This Meeting Held via Zoom: CLICK HERE TO ATTEND

How the District Works – 12:45 – 1:00 pm

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance – 1:00 pm

2. Introductions
   a. Visitors/Guests
   b. Awards/Recognition
      i. 2020 Perfect Attendance – Board Members
      ii. CASFM Engineering Excellence Award: Sanderson Gulch
      iii. ACEC Excellence Award: Wonderland Creek

3. Roll Call – Determination of Quorum

4. Approval of October 15, 2020 Meeting Minutes
   (If there are no corrections “Minutes stand approved”, or with corrections “Minutes stand approved as corrected”)

5. Presentation Agenda
   (Each resolution will, after introduction and presentation from District staff, be placed on the Consent Agenda unless a request is made by a Board Member for action upon the resolution separately)
   a. Legislative Committee
      (Resolution No. 75, Series of 2020)
   b. Policy Regarding Conflicts of Interest in Contracting
      (Resolution No. 76, Series of 2020)
   c. Authorization to Purchase the Property at 7420 East 86th Avenue, Commerce City, Adams County
      (Resolution No. 77, Series of 2020)
   d. Acceptance of Basin 4100 and DFA 0056 Outfall Systems Planning Study
      (Resolution No. 78, Series of 2020)
   e. Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek, Douglas County
      (Resolution No. 79, Series of 2020)
   f. Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Weaver Creek at Bellevue Avenue, Jefferson County
      (Resolution No. 80, Series of 2020)

6. Consent Agenda
   (Consent items are considered routine and will be approved by one motion unless a request is made by a Board Member for removal of a specific resolution for a presentation by District staff or discussion)
   a. Review of Cash Disbursements
   b. Additional Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue, City of Louisville, Boulder County
      (Resolution No. 81, Series of 2020)

7. Vote on Approval of the Consent Agenda
   (Motion and roll call vote required)
8. Other Business
   a. Nominating Committee – Recommendation of 2021 Officers

9. Reports/Discussions
   a. Executive Director’s Report

10. Announcements
    a. Annual Meeting: Thursday, January 21, 2021

11. Adjournment
Board Members Present:

Herb Atchison  Mayor, City of Westminster
Guyleen Castriotta  Mayor Pro Tem, City/County of Broomfield
Jolon Clark  Council Member, City/County of Denver
Stacie Gilmore  Council Member, City/County of Denver
Mark Hunter  Engineer
Nicole Johnston  Mayor Pro Tem, City of Aurora
Matt Jones  Commissioner, Boulder County
Paul Kashmann  Council Member, City/County of Denver
Jan Kulmann  Mayor, City of Thornton
Don Mares  Deputy Mayor, City/County of Denver
Adam Paul  Mayor, City of Lakewood
Stephanie Piko  Mayor, City of Centennial
Dave Sellards  Engineer
Nancy Sharpe  Commissioner, Arapahoe County
Bud Starker  Mayor, City of Wheat Ridge
Ashley Stolzmann  Mayor, City of Louisville
Libby Szabo  Commissioner, Jefferson County
Chaz Tedesco  Commissioner, Adams County
Lora Thomas  Commissioner, Douglas County
Jerry Valdes  Mayor, City of Littleton
Marc Williams  Mayor, City of Arvada
Bob Yates  Mayor Pro Tem, City of Boulder

Board Members Absent:
Meredith Leighty  Mayor, City of Northglenn

MHFD Staff Present:

Ken MacKenzie  Executive Director
Kurt Bauer  Watershed Manager
David Bennetts  Government Relations Manager
Darren Bradshaw  Senior Construction Manager
Ritzwi Chapagain  Student Intern
Barbara Chongtoua  Development Services Manager
David Crooks  Student Intern
Amelia Deleon  Human Resources Manager
Katie Evers  GIS Analyst
Terri Fead  Floodplain Manager
Dan Hill  Project Engineer
Laura Hinds  Staff Engineer
Hung-Teng Ho  Hydraulic Modeler
Bryan Kohlenberg  Watershed Manager
Laura Kroeger  Engineering Services Manager
Kelsey Mehan  Office Coordinator
Charles Nelson  Student Intern
Ellie Paulsen  Administrative Assistant
Holly Piza  Engineering Services Manager
Melanie Poole  Project Engineer
How the District Works: Introduction to Confluence

Mrs. Shea Thomas, Engineering Services Manager, gave a presentation on Confluence, the District’s online data platform.

1. Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance – 1:00 p.m.

   Council Member Stacie Gilmore called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

2. Introductions

   a. Visitors/Guests

      Mr. Ken MacKenzie introduced the following guests:
      - Jim Kaiser  City of Thornton
      - David Rausch  Adams County

   b. Awards/Recognitions

      i. American Society of Landscape Architects - 2019 Merit Award for Design: Wonderland Creek

         Mr. David Skuodas, Mrs. Mary Powell, Mr. Jim Watt, and Mr. Kurt Bauer received the American Society of Landscape Architects Merit Award for Design for the Wonderland Creek project. Mr. MacKenzie congratulated them on their achievement.

      ii. American Public Works Association - Technical Director of Leadership and Management

         Mrs. Laura Kroeger was made Technical Director of Leadership and Management for the American Public Works Association. Mr. MacKenzie congratulated Mrs. Kroeger on this achievement.

