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On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Pima County Regional Flood Control District, I am pleased to present the District’s Annual Report for fiscal year 2010/2011. The following are a few of this year’s highlights, which are described in more detail later in this report:

In 2006, we received record rainfall events in June, July and August with 8.6 inches of rainfall; two inches more than the average. FEMA approved $8 million in funding for emergency work and repair projects for the flood damage. In addition to bank stabilization and sediment removal projects reflected in recent year’s CIP the debris flows, erosion and deposition associated with these floods as well as changes over time necessitated the restudy of numerous foothills floodplains. During FY10/11 these studies continued including:

- Scott’s Knob;
- Nanini;
- Casas Adobe; and
- Campbell Washes.

In addition to improved floodplain mapping and risk identification, our Capital Improvement Program continues to be successful resulting in the completion of several flood safety projects each of which provide multiple benefits including flood control, recreation and neighborhood stabilization including:

- Mission View Wash;
- Green Valley Erosion Control; and
- City of South Tucson Urban Drainage.

The year increased attention was directed toward technical procedures and standards. A technical policy was adopted facilitating calculation of alternative erosion hazard setbacks, along with standards for data collection, surveying, drafting and soil cement repair.

I hope you’ll take some time to read this year’s annual report, which details our programs, CIP projects and other District activities. This year’s report and all previous annual reports are also available at: www.rfcd.pima.gov.

Suzanne Shields, P.E.
Chief Engineer and Director
Regional Flood Control District
The District will continue to be a leader in providing quality flood protection and floodplain management services within Pima County.

**Vision**

The District will continue to be a leader in providing quality flood protection and floodplain management services within Pima County.

**Mission**

The Pima County Regional Flood Control District is a regional agency whose mission is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of Pima County residents by providing comprehensive flood protection programs and floodplain management services. These services emphasize fiscal responsibility, protection of natural resources, and a balanced multi-objective approach to managing regional watercourses, floodplains, and stormwater resources.
To comply with federal law, the State of Arizona passed the Floodplain Management Act of 1973. This act authorized Arizona counties to adopt rules and regulations concerning management of floodplain areas. The Arizona State Legislature subsequently authorized flood control districts to levy taxes on real property to finance district operating expenses. The Pima County Board of Supervisors, which sits as the Pima County Flood Control District Board of Directors (Board), organized the Pima County Flood Control District (District) on June 5, 1978. The District first became operational on July 1, 1978.

Provisions of state legislation also allow incorporated cities and towns within Pima County to undertake their own floodplain management duties and regulatory functions. In Pima County, the incorporated areas of the City of Tucson, the Town of Oro Valley, the Town of Marana, and the Town of Sahuarita have elected to assume floodplain management duties in their respective jurisdictions. The District is responsible for floodplain management activities for the remainder of unincorporated Pima County (with the exception of national forests, parks, monuments, and Indian Nations) and for the City of South Tucson.
The goals and objectives of the District represent both flood control and resource protection. The District’s approach varies from traditional flood control approaches because of a multi-benefit public philosophy. The District recognizes that it is necessary and desirable to maintain a balanced relationship between human communities and the land and resources that sustain them. To that end, the following policy goals and objectives have been adopted by the Board as part of the District’s Floodplain and Erosion Hazard Management Ordinance:

- Minimize flood and erosion damages.
- Meet or exceed state and federal requirements relating to floodplain management.
- Establish minimum flood protection elevations and damage protection requirements for structures and other types of development.
- Regulate encroachment and building development within areas subject to flooding or erosion.
- Encourage the most effective expenditures of public money for flood control projects.
- Minimize damage to public facilities, utilities and streets located in regulatory floodplain and erosion hazard areas.
- Help maintain a stable tax base by providing for the protection of regulatory flood and erosion hazard areas.
- Inform the public when property is in a regulatory floodplain or erosion hazard area.
- Encourage the preservation of natural washes and enhancement of the riverine environment.
- Emphasize overall watershed management.
- Protect, preserve and enhance groundwater recharge.
District Activities

Service Programs

Customer Service
The District encourages residents to become familiar with flood related hazards that may impact their properties or properties they are considering for purchase. In order to assist in this research, the District maintains an abundant amount of information at our customer service counter which includes floodplain maps, elevation certificates, detailed hydrologic and hydraulic studies, historic and current aerial photos, and topographic information.

