

Urban Flood Safety & Water Quality District

2026-27 Hearing Minutes

Thursday, May 21, 2026

1:00 P.M

1880 NE Elrod Dr

Portland, Oregon

Present:

TSCC:

Chair Matt Donahue,
Vice Chair Dr. Rita Moore,
Commissioner Tod Burton,
Commissioner Dr. Will Terry,
Commissioner Erik Kvarsten,
Executive Director Allegra Willhite,
Budget Analyst Brittanie Abayare

Absent: None

Urban Flood Safety and Water Quality District (UFSWQD) Board and Staff:

Kayla Calkins, Board Chair
Phil Ralston, Board Vice Chair
Eric Mueller, Board Director
Heather King, Board Director
Steve Fancher, Executive Director
Dan Eisenbeis, Board Member
Lori Baker, Director of Finance and Administration
Colin Rowan, Director of Planning Public Affairs
Angel Almendarez, Senior Finance Manager
Kevin Severson, Chief Engineer and Capital Program Manager
Angelique Nomie, Executive Assistant
Jeremiah Hess, Senior Engineer

Opening Remarks and Introductions

Chair Matt Donahue called the annual Urban Flood Safety and Water Quality District Budget Hearing to order and welcomed attendees. He stated that the Tax Supervising and Conservation Commission (TSCC) is a community oversight commission established by the Oregon Legislature over 100 years ago that oversees the budgets of all TSCC member taxing districts, conducts budget reviews, and holds public hearings to provide opportunities for public comment before budget adoption.

The TSCC commissioners and staff introduced themselves as did the district representatives.

Executive Director Steve Fancher welcomed the commission, noting they were excited to participate in the collaborative process.

Public Comment

No members of the public had signed up for testimony.

Commissioner Questions and District Responses

Question 1: Asked by Commissioner Erik Kvarsten: “Capital projects are a large part of your budget. Could you please give us an update on two of the most significant projects that were included in your budget last year and continue in FY 27: the Portland International Raceway (PIR) Pump Station Replacement in the General Fund, and the Portland Metro Levee System (PMLS) bond funded project? Are they proceeding as expected in terms of timeline and cost?”

- **Dan Eisenbeis** (Board Member) answered that the PIR pump station replacement project is listed in the district's general fund budget, but the primary source of funding for the current design phase is a FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) natural hazard mitigation grant, and the primary source of funding for construction will also need to be from a grant source such as a FEMA BRIC (Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities) grant. He noted the district does not have that grant in hand currently, and the project will not proceed with construction without a large external grant funding source, so the anticipated timeline for completion has never been definitive. The pump station is currently owned by the City of Portland, and the agreement with the city specifies that ownership will be transferred to the district after it has been replaced. The design of the project is nearing 100%, is on budget, and on schedule. The district and city recently submitted a pre-application for construction funding under the FEMA BRIC program, which is active again. The local match for this funding must still be identified, and staff anticipate hearing back soon on whether they can proceed with a formal application.
- In regards to the Portland Metro Levee System (PMLS) packages of projects, the district continues to work closely with the Army Corps. Those packages are led by the Corps with support from the district as the non-federal sponsor. Detailed project scopes and cost estimates are being refined as designs advance. Prior to proceeding with construction of any of the PMLS projects, a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) must be signed between the Corps and the district. While this agreement was expected to occur in the fall of 2026, the district has been informed by the Army Corps that it is now anticipated in the fall of 2027. The delay is due to a new Army Corps policy that requires the design of all packages to be at 35% before such an agreement is signed. This delay is not anticipated to impact the overall construction schedule.

Chair Matt Donahue asked a follow-up question: He asked if the pump station is waiting on a FEMA grant and what the plan is for the local match, specifically if they would use General Obligation bond funds.

- **Dan Eisenbeis and Steve Fancher** answered that the design is currently funded through a FEMA grant and the district has submitted a pre-application for different FEMA grant for construction. They explained that the local match for construction is still to be determined, as they are negotiating with the City of Portland around the overall funding of these types of projects. It could potentially be funded from the

district's bond, by the City of Portland, or from another grant source to be determined.

Question 2: Asked by Commissioner Tod Burton: "I think you actually answered a lot of my question. You note in the budget that the PMLS project is 65% funded by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. We know federal funding has been disrupted for some of districts we work with - is the project included in the Corps budget, and what is the timeline for receiving the funds?"

- **Steve Fancher** clarified that the design portion of the project is not delayed and is proceeding on a 65% federal and 35% local match. He then deferred to staff to expand on the federal funding status.
- **Colin Rowan (Director of Planning and Public Affairs)** answered that the federal funding impact on PMLS is largely related to the annual appropriation. The project is fully authorized through an act of Congress, meaning the federal government is committed to construct the project, and the district must request annual appropriations, which they have successfully received each year. Currently, the House is putting together the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Bill, and the district believes they will be included in that draft. Rowan emphasized that the project is a high priority for both the Portland District and the Northwestern Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Oregon's congressional delegation has been strong supporters of this project, positioning the district as well as possible in the current environment.