3. Roll Call – Determination of Quorum

   Roll was called and a quorum was declared present.
4. Committee Reports  
   a. Audit and Finance Committee  
   Mayor Bud Starker gave a brief update on the Audit and Finance committee (AFC) discussion, which took place on Monday, October 5 at 11 am. In addition to Mayor Starker, those in attendance included: Mayor Ashley Stolzmann, Mr. Dave Sellards, Mr. MacKenzie, Mrs. Terri Schafer, Finance and Accounting Manager, Mrs. Laura Kroeger, Engineering Services Manager, and Mrs. Barbara Chongtoua, Development Services Manager. Mr. MacKenzie presented the 2021 Budget. Following the budget presentation, Mrs. Kroeger presented the 5-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and Mrs. Chongtoua presented the Development Services Enterprise (DSE) Budget and Program.  
   The AFC unanimously recommends the adoption of the 2021 Budget to the Board of Directors, but did not unanimously agree on the proposed pay raises and their implementation and seeks discussion with the Board.

   b. Executive Committee  
   Council Member Gilmore provided an update on the Executive Committee meeting that took place via conference call on October 8 & 14, to discuss Mr. MacKenzie’s year-end evaluation. Committee members in attendance in addition to Council Member Gilmore included: Mayor Adam Paul, Commissioner Nancy Sharpe, Mayor Bud Starker, Mayor Stephanie Piko, and Ms. Amelia Deleon, Human Resources Manager. The Executive Committee congratulated Mr. MacKenzie on his and the District’s accomplishments in 2020.  
   Council Member Gilmore discussed the Executive Committee’s recommendation for Mr. MacKenzie’s annual salary increase and potential salary increase for MHFD staff in 2021. It was the consensus of the Executive Committee to propose 2% increases for all of MHFD Staff with an option to reevaluate mid-year.

5. Approval of August 20, 2020 Meeting Minutes  
   (If there are no corrections “Minutes stand approved”, or with corrections “Minutes stand approved as corrected”)  
   Council Member Gilmore asked if there were any corrections to the August 20, 2020 minutes. Hearing none, the minutes were approved as submitted.

6. Public Hearing  
   a. 2021 Budget  
   Council Member Gilmore opened the public hearing at 1:17 p.m. The final budget was presented to the AFC on Monday, October 5. Mr. MacKenzie provided an overview of the final 2021 budget to the Board, highlights included:  
   - 2021 Mill Levy, Adams, Arapahoe, Denver, Douglas, and Jefferson Counties: 1.000  
   - 2021 Mill Levy, Boulder and Broomfield Counties: 0.900  
   The overview of the 2021 budget identified changes in revenue and expenditures. Three resolutions were highlighted in the budget discussion: Resolution No. 63 certifies the tax levy, Resolution No. 64 adopts the 2021 Budget, and Resolution No. 65 appropriates the funds.  
   Council Member Gilmore requested comments or questions from the Board and public.  
   Mayor Ashley Stolzmann had a point of discussion regarding the employee and Executive Director’s salary increases for 2021. Mayor Stolzmann recommended the Board approve the budget that was originally approved by the AFC, which was a 4% salary increase for all of MHFD staff.  
   There was a lengthy discussion regarding whether to give staff 4% average salary increases at the beginning of 2021, or to give 2% salary increases to staff in January with the option for the executive director to consider giving up to an additional 2% mid-year after consulting the executive committee on the socio-economic conditions in their respective communities and the optics of giving raises to District employees during a time of high unemployment and with some municipal and county employees receiving no raises and even facing furloughs.
Mr. MacKenzie pointed out that this discussion does not change the proposed budget, but that he had already agreed to the executive committee’s suggestion to defer half of the proposed employee raises in return for that committee not opposing the adoption of the 2021 budget as a whole.

Council Member Gilmore recommended closing the public hearing and continuing the discussion during the resolution portion of the meeting.

The public hearing was closed at 2:05 p.m.

The Board continued to discuss the 2021 budget, specifically discussing the amount and when a salary increase for Staff might take effect.

b. **2020-2024 Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan**

Council Member Gilmore opened the Public Hearing at 2:31 p.m.

Mrs. Kroeger presented the 2020-2024 Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). All CIP projects must meet the following requirements:

- Requested by local governments
- Included in a Master Planning document
- 50% funding match from local government
- Project is maintained by local government
- Revenues from county spent in same county over the five-year period

Mrs. Kroeger explained that the process for sending out request letters has changed from physical letters to emails due to the current state of the pandemic. The District received requests totaling just over $33 million in project requests for 2021 from 31 different agencies.

Two resolutions were highlighted in the Five-Year CIP discussion. Resolution No. 64 adopts the 2021 Work Program and authorization of expenditures and Resolution No. 65 adopts the Five-Year CIP 2021 - 2024.

Council Member Gilmore asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board and public. There being none, the public hearing was closed at 2:36 p.m.

7. **Presentation Agenda**

   *(Each resolution will, after introduction and presentation from District staff, be placed on the Consent Agenda unless a request is made by a Board Member for action upon the resolution separately.)*

a. **Certification of Tax Levy**

   *(Resolution No. 63, Series of 2020)*

   Resolution No. 63, Certification of Tax Levy, was discussed during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

   There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 63 on the Consent Agenda.

b. **Adoption of 2021 Budget**

   *(Resolution No. 64, Series of 2020)*

   Resolution No. 64 was discussed in the public hearing portion of the meeting.

   During the discussion on the adoption of the 2021 budget there were motions and a substitute motion made that addressed the amount and when a salary increase for Staff might take effect. Ultimately, there was a consensus of the Board that a 2% Staff salary increase be implemented by Mr. MacKenzie beginning January 01, 2021 with the possibility of an additional increase of 2% mid-year, at the discretion of Mr. MacKenzie.

   Council President Gilmore made a motion to adopt the 2021 budget as outlined by Mr. MacKenzie Mayor Paul seconded.

   The motion passed with a vote of 21 ayes and with Council Member Clark voting nay.
c. Appropriation of Funds for 2021  
(Resolution No. 65, Series of 2020)  
Resolution No. 65, Appropriation of Funds for 2021, represents the expenditures component of the 2021 budget that was discussed during the Budget Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 65 on the Consent Agenda.

d. Adoption of 2021 Work Program and Authorization of Expenditures  
(Resolution No. 66, Series of 2020)  
Mr. MacKenzie presented Resolution No. 66, Adoption of 2021 Work Program and Authorization of Expenditures. This is an omnibus resolution that authorizes District expenditures that are typically funded 100% from District tax dollars without local government matching funds, and are not otherwise authorized individually under the District’s capital improvement and master planning programs.