Residents may discuss any of this information with a hydrologist who can provide additional information regarding any limitations on the property or requirements that may apply for proposed improvements due to the extent of flooding or erosion hazards.

Floodplain Management also provides an efficient Special Flood Hazard Area Identification service. This information is conveniently provided in writing via a Flood Hazard Information Sheet. This form identifies whether the property is located in or out of the federal floodplain and/or floodway and whether the structure is in or out of the floodplain. This service can be provided at our customer service counter. During 07/08 the District created an online Flood Hazard Map service. By going to http://rfcd.pima.gov/fpm/hazrd.html a user can enter a parcel id or address and download or print a Flood Hazard Map.

Another customer service component provided by Floodplain Management includes performing field investigations in response to constituent complaints and concerns. Through these field investigations, Floodplain Management is able to ensure that property owners are not being adversely affected by improvements that they or their neighbors construct, and can provide advice regarding improvements that can be made in order to minimize the potential of flood damage. If non-compliant improvements are observed, Floodplain Management personnel will proceed with compliance enforcement actions.

Flood Protection Assistance
Floodplain Management

The goal of Floodplain Management is to provide floodplain information, establish development requirements and provide assistance to Pima County residents with drainage questions in order to minimize the threat to life and property from flooding and erosion hazards. This includes ensuring that any new development within the floodplain is safe from flooding and erosion hazards, does not adversely impact adjacent properties, and maintains the integrity of the floodplain.

Another important goal is protecting natural resources within floodprone areas. Floodplains typically support important riparian ecosystems and associated wildlife. These riparian areas are also important for their role in mitigating flood hazards by maintaining stable flood flow conditions, providing natural erosion control, as well as promoting recharge into underground aquifers. As such, it is beneficial to all residents of Pima County that these critical resources are protected and maintained.

One of the ways Floodplain Management accomplishes these goals is by implementing floodplain regulations contained in the Pima County Floodplain and Erosion Hazard Management Ordinance (Ordinance). The Ordinance was developed to conform to the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which allows residents of Pima County to purchase flood insurance. In addition, the Ordinance includes provisions regarding the construction of buildings and other man-made structures within regulatory floodplains. The Ordinance applies only to those areas prone to flooding where the peak discharge is 100 cubic feet per second or greater, or prone to sheet flooding. In other areas, the Ordinance does not apply; however, other ordinances may apply, such as the Grading Ordinance administered by the Development Services Department.
One of our most used services is the District’s Automated Local Evaluation in Real Time (ALERT) system, which has been providing precipitation and stream flow data from a series of gauges located throughout Pima County since 1981. The ALERT system was established as part of a three-way agreement with the National Weather Service (NWS), the Arizona Department of Water Resources and the District. The ALERT system was initially installed to provide advanced warning of potential flood flows on the upper Cañada del Oro watershed as a result of the Golder Dam breach. Federal and state financial assistance combined with funding from the District has allowed us to expand the ALERT system. The system of gauges now covers most of the large watersheds in eastern Pima County and currently includes 93 precipitation gauges, 36 stream gauges, and four weather sites.

The precipitation gauges relay rainfall or snowfall amounts and intensities, stream gauges measure the depth of flow in streams, and weather stations provide precipitation information plus wind speed, temperature, relative humidity and barometric pressure. This network of automated gauges transmits data in real time using radio telemetry transmitted directly to the District, NWS, and the Arizona Department of Water Resources office in Phoenix. The NWS uses this data to produce flash flood watches and warnings and to ground-truth radar estimates of precipitation. District personnel utilize the information to assist emergency response agencies including the Pima County Department of Transportation’s Maintenance Operations staff during storm events. Data generated by these sites may be viewed at the District’s rfcd.pima.gov/wrd/alertsys/index.htm
In 2006, Pima County received record rainfall events in June, July and August with 8.6 inches of rainfall; two inches more than the average. With these events large amounts of debris including sediment flowed from the National Forest headwaters of the canyon washes into the foothills residential area and more intense development within the geologic floodplains of the desert basin floor. Since that time the District had focused attention on repairing damages including restoring channel capacity along the major watercourses and where damages were the most severe.

