the bus stop at Arie Ave.

Jim DeWoody asked if it was possible to put something on the list about mitigating the runoff issue. Fred Doten said that if he would write it up he would put it on the list. As there was nothing else the committee went on to item B.

Discuss Zone Inspections and take any action appropriate: Fred Doten Tabled this agenda item.

5. **COMMUNITY INPUT/ PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no comments from the Community or from the committee members.

6. **NEXT MEETING DATE:** The next meeting date for the Public Works Committee is **May 19, 2015**, 10:00 AM, Laughlin Regional Government Center, 101 Civic Way, Laughlin, Nevada. **Agenda items due no later than May 8, 2015.**

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:32 hrs.

NOTE: *These meeting minutes are in draft form and will be formally approved at the May 19, 2015 meeting. Any corrections to these minutes will be reflected in the minutes of the May 19, 2015 meeting.*