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 66 on the Consent Agenda.

e. Adoption of Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2020 – 2024  
(Resolution No. 67, Series of 2020)  
Resolution No. 67, Adoption of Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) 2020-2024, was discussed during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting.

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 67 on the Consent Agenda.

f. Authorization to Participate in a Planning Study of Cottonwood, Lone Tree, Windmill, and Dove Creeks  
(Resolution No. 68, Series of 2020)  
In 2010, the Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority (SEMSWA), on behalf of Arapahoe County and the City of Centennial, requested an outfall systems planning study for Cottonwood, Lone Tree, Windmill, and Dove Creeks. SEMSWA will be the only funding partner.

Previous MHFD studies of Cottonwood, Lone Tree, Windmill, and Dove Creeks include:
- “Cottonwood Creek Outfall System Plan,” (Muller, 2010)

SEMSWA revised the hydrology for the watersheds using the new NOAA Atlas 14 rainfall values and CUHP Version 2.0, which produced results different from the previous study. MHFD reviewed and approved the revised hydrology. SEMSWA would like to revisit the recommendations from the 2010 studies to identify modifications required for the revised hydrology. The master planning costs are projected to be $180,000 with SEMSWA contributing $90,000.

Resolution No. 68 authorizes $90,000 of District funds from the General Fund to be at least matched by SEMSWA for the planning study.

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 68 on the Consent Agenda.

g. Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Lena Gulch at Zeta Street and Upstream, City of Golden, Jefferson County  
(Resolution No. 69, Series of 2020)  
This is a joint project with the City of Golden. The City of Golden desires to design, acquire right-of-way, and construct improvements along Lena Gulch from Zeta Street to its source in accordance with the “Upper Lena Gulch Major Drainageway Plan,” by Boyle Engineering Corporation from March 1994. The project reach is approximately one mile long and includes improvements to eroding banks, existing crossings, flood risk reduction, and evaluation of a new detention basin. Easement and right-of-way acquisition will be included in the project costs. The District and City of Golden will be selecting a consulting engineering firm for design. Construction is anticipated in 2022. The District and City of Golden have identified $2,000,000 in initial project costs for the design, right-of-way acquisition, and
construction with the District's participation being $1,000,000 in 2020 funds. It is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future.

Resolution No. 69 authorizes $1,000,000 of District funds from the Special Revenue Fund – Construction to be at least matched by City of Golden for the design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of the drainage elements of the project.

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 69 on the Consent Agenda.

h. **Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Jackass Gulch at Highline Canal, City of Littleton, Arapahoe County (Resolution No. 70, Series of 2020)**

   This is a joint project with the City of Littleton. The City of Littleton desires to design, acquire right-of-way, and construct improvements along Jackass Gulch in accordance with the "Outfall Systems Plan: Dad Clark Gulch," dated 1990. The project includes stream restoration and stabilization as well as construction of a flood control facility that will include a natural park area. Easement and right-of-way acquisition will be included in the project costs. The City of Littleton is administering the design with Calibre Engineering Company. The District and the City of Littleton have identified $350,000 in initial project costs for the design, right-of-way acquisition, and partial funding of construction with the District's participation being $175,000 in 2020 funds. It is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future.

   Resolution No. 70 authorizes $175,000 of District funds from the Special Revenue Fund – Construction to be at least matched by the City of Littleton for the design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of the drainage elements of the project.

   There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 70 on the Consent Agenda.

i. **Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Marcy Gulch from Stockpond to Wildcat Reserve Parkway, Highlands Ranch Metro District, Douglas County (Resolution No. 71, Series of 2020)**

   This is a joint project with Highlands Ranch Metro District (HRMD). HRMD desires to design, acquire right-of-way, and construct improvements along Marcy Gulch from Stockpond to Wildcat Reserve Parkway in accordance with the “Master Plan of Drainage for Marcy Gulch,” dated 1985. The project includes improvements to Marcy Gulch from Stockpond to Wildcat Reserve Parkway. HRMD already holds the necessary easements and right-of-way where the project will be carried out. HRMD is administering the design with Muller Engineering Company. The District and HRMD desire to construct the improvements, which will be managed by the District. Construction is anticipated in 2021. The District and HRMD have identified $850,000 in initial project costs for the design, right-of-way acquisition, and partial funding of construction with the District's participation being $425,000 in 2020 funds. It is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future.

   Resolution No. 71 authorizes $425,000 of District funds from the Special Revenue Fund – Construction to be at least matched by HRMD for the design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of the drainage elements of the project.

   There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 71 on the Consent Agenda.

j. **Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on the South Platte River - Globeville Levee from 31st Street to East 50th Avenue, City and County of Denver (Resolution No. 72, Series of 2020)**

   This is a joint project with the City and County of Denver (CCD). CCD desires to design, acquire right-of-way, and construct improvements along the South Platte River – Globeville Levee from 31st Street to East 50th Avenue in accordance with the "Globeville Levee Recertification Conceptual Design," dated July 2018. The project includes improvements to the Globeville Levee from 31st Street to East 50th
Avenue. CCD already holds the necessary easements and right-of-way where the project will be carried out. The District is administering the design with the Wilson and Company Engineering Company. The District and CCD desire to construct the improvements, which will be managed by CCD. The District and CCD have identified $2,000,000 in initial project costs for design with the District's participation being $500,000 in District funds transferred from the Sanderson Gulch Lipan Street to the South Platte River, Globeville Levee project, which is now complete. It is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future.