In addition to bank stabilization and sediment removal projects reflected in our CIP the debris flows, erosion and deposition associated with these floods as well as changes over time necessitated the restudy of numerous foothills floodplains. Furthermore a significant rainfall event in 2007 flooded homes along the Valley View Wash and highlighted the need for updated mapping and hydraulic studies. During FY10/11 District staff continued developing floodplain mapping studies needed in the following foothills washes;

- Scott’s Knob;
- Nanini;
- Casas Adobe; and
- Campbell Washes.

These studies, conducted in-house by PCRFCD staff utilized approved local, state and federal methodologies to determine discharge rates and floodplains limits and have in most cases been used to submit Letters of Map Revision for approval by FEMA. These “Technical Data Notebooks” use better topographic, hydrologic and hydraulic data than was available when the original FEMA maps were created. Furthermore these studies identified specific infrastructure including culverts, dip sections and bridges which may restrict flow. Notices have been sent to every impacted property owner specifically explaining if their buildings or land has been determined to be within or not within the floodplain.
Water Resources and Riparian Habitat Management

This program consists of activities intended to prevent flooding, erosion and riparian habitat loss by means other than constructing structural flood control improvements. The District promotes and supports regional riparian restoration with the goal of recovering natural functions within riverine systems and establishing habitat for native wildlife.

Mitigation Guideline Revisions

The Floodplain and Erosion Hazard Management Ordinance (Ordinance) requires compensatory mitigation for disturbances to regulated riparian habitat. The Regulated Riparian Habitat Mitigation Standards and Implementation Guidelines (Guidelines) were developed as a supplement to Ordinance Number 1999-FC1 to provide guidance for applicants going through the mitigation process. Since its inception in 1994, the riparian protection regulations of the Ordinance have been revised twice, first in 1998 (Number 1999-FC1) and again in 2005 (Number 2005-FC2). In a continuing effort to meet the goals of the Ordinance and to ensure that requirements are being met, the District began revising the Guidelines in FY 2007-08 to incorporate Ordinance revisions adopted in 2005.

The District selected a project team to conduct technical studies which would determine the effectiveness of the current Guidelines, study offsite mitigation opportunities, and assist them with the public participation process. Because of the complexity of offsite mitigation issues, the revision process was split into two efforts, revision of the Onsite Mitigation Guidelines and development of an Offsite Mitigation Program.

Public participation is an essential aspect in revising the onsite Guidelines and development of the offsite mitigation program. The Mitigation Working Group (MWG) was created to assist the District in the process of revising the Guidelines, and members were selected to represent a broad spectrum of the community.

MWG Members

- Southern Arizona Home Builders Association (SAHBA)
- Tucson Audubon Society
- Coalition for Sonoran Desert Protection
- Rincon Institute
- American Society of Landscape Architects
- Metropolitan Pima Alliance
- Westland Resources
- Diamond Ventures
- Pima County Resident

Two MWG meetings were held in FY 2008-09. These meetings occurred on October 27, 2010 and January 25, 2011 and focused on revising the onsite guidelines. The revisions to the Guidelines were not completed at the end of FY 2010-11 and are continuing.
“Habitat loss contributes to flooding erosion hazards.”

“Healthy habitat absorbs floodwater.”
The national response to flood disasters prior to 1968 was to install dams, levees, and seawalls; however, this approach failed to reduce flood losses. Flood victims were often left destitute because homeowners and business owners could not purchase private flood insurance. Insurers were either unwilling to offer flood insurance or premiums were too costly—consequently flood disaster costs and the number of flood victims continued to increase over time.

In 1968, Congress created the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The three basic goals of the program are to:

1) Promote sound floodplain management to reduce future flood losses, 2) Provide flood insurance, and 3) Identify flood hazards and create floodplain mapping.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) identifies flood hazard areas by publishing Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). The first FIRMs for Pima County became effective in 1983, however, revising the FIRMs to accurately reflect flood hazards is a never-ending process. Watercourses move and watersheds change over time, so the maps are continually being updated.