Resolution No. 72 authorizes $500,000 of District funds to be at least matched by CCD for the design of the drainage elements of the project, and CCD requests the South Platte River – Globeville Levee from 31st Street to East 50th Avenue project be added to the 2020-2024 Five Year Capital Improvement Plan.

There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolution No. 72 on the Consent Agenda.

8. Consent Agenda

Mr. MacKenzie announced that the agenda items under the Consent Agenda would not include presentations, and asked the Board if they had any questions regarding any of the resolutions included on the Consent Agenda. There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to place Resolutions No. 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, and 74, Series of 2020, and the Review of Cash Disbursements dated August, September, and October 2020 on the Consent Agenda.

a. Review of Cash Disbursements

The Cash Disbursement list, dated August, September, and October 2020, has been distributed to the Board for review. There being no further comments or questions, it was the consensus of the Board to include approval of the Cash Disbursements on the Consent Agenda.

b. Additional Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Coal Creek from County Line Road to Kenosha Road, Town of Erie, Boulder County (Resolution No. 73, Series of 2020)

c. Additional Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Happy Canyon Creek Upstream of Interstate 25, Douglas County (Resolution No. 74, Series of 2020)

9. Vote on Approval of the Consent Agenda

Council Member Kashmann moved and Mayor Piko seconded the motion to adopt the Consent Agenda. Upon a roll call vote, the motion was passed unanimously.

10. Other Business

a. Call for Volunteers: Nominating Committee for 2021 Officers

Ms. Deleon will email the Board requesting volunteers for the Nominating committee for 2021 officers. Those on the committee are ineligible to serve as an officer.

b. Call for Volunteers: 2021 Legislative Committee

Ms. Deleon will email the Board requesting volunteers for the Legislative committee for 2021.

11. Reports/Discussions

a. Executive Director’s Report

Budget Update

Mr. MacKenzie informed the Board that the District has collected all but $2 million of the current budgeted revenue. The District has expended about 80% construction and about 60% maintenance of budgeted funds. Mr. MacKenzie assured the Board that the District will meet most of the budgeted goals for expenditures. Revenue is also on target for the budget goals.

Local Government Satisfaction Survey

Mr. MacKenzie provided the Board with an update on the annual Local Government Satisfaction Survey. Mr. MacKenzie shared a brief overview of survey results with the Board. Mr. MacKenzie suggested that the survey should not be anonymous in the future in order to reach out to those who had concerns that needed to be addressed.
12. Announcements

13. Executive Sessions
   a. Executive Committee Report of Director’s Annual Review
      (Pursuant to 24-6-402(4)(f)(1) CRS)
      Mayor Starker at 3:03 p.m. moved to go into executive session to discuss Mr. MacKenzie’s annual
      review. The motion was seconded by Mayor Castriotta and the motion passed unanimously. The
      executive session was closed at 3:16 p.m.

   b. Provide Board with Legal Advice
      (Pursuant to 24-6-402(4)(b) CRS)
      Council Member Kashmann at 3:16 p.m. moved to go into executive session to receive legal advice
      regarding a draft policy addressing employees’ and board members’ potential conflicts of interest. The
      motion was seconded by Commissioner Sharpe. The executive session was closed at 3:40 p.m.

14. Adjournment
    Council Member Gilmore adjourned the meeting at 3:42 p.m.
WHEREAS, Section 32-11-220(1)(l), CRS, provides that: “The district also has the following powers: To have and exercise all rights and powers necessary or incidental to or implied from the specific powers granted in this article, which specific powers shall not be considered as a limitation upon any power necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and intent of this article,” and

WHEREAS, from time to time state and federal legislation is proposed and being acted upon which would affect the operations of the District; and

WHEREAS, each year, a Legislative Committee is established by the Board of Directors for the following calendar year.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. There is hereby established in the place and stead of any previous Legislative Committee (Committee) a Committee composed of board members Mayor Bud Starker, Commissioner Matt Jones, Commissioner Lora Thomas, and Mr. Dave Sellards selected by the Board of Directors (Board) from the members of the board.

2. The Legislative Committee shall review and evaluate, from time to time, on behalf of the Board, pending state and federal legislation which would affect the operations of the District. Actions of the Legislative Committee shall include, but not be limited to; review and evaluate pending legislation, both state and federal; direct the District's lobbyists and/or Executive Director to advocate, oppose or monitor individual bills; and to receive updates and advice on activities at the city and county level which are applicable to the District.

3. The Committee shall report to the Board at the next regularly scheduled Board meeting any actions taken by the Committee along with a summary of any bills or activities that may affect the District.
WHEREAS, 24-18-109(3) CRS states that "a member of the governing body of a local government who has a personal or private interest in any matter proposed or pending before the governing body shall disclose such interest to the governing body and shall not vote thereon [except as necessary to obtain a quorum] and shall refrain from attempting to influence the decisions of the other members of the governing body in voting on the matter;” and

WHEREAS, Article XXIX Section 1(c) of the Colorado Constitution states that government officials and employees should also avoid conduct that "creates a justifiable impression among members of the public that [the public] trust is being violated;” and

WHEREAS, the enabling legislation of the District 32-11-213(1) CRS states that “no director, officer, employee, or agent of the district shall be interested in any contract or transaction with the district, except in his official representative capacity or as is provided in his contract of employment with the district…;” and

WHEREAS, the enabling legislation of the District (32-11-801 CRS) requires that an annual independent audit be made pertaining to the financial affairs of the District as provided in the Local Government Budget Law of Colorado, the Colorado Local Government Uniform Accounting Law, and the Colorado Local Government Audit Law; and

WHEREAS, the District currently has an Engineering Consultant and Contractor Selection Process (Exhibit A), which was developed explicitly to prevent conflicts of interest from impacting the proper selection of vendors, and which prohibits any employee, director, or local government representative with a conflict of interest from participating in the selection process; and

WHEREAS, the District currently defines conflicts of interest in its employee policy manual which states that “If an employee has any situation which may be an actual or potential conflict of interest, the employee must disclose this to the Executive Director as soon as possible…,” but is otherwise lacking in specificity as to what actions follow; and

WHEREAS, current District employees, including those in upper management positions, have disclosed conflicts of interest and are in need of a clear, robust policy that protects them, the District, and the taxpayers.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

The Board of Directors of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District d/b/a Mile High Flood District hereby adopts the following Policy Regarding Conflicts of Interest in Contracting:

1. For the purpose of this policy, conflicts and potential conflicts of interest in contracting are treated equally. These situations exist when an employee or Board Director participates personally and substantially in a contract or formation of a contract (explicitly including the selection process) that would have a direct and predictable and significant effect on the employee’s or Board Director’s own financial interest, or the financial interest of another party with whom the employee or Board Director has a close personal relationship (including but not limited to a spouse, ex-spouse, parent, sibling, child, partner, or other relative by blood or in-law), or any person or entity with whom the employee or Board Director serves as an officer, director, trustee or employee, or any person or entity with whom the employee or Board Director is negotiating or has an arrangement for prospective future employment or significant financial relationship (including but limited to a partnership, co-ownership, loan, joint investment, etc.).

2. If an employee has a conflict or a potential conflict of interest, that employee must disclose it in writing to the Executive Director.

3. If a Board Director has a conflict or a potential conflict of interest, that Board Director must disclose it in writing to the Board Executive Committee.
4. No employee, including the Executive Director, having a conflict of interest shall sign contracts or checks for vendors with respect to whom they have a conflict of interest, nor be involved in the process through which that vendor is selected.

5. No Board Director having a conflict of interest shall sign contracts or checks for vendors with respect to whom they have a conflict of interest, nor be involved in the process through which that vendor is selected.

6. Board Directors having a conflict of interest in contracting shall not vote on resolutions related to matters involving parties with respect to whom they have conflict of interest.

7. The Executive Director shall, on an annual basis, provide the District's annual independent auditor with a list of all signed contracts, including the contact information of the employee who initiated each contract. For contracts that include local government funding the list shall also include the local government representative who participated in the selection process. The Executive director shall highlight those contracts with which there are known conflicts of interest.

8. The District’s annual independent auditor shall confidentially interview those employees initiating contracts and, where applicable, at least one local government representative who participated in the selection process, related to known conflicts of interest, and shall report their findings back to the Board of Directors in their annual presentation detailing their examination of the District’s financial statements.

9. Based on the findings of the annual independent auditor’s report, the Executive Director will take action for any issues with employees, as guided by the District’s Employee Policy Manual; and the Board of Directors’ executive committee will take action for any issues with Directors, as guided by the Board of Director’s Bylaws and Rules of Procedure.

10. Employees having conflicts of interest who are following this policy and are otherwise adequately performing their assigned duties shall not be barred from promotions or otherwise discriminated upon based solely on their conflict of interest.

11. The District’s Engineering Consultant and Contractor Selection Process (Exhibit A) has been developed explicitly to prevent conflicts of interest from impacting the proper selection of vendors. The Executive Director shall maintain and update this document periodically, ensuring it conforms to this policy and is followed at all times.

12. The Executive Director shall incorporate this policy into the District’s Employee Policy Manual and into the Board of Director's Bylaws and Rules of Procedure, as appropriate.

URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
d/b/a
MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT
Date: ______________________
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ATTEST:

Secretary

Chairperson
CONSULTANTS

The Mile High Flood District (MHFD) follows the American Society of Civil Engineer’s (ASCE) qualification-based selection (QBS) process when engaging engineering consultants. This method of selecting a consultant was identified as the preferred method of engaging engineering consultants by a national task force in 1964 and published in the ASCE’s Manual on Engineering Practice No. 45 (1964, 2002). The federal government and many states, including Colorado, require QBS for engineering services, emphasizing that responsible selection be based on relevant qualifications and not solely on cost. The cost of the engineering services is negotiated only after the best-qualified consultant is selected. If an agreeable cost cannot be negotiated, then the next best-qualified consultant shall be selected, and the cost of the engineering services is negotiated with that firm.

MHFD maintains a list of prequalified engineering consultants. This list is opened annually for newly qualifying and requalifying consultant consideration based on the consultants’ statements of qualifications (SOQ). Consultants demonstrate interest in prequalification by completing an interest form on the MHFD website. From this large list of interested consultants, and by vote, MHFD staff, representatives from every local government served by MHFD, and a MHFD Director appointed under 32-11-204(6a & 6b) C.R.S. (i.e., a Board-appointed Engineer), create a short list of consultants who will then submit SOQs. In no case shall a vote be taken unless the local government representatives plus the Board-appointed Engineer outnumber MHFD staff, and no employee, local government representative, or Board-appointed Engineer shall vote if they have a conflict of interest with any of the consultants. In this manner the final selection is again weighted toward the local governments, avoiding any potential conflict of interest with MHFD staff.

The final prequalification selection is based on each consultant’s SOQ, and decided by local government representatives (including at least one from within each of the seven counties MHFD serves) and MHFD staff plus a Board-appointed Engineer. In no case shall a vote be taken unless the local government representatives plus the Board-appointed Engineer outnumber MHFD staff, and no employee, local government representative, or Board-appointed Engineer shall vote if they have a conflict of interest with any of the consultants. In this manner the final selection is again weighted toward the local governments, avoiding any potential conflict of interest with MHFD staff. Once a consultant is on the prequalified list, they can remain on the list for up to four years if they receive satisfactory annual performance evaluations from MHFD staff and local government representatives. At the end of the four-year period consultants must resubmit their SOQ in an open prequalification competition.