Digital FEMA Data

On October 23, 2008 FEMA announced its intent to discontinue distribution of paper maps and initiation of the distribution of Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps or DFIRM’s. In anticipation of this announcement the Regional Flood Control District (District) has been working with FEMA to create a digital GIS library that includes hyperlinks to all map change documents such as Letters of Map Revision, and Letters of Map Amendments. In Fiscal Year 2008/09, the District obtained digital map documents for all of the incorporated communities in Pima County that participate in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). We also made available digital map products in the form of ESRI shape files or AutoCAD files to engineering companies to assist them in preparation of map revision applications to FEMA. Conversion of the paper to digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps facilitated comparison to recent aerial photography. This enabled District engineers and landowners to work together in submitting more accurate information for FEMA approval. In FY 09/10 we created a Mapguide comparison site so that property owners could look to see how the map changes would impact them. Stakeholder review of these maps continued throughout FY 10/11 and the DFIRMs became effective on June 16, 2011.
The Community Rating System (CRS) is a voluntary incentive program that rates local communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) who are interested in providing a level of service that is above and beyond the minimum NFIP requirements. Participating communities receive discounted flood insurance premium rates in increments of 5%. For example, a Class 1 community, whose service is considerably above the minimum, would receive a 45% premium discount, while a Class 9 community whose service is nominally above the minimum would receive a 5% discount. A Class 10 community only meets the minimum level required, which in turn would not receive a discount for their constituents.

The CRS classes for local communities are based on 18 activities and are organized under four categories: 1) Public Information, 2) Mapping and Regulations, 3) Flood Damage Reduction, and 4) Flood Preparedness.

While we recertify our rated activities each year FEMA utilizes auditors from the Insurance Services Organization (ISO) to verify our performance. During March of 2011 the District was audited by FEMA contractors to verify our performance. This audit includes preparation of documentation, and a “cycle verification visit” conducted by the ISO. For Class 5 communities these visits are conducted every five years and require extensive follow up submittals.

In recognition of the excellent level of floodplain management performed by the District, Pima County is a Class 5 Community, which yields a 25% discount in flood insurance premiums for our constituents. Pima County ranks in the top 6% of all participating communities nationwide.
FLAP provides relocation assistance to property owners and purchases flood damaged land, whether it is improved property or vacant land. Specific criteria used to rank FLAP applications and determine eligibility include the extent of flood damage or severity of potential flood and erosion hazards on the property. The highest priority is given to improved properties that have or may suffer significant damage as a result of flooding.

This program is completely voluntary and is designed to assist property owners who are likely to experience, or have experienced, flooding which resulted in severe damage and flood hazards. The community also benefits from these acquisitions, which increase open space for overbank storage, enhance groundwater recharge, and provide riparian habitat preservation, wildlife corridors, passive recreation opportunities and protects cultural resources. FLAP also protects emergency responders and county resources from harm by reducing potential rescue needs.

Additional grant monies to purchase additional floodprone and damaged property became available after subsequent disasters because Pima County had an established floodprone land acquisition program.
In 1986, after voters approved general obligation bond sales of $20 million for flood-prone land acquisition, a land acquisition plan was adopted by the Pima County Board of Supervisors outlining criteria to guide the District’s overall acquisition efforts and allow the dedication of tax levy revenues to be used for acquisition of floodprone lands. This newly adopted plan aided in the expansion of the program to include purchasing undeveloped land to prevent future floodplain development in sensitive riparian areas and to meet the open space goals of the community.

In fiscal year 2010/2011 the District spent $365,507 and added 27 acres of land to the FLAP inventory bringing the total of District-owned property to 10,370.76 acres at a cost of $67,817,544 since the program’s inception.
Capital Improvements Program

Fiscal Year
July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP No.</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5CRMAC</td>
<td>Carmack Wash Channel Erosion</td>
<td>December-10</td>
<td>77,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MISWA</td>
<td>FC-04 Mission View Wash</td>
<td>March-11</td>
<td>8,913,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5GVERC</td>
<td>FC5.02 Green Valley Erosion Control</td>
<td>March-11</td>
<td>1,438,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5MEDIO</td>
<td>El Rio Medio (USACOE Study)</td>
<td>May-11</td>
<td>879,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5PKOLB</td>
<td>Pantano Wash: Kolb Executive Park Bank Protection</td>
<td>May-11</td>
<td>724,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5UDSTU</td>
<td>FC5.03 City of South Tucson Urban Drainage</td>
<td>June-11</td>
<td>1,521,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5UBDRC</td>
<td>FC5.02 Tanque Verde Creek Lakes of Castle Rock Erosion Protection</td>
<td>June-11</td>
<td>24,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,578,944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission View Wash

The Tucson Stormwater Management Study identifies 44 existing homes, in the Greyhound Wash drainage area that will be protected from flooding. The expanded project will also protect the City of South Tucson, reduce flooding along the UPRR from 34th Street to 22nd Street and reduce flooding in the Tucson downtown area at 18th and 22nd Streets, and roadway flooding would also be reduced, resulting in safer driving conditions. The detention basin has been designed to provide future areas to be developed for multi-purpose uses by the proposed Bridges Planned Development, thereby providing park, recreation and open space benefits to the surrounding community.

Green Valley Erosion Control

The project provided drainage improvements to control flooding and erosion in drainage ways located in Green Valley, Arizona. Drainage improvements were performed in drainage ways 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 17, 24, and 25. The improvements ranged from filling scour holes with rip-rap and repairing existing structures to the construction of new bank protection and grade control structures.
In addition to the improvements, the District also conducted the Green Valley 2010 Drainage Way Evaluations to reassess the original RS Engineering May 2004 report and to update the maintenance and engineering improvements needed for Green Valley.

**Pantano Wash: Kolb Executive Park Bank Protection**

On July 31, 2006 the observed peak flow in Pantano Wash at Broadway Blvd wash measured to be 15,900 cfs, this corresponds to a 33-year event. Existing gabion bank protection failed at Kolb Executive Park, threatening to wash the busines complex’s parking lot and parking structures away. The District provided temporary riprap to stabilize the bank and worked with FEMA to provide a temporary and permanent solution to the failure created by the emergency. The temporary repairs were completed in 2007, while the permanent bank protection solution was be designed.

The project included removal of the temporary riprap bank protection, stabilizing and coating the existing riprap with an 8 foot thick layer of soil cement bank protection, new handrail, maintenance road and associated drainage structures.

The project was bid and awarded on Nov. 17, 2009. Construction was started on Feb. 2, 2010 and substantially completed by Sept. 1, 2010. Landscaping and handrail were completed by Oct. 2010.

**Tanque Verde Creek Lakes of Castle Rock Erosion Protection**

The project provided improvements to restore the bank and prevent erosion at Common Area of the Lakes of Castle Rock. The improvements involved installing five weirs constructed of over 600 lineal feet of gabions. The project also diverted the deepest part of the flow away from the north bank. By diverting the flow, the project protects the Castle Rock property and the property immediately downstream owned by Pima County and used by Therapeutic Riding of Tucson (TROT), a non-profit organization. The project worked in tandem with bank protection installed this past spring at TROT to prevent erosion along the north bank at both properties. The project also preserved a large tree that was at least 50 years old and provided habitat for birds of prey.
### Flood Control District Tax Levy Rate 1981 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ending</th>
<th>Levy Rate</th>
<th>Tax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0.5143</td>
<td>$4,637,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>0.4683</td>
<td>$5,342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>0.5072</td>
<td>$6,882,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>0.4739</td>
<td>$7,652,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>0.5269</td>
<td>$9,243,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0.5102</td>
<td>$9,969,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>0.5346</td>
<td>$11,713,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>0.7630</td>
<td>$17,272,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>0.5592</td>
<td>$13,730,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0.5985</td>
<td>$14,663,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>0.5985</td>
<td>$14,058,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>0.5871</td>
<td>$13,689,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>0.5871</td>
<td>$13,767,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>0.5398</td>
<td>$12,678,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0.4623</td>
<td>$11,379,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.3596</td>
<td>$9,368,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.3596</td>
<td>$9,467,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.3296</td>
<td>$10,392,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.3246</td>
<td>$10,411,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.3046</td>
<td>$10,327,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.3046</td>
<td>$10,414,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.3546</td>
<td>$13,713,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.3546</td>
<td>$14,467,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.3546</td>
<td>$14,467,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.3546</td>
<td>$14,467,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.3746</td>
<td>$19,720,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.3746</td>
<td>$22,620,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.3446</td>
<td>$25,331,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.2935</td>
<td>$25,145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.2635</td>
<td>$23,142,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.2635</td>
<td>$22,220,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Revenues

Although the District receives assistance from state and federal agencies to construct major capital facilities, most of the District’s funding is generated from the property tax levy along with general obligation bond sales authorized by the electorate. Information on the District tax levy rate is shown in the table at left.