Prequalified consultants are then selected for individual projects by the local government partners either by direct selection or an interview depending on the size of the project. In the case where there is no local government participation, MHFD staff members without conflicts of interest shall select a prequalified consultant based on specific qualifications and availability.

Engineering consulting selection for planning studies shall be handled in a similar annual competitive process that includes selection weighted toward the local governments, avoiding any potential conflicts of interest with MHFD staff. Special projects can require the services of specialized consultants not on the prequalified list; selection of these consultants is handled on a case-by-case basis but always with emphasis on the avoidance of any potential conflicts of interest.

MHFD controls engineering costs by maintaining a database of hourly rates from an annual survey completed by those consultants we work with. Except in the case of highly specialized services, and will not pay hourly rates greater than one standard deviation above the corresponding average rate from the database. This strategy frequently results in consultants providing MHFD with lower hourly rates than their other clients in order to continue working with us.
After a consultant is selected, the project team (which consists of the MHFD project manager, local government project manager and the consultant) work together to draft a detailed scope of work. The consultant then submits a fee proposal based on hours and rates, and the project sponsors negotiate the final cost of services into a legally-binding agreement. Amendments to the agreement for additional services are managed in the same way. The local government sponsors are involved in the entire process and are asked to formally acknowledge the terms of all engineering agreements and subsequent amendments.

CONTRACTORS

MHFD maintains a list of prequalified construction contractors. This list is opened every other year for newly qualifying and requalifying contractors. An advertisement requesting SOQs from interested contractors is posted on the MHFD website and disseminated in a number of other forums.

Local government representatives (including at least one from within each of the seven counties MHFD serves) are invited to join MHFD staff and a Board-appointed Engineer to evaluate each contractor's SOQ. In no case shall a vote be taken unless the local government representatives plus the Board-appointed Engineer outnumber MHFD staff, and no employee, local government representative, or Board-appointed Engineer shall vote if they have a conflict of interest with any of the contractors. In this manner the final selection is weighted toward the local governments, avoiding any potential conflict of interest with MHFD staff. The contractor’s qualifications are evaluated based on drainage and flood mitigation construction experience in an urban setting, and performance over the past two years. While experience and performance are weighted equally in this process, experience is rated first and only those contractors who meet the experience requirement are eligible to have their performance evaluated.

Once a contractor is on the prequalified list, that contractor may remain on the list for up to four years if they receive satisfactory annual performance evaluations by MHFD staff and local government representatives. At the end of the four-year period contractors must resubmit their SOQ in an open prequalification competition.

The selection of contractors from the prequalified list depends on the size and complexity of the project. For annual stream management contracts and for small projects involving only MHFD funding, a contractor is selected by MHFD staff based on expertise and availability, and a fair price is then negotiated. If negotiations are not satisfactory to MHFD, another contractor is selected.

For larger projects involving local government partners, the local government sponsor can choose from three project delivery options, including: 1) Traditional Design-Bid-Build, 2) Modified Design-Bid-Build using the prequalified list of contractors, or 3) the District’s alternative project delivery option called Project Partners. MHFD remains flexible in this matter in order to best serve the needs of the local government.

With the Project Partners process, a contractor is selected for a specific project based on qualifications in a manner similar to MHFD’s engineering consultant selection discussed above, and not by low bid. The final selection shall be weighted toward the local government(s) co-funding and/or co-managing the project. The contractor is then paid an agreed-upon hourly rate to participate in the design process and offer expertise on means, methods, materials, and permitting requirements. Upon completion of the design process, the contractor estimates the construction costs to construct the project. In the absence of a competitive bidding process, these costs are controlled by comparing them to the engineering consultant’s construction cost estimates, with any discrepancies between those costs negotiated. If contractor cost negotiations are not satisfactory to MHFD staff or to the local government representative(s), then the design team will develop the plans to a condition sufficient for bidding upon and go through the Modified Design-Bid-Build process with the prequalified contractors.
WHEREAS, the District, in a policy statement previously adopted (Resolution No. 14, Series of 1970 and Resolution No. 11, Series of 1973), expressed an intent to assist public bodies which have heretofore enacted floodplain zoning measures; and

WHEREAS, Commerce City has enacted floodplain regulations; and

WHEREAS, Commerce City and the District cooperated in the preparation of "Irondale Gulch OSP," dated September 2011 which recommends a regional detention pond on Irondale Gulch at 7420 East 86th Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the 4.26-acre property at 7420 East 86th Avenue on Irondale Gulch was identified in the outfall systems plan as a site for regional detention; and

WHEREAS, Commerce City has commissioned a land value appraisal of said property, which values it at $1,160,000; and

WHEREAS, Commerce City has now negotiated an offer of $1,160,000 for said property, which offer is agreeable to the property owner as full and final payment; and

WHEREAS, Commerce City has requested the District participate for $300,000 in 2020 for this purchase; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future; and

WHEREAS, the District’s policy regarding preservation of floodways and floodplains and the purchase of land for future improvements (Resolution No. 67, Series of 2019) authorizes the District’s participation in the acquisition of undeveloped floodplains to prevent unsafe development and for future improvements; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors adopted a budget for 2020 (Resolution No. 63, Series of 2019) which includes $2,000,000 for floodplain preservation within the District.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Executive Director of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District d/b/a Mile High Flood District is authorized to execute an agreement with Commerce City for the purchase of the property at 7420 East 86th Avenue for an amount not to exceed $300,000.

2. If additional funds are needed in the future for this purchase, the Executive Director will bring the request for additional funds to the Board for approval.

3. Upon taking ownership of the property at 7420 East 86th Avenue, Commerce City shall restrict its future use to that of regional detention, preserved floodplain, and open space only.
URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
d/b/a
MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT
Date: ________________

ATTEST:

____________________________________  ________________________
Secretary                                     Chairperson
RESOLUTION NO. 77, SERIES OF 2020
(Authorization to Purchase the Property at 7420 East 86th Avenue, Commerce City, Adams County)

EXHIBIT A
WHEREAS, the District cooperated with the City of Thornton and Adams County in the preparation of an outfall systems planning study for Basin 4100 and DFA 0056 (Resolution No. 62, Series of 2016) (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director executed an agreement for engineering services with the consulting firm Olsson Associates to conduct studies and prepare an outfall systems planning report for Basin 4100 and DFA 0056; and

WHEREAS, Olsson Associates has completed the study and submitted to the District the report titled “Basin 4100 and DFA 0056 Outfall Systems Planning Study,” dated September 2020.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Board of Directors of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District d/b/a Mile High Flood District hereby accepts the report titled “Basin 4100 and DFA 0056 Outfall Systems Planning Study,” dated September 2020, and recommends that all drainage, flood control and stormwater management infrastructure and practices recommended in the report be used to guide future drainage and flood control planning, land development, and design and construction of all such infrastructure within jurisdiction covered by said plan.

URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT

d/b/a

MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT

Date: ______________________

(SEAL)

ATTEST:

__________________________________________  __________________________________________
Secretary                                                   Chairperson
WHEREAS, the District, in a policy statement previously adopted (Resolution No. 14, Series of 1970 and Resolution No. 11, Series of 1973), expressed an intent to assist public bodies which have heretofore enacted floodplain zoning measures; and

WHEREAS, Douglas County has enacted floodplain regulations; and

WHEREAS, Douglas County and the District cooperated in the preparation of “Willow Creek, Little Willow Creek, and East Willow Creek Outfall Systems Plan Preliminary Design Report,” dated December 1998 and “Plum Creek Outfall Systems Plan,” dated July 2003; which recommend improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek; and

WHEREAS, Douglas County has requested that the District manage the design and construction of improvements required as a result of a development in lieu of the Sterling Ranch Development Company designing and constructing those improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, preliminary project costs are estimated to be $8,000,000; and

WHEREAS, the District established a water activity enterprise known as the Development Services Enterprise (DSE) (Resolution No. 38, Series of 2017) which allows the District to collect design, construction, and administration fees to manage the design and construction of drainage and flood control improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek; and

WHEREAS, expenditures in 2020 from the DSE have been budgeted (Resolution No. 62, Series of 2019).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Executive Director of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District d/b/a Mile High Flood District is authorized to execute the necessary agreements with Douglas County for the design and construction of drainage and flood control improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek.

2. The District is authorized to collect from Douglas County sufficient fees to cover the cost of the preliminary design, the final design, and construction of the improvements, plus the District’s administrative fee and to deposit those fees in a project-specific account in a separate Development Services Enterprise (DSE) fund which shall be set apart from all other funds of the District.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into agreements with qualified engineers, qualified contractors, and others as necessary for the design and construction of drainage and flood control improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek.
URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
d/b/a
MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 79, SERIES OF 2020
(Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on the Sterling Ranch Development along Sterling Gulch, Willow Creek, and Little Willow Creek, Douglas County)

EXHIBIT A
WHEREAS, the District, in a policy statement previously adopted (Resolution No. 14, Series of 1970 and Resolution No. 11, Series of 1973), expressed an intent to assist public bodies which have heretofore enacted floodplain zoning measures; and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County has enacted floodplain regulations; and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County and the District cooperated in the preparation of “Weaver Creek Major Drainage Way Plan,” dated February 2018; which recommends improvements on Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue; and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County has requested District participation in the design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of improvements at three locations along Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, Jefferson County has estimated the initial project costs to be $295,000; and

WHEREAS, the District’s participation being authorized by this resolution is $100,000 to be at least matched by Jefferson County; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future; and

WHEREAS, the District has adopted, subsequent to a public hearing, a Special Revenue Fund – Construction Budget (Resolution No. 62, Series of 2019) for calendar year 2020, which includes funds for design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of drainage and flood control improvements along Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the District has adopted, subsequent to a public hearing, a Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (Resolution No. 65, Series of 2019) which includes funds for the improvements along Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Executive Director of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District d/b/a Mile High Flood District is authorized to execute the necessary agreements with Jefferson County for the design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of drainage and flood control improvements on Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue.

2. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into agreements with qualified engineers, qualified contractors, and others as necessary for the design, acquisition of right-of-way, and construction of drainage and flood control improvements on Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue.

3. The District’s maximum contribution to the Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue project, without prior approval of the Board, shall be $100,000 plus interest earned on monies deposited in the project fund, which contribution shall be at least matched by Jefferson County.

4. Such approval for expenditure of District funds is contingent upon Jefferson County agreeing to regulate and control any defined floodplain in the Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue project area in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program Regulation as a minimum; agreeing to maintain the completed facilities in a manner acceptable to the District; granting the District access to the completed improvements at all times; and agreeing not to make any changes to the improvements without the District’s approval.
URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
d/b/a
MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT

RESOLUTION NO. 80, SERIES OF 2020
(Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Weaver Creek at Belleview Avenue, Jefferson County)

EXHIBIT A
WHEREAS, the District, in a policy statement previously adopted (Resolution No. 14, Series of 1970 and Resolution No. 11, Series of 1973), expressed an intent to assist public bodies which have heretofore enacted floodplain zoning measures; and

WHEREAS, the City of Louisville has enacted floodplain regulations; and

WHEREAS, the City of Louisville and the District have determined that a major drainageway need exists for improvements on Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the Board previously authorized $379,548.60 for the Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue project (Table 1); and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution No.</th>
<th>Series of</th>
<th>District Authorization</th>
<th>Local Share</th>
<th>Work Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$379,548.60</td>
<td>$483,257.95</td>
<td>Design, Right-of-Way, and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$379,548.60</td>
<td>$483,257.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHEREAS, the City of Louisville and the District now desire to continue design and fund construction improvements along Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the District’s additional participation being authorized by this resolution is $250,000 to be at least matched by the City of Louisville; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that additional funds may be required for this project in the future; and

WHEREAS, the District has adopted, subsequent to a public hearing, a Special Revenue Fund – Construction Budget (Resolution No. 62, Series of 2019) for calendar year 2020 which includes funds for construction of drainage and flood control improvements along Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the District has adopted, subsequent to a public hearing, a Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan (Resolution No. 65, Series of 2019) which includes funds for the improvements along Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

1. Resolution No. 39, Series of 2020, Paragraph 3, is amended as follows:
   “The District's maximum contribution to the Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue project without prior approval of the Board shall be $379,548.60 $629,548.60 plus interest earned on monies deposited in the project fund, which contribution shall be at least matched by the City of Louisville.”