### Expenditures

The table on Page 18 provides information on capital project expenditures for projects completed during Fiscal Year 2010/11. The remainder of District expenditures goes toward debt service and operating expenses, which include funds allocated for maintenance of flood control structures, floodplain management, planning and administration activities.
Financial Highlights
Fiscal Year 2010/2011

Revenues
The primary source of revenue is the District’s secondary property tax levy of $0.2635 per $100 of real property assessed valuation (this rate was the same in FY2000/2010). In 2010/2011, the District received approximately $22.2 million dollars in tax levy revenue reflecting declining property values. Other local sources of revenue include revenue for capital improvements from the sale of general obligation (GO) bonds (2.9) and reimbursements from other funds ($250,500). The total revenue from all sources in FY2010/2011 was almost 25.4$ million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$22,220,943.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Participation</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Participation</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Gov’t</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Royalties</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>$150,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>$2,911,710.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,383,153.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures
The total expenditures for the District in FY2010/11 were approximately $18.4 million. The Capital Improvement Program expenditures of over $8 million were direct capital expenses. The annual operating budget for the District was approximately $10.2 million. The other significant expenditure was $32,954 for debt service on flood control bonds and our contribution to the Pima Association of Governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvements</td>
<td>$8,172,211.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Budget</td>
<td>$10,257,511.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAG</td>
<td>$30,266.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PimaCore/Debt Services</td>
<td>$2,688.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,462,676.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Expenditures

Capital Improvements
The expenditures for capital improvements include engineering service costs for planning and design; construction costs; right-of-way acquisition and utility costs; and other costs such as preparing new FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps once a capital project is completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIP Expenditures</th>
<th>FY 10/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$1,097,518.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$986,050.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$567,595.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$5,519,033.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>$2,012.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,172,211.02</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operating Budget
The Districts operating budget includes administrative, personnel, supplies, and service costs associated with Flood Control Support, Flood Prevention and Riparian Protection. Flood Control Support Services include programs such as customer service, permits, public education, and financial management. Flood Prevention Services include maintenance, flood warning, emergency preparedness, and enforcement activities. Riparian Protection services include the environmental restoration, water resources and riparian habitat management programs.
Pima County Department of Transportation

The District contracts with Pima County for services from divisions within the Department of Transportation:

• Field Engineering Division
• Maintenance Operations Division
• Real Property Division
• Technical Services Division
• Administrative Services Division

Other Pima County Departments

The District cooperates with other Pima County Departments on various projects and exchanges information as needed:

• Pima County Attorney’s Office
• Development Services Department
• Department of Environmental Quality
• Health Department
• Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation Department
• Tucson-Pima County Office of Emergency Management
• Regional Wastewater Reclamation Department (RWRD)

Local Governments

The District has entered into intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) to provide specific flood control or floodplain management services to, or to jointly fund flood control activities with, the following:

• City of Tucson
• City of South Tucson
• Town of Oro Valley
• Town of Marana
• Town of Sahuarita

Pima Association of Governments (PAG)

PAG facilitates coordination among local government agencies, including the District, on environmental matters affecting the community.

State Agencies

The District coordinates activities with the following state agencies:

• Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR)
• Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ)
• Arizona Game and Fish (AGFD)
• Arizona State Land Department

Federal Government

Several federal agencies participate in local flood control projects, as listed below:

• U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE)
• Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
• Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
• U. S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR)
• U. S. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)
• National Weather Service (NWS)
• U. S. Geological Survey (USGS)
• U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Nongovernmental Organizations

Other nongovernmental agencies that the District works with include:

• The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
• Cortaro-Marana Irrigation District (CMID)
• Central Arizona Water Conservation District (CAWCD)
• Metropolitan Domestic Water Improvement District (MDWID)
• University of Arizona (UA)