2. All other conditions and authorizations remain as stated in Resolution No. 39, Series of 2020.
URBAN DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT  
d/b/a  
MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT  

RESOLUTION NO. 81, SERIES OF 2020  
(Additional Authorization to Participate in Drainage and Flood Control Improvements on Coal Creek Drainageway A-1 at Garfield Avenue, City of Louisville, Boulder County)  

EXHIBIT A
# MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT
## BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET ITEM:</th>
<th>2019 Actual</th>
<th>2020 Budget</th>
<th>Actual as of 10/31/2020</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beginning Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABOR Emergency Reserve</td>
<td>1,026,000</td>
<td>1,420,500</td>
<td>1,428,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Preservation Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Future Operations</td>
<td>1,457,324</td>
<td>1,418,475</td>
<td>4,079,292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>43,391,369</td>
<td>62,860,500</td>
<td>61,692,585</td>
<td>1,167,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Ownership Taxes</td>
<td>3,403,210</td>
<td>3,100,000</td>
<td>3,044,992</td>
<td>55,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent Property Tax Interest</td>
<td>42,984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,746</td>
<td>(36,746)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Interest</td>
<td>429,121</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>311,315</td>
<td>38,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Participation Funds Returned</td>
<td>19,414</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Participation Interest Returned</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Income</td>
<td>83,439</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>47,375,948</td>
<td>66,358,500</td>
<td>65,092,241</td>
<td>1,266,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers from other Funds</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds Available</strong></td>
<td>48,833,271</td>
<td>68,276,975</td>
<td>69,171,533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Projects</td>
<td>14,260,000</td>
<td>22,832,000</td>
<td>18,295,000</td>
<td>4,537,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Services</td>
<td>14,336,528</td>
<td>16,915,000</td>
<td>12,213,055</td>
<td>4,701,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll and Benefits</td>
<td>5,321,660</td>
<td>6,413,480</td>
<td>4,790,337</td>
<td>1,623,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Platte River</td>
<td>3,935,248</td>
<td>5,209,000</td>
<td>2,944,325</td>
<td>2,264,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Costs</td>
<td>2,457,362</td>
<td>3,221,700</td>
<td>1,872,957</td>
<td>1,348,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Development</td>
<td>1,065,858</td>
<td>2,295,000</td>
<td>1,186,995</td>
<td>1,108,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Preservation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>101,427</td>
<td>1,898,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Warning</td>
<td>977,238</td>
<td>1,140,000</td>
<td>968,040</td>
<td>171,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Planning Studies</td>
<td>891,384</td>
<td>1,060,500</td>
<td>723,640</td>
<td>336,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management</td>
<td>498,783</td>
<td>1,040,000</td>
<td>763,534</td>
<td>276,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Services</td>
<td>107,918</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>52,866</td>
<td>37,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>43,851,979</td>
<td>62,216,680</td>
<td>43,912,177</td>
<td>18,304,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue minus Expenditures</td>
<td>3,523,969</td>
<td>4,141,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers to other Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Floodplain Preservation Reserve</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Preservation Reserve Balance</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in TABOR Emergency Reserve</td>
<td>402,000</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABOR Emergency Reserve Balance</td>
<td>1,428,000</td>
<td>1,990,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABOR Emergency Reserve as % of Expenditures</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending Fund Balance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for Future Operations</td>
<td>4,079,292</td>
<td>1,990,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revenues and Expenditures as of 10/31/2020

- **Construction Projects**: 22,832,000
- **Maintenance Services**: 16,915,000
- **Payroll and Benefits**: 6,413,480
- **South Platte River**: 5,209,000
- **Operating Costs**: 4,790,337
- **Operations and Development**: 3,221,700
- **Floodplain Preservation**: 2,944,325
- **Flood Warning**: 1,872,957
- **Watershed Planning Studies**: 1,186,995
- **Floodplain Management**: 1,040,000
- **Contract Services**: 90,000

**Revenue**

- **Total Revenue**: 66,358,500
- **Floodplain Management**: 101,427
- **Watershed Planning Studies**: 1,060,500
- **Flood Warning**: 2,295,000
- **Operations and Development**: 1,186,995
- **Floodplain Preservation**: 2,000,000
- **South Platte River**: 52,866
- **Payroll and Benefits**: 90,000
- **Construction Projects**: 1,140,000
- **Maintenance Services**: 968,040

**Expenditures**

- **Total Expenditures**: 65,092,241
- **Contract Services**: 1,040,000
- **Floodplain Management**: 763,534
- **Watershed Planning Studies**: 723,640
- **Flood Warning**: 2,944,325
- **Operations and Development**: 1,186,995
- **Floodplain Preservation**: 2,000,000
- **South Platte River**: 2,944,325
- **Payroll and Benefits**: 968,040
- **Construction Projects**: 1,140,000
- **Maintenance Services**: 1,040,000

**Budget Summary**

- **2020 Budget**: 66,358,500
- **Actual as of 10/31/2020**: 65,092,241