Commissioner Tod Burton asked a follow-up question: inquiring if they are positioning themselves to address this in case the funding doesn't come through.

- **Dan Eisenbeis** answered that while they are optimistic that the Army Corps will continue to receive annual appropriations, there remains a lot of uncertainty about federal investments and capacity overall. Because flood risk is real and large storms and atmospheric rivers are becoming more frequent, the engineering team added a new flood risk assessment methodology to the CIP development process this fiscal year to help prioritize projects. If federal funding were stopped or delayed, staff would apply that methodology to reassess investments and timing, seek other funding support through regional, state, or other federal partners, and consider if the current bond would adequately complete priority projects.

Commissioner Tod Burton asked an additional follow-up question inquiring whether any bonds have been issued yet in the public market.

- **Lori Baker** (Director of Finance and Administration) answered that because the district is a new organization without a credit rating, they issued a bank offering of \$15.7 million in September, which cost less than a penny per \$1,000 for taxpayers. Design work is currently being performed using those funds, and the district does not anticipate needing to issue the rest of the bonds for another year. The district is utilizing a \$20 million grant received from the State of Oregon to fund the G.O. Bond program spending for the upcoming year. They anticipate doing a public offering for the remainder of the bond funds in the subsequent year, at which point they will have

a three-year operational track record that will make it easier to work with rating agencies.

Commissioner Tod Burton asked an additional follow-up question for updates regarding the bond oversight committee.

- **Dan Eisenbeis** answered that the Bond Accountability Committee has been formally established. The Board approved the charter and recruitment plan late last year, reviewed applications in January, and appointed a five-member committee in February. The committee members are Edmundo Adriano Jr., Nancy Hendrickson, Keith Hobson, Patricia Kent, and a Parks and Recreation representative. Their first meeting will be in July, and they will meet quarterly to review bond project progress. Staff will provide reports and field visits, and the committee will be responsible for reporting progress to the public.
- **Lori Baker** added that Keith Hobson is the committee's finance representative, and the Board selected a mix of individuals with different qualifications.
- **Dan Eisenbeis** added that the Board is looking forward to the public-facing accountability and transparency that this committee provides.

Question 3: Asked by Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore: "Last year, the district committed to developing performance metrics and key performance indicators (KPIs) based on updated levels of service by the summer of 2026. What specific metrics have been finalized, and how will these be reported to the public to demonstrate the value of the new district?"

- **Eric Mueller (Board Director)** answered that while no specific metrics have been finalized yet, the district has made substantial progress. The Board recently adopted a strategic plan, and while it was being finalized, staff worked with community partners to define "community levels of service" by asking what the community expects from district services. Staff also worked across departments to draft "technical levels of service," which include measurable indicators like system reliability, staff training compliance, equipment uptime, monitoring of equipment, and the infrastructure's ability to function across different design storms. Once complete in the fall, the district will incorporate these KPIs and ongoing progress into annual reports and other public-facing outlets to help monitor progress and prioritize funding.

Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore asked a follow-up question inquiring if they anticipate going out to the public in the fall.

- **Colin Rowan** answered that they are already engaging the public, working directly with community-based organizations to integrate their expectations. He explained that while regulatory requirements from DEQ and the Army Corps of Engineers drive the technical levels of service, they want to establish a clear through-line between the Board's strategic priorities, the budget, and actual performance using these levels of service in a way that people can clearly understand.

Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore asked an additional follow-up for the definition of level of service.

- **Colin Rowan** answered that level of service is defined as "how much of something we do and how we do it," spanning the entire organization. For example, in the ditch system, it describes how much of a design storm can be carried through the system, culverts, and pump stations (how much they can pump). It also covers emergency management, response times, and similar metrics. While statutory requirements are established in the special district's creating statute, the statute doesn't specify "how much" of those things the district does, which is what they are defining.

Question 4: Asked by Commissioner Dr. Will Terry: "We see flooding issues happening on the coast and in other parts of the state. How does the district coordinate with the broader state and region in terms of flood issues?"

- **Board Chair Kayla Calkins** answered that the district's robust emergency preparedness program includes planning for various flood scenarios and training for staff. They coordinate closely with local cities, Multnomah County Emergency Management, and Oregon Emergency Management, taking the stance that a major storm bringing flooding is a question of "when," not "if." The district also leads a coalition of levee operators across Oregon to share information and elevate flood safety at the state level. This coalition successfully coordinated with legislators and Business Oregon (the Oregon Business Development Department) to establish the state's levee grant program.
- **Lori Baker** added detail regarding operational and capital funding. Operating revenue (around \$16 million to \$17 million) comes from property assessments in the floodplain, heavily supported by the Port of Portland, and a Flood Safety Intergovernmental Fee paid by municipal partners inside the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of Multnomah County. The City of Portland contributes about \$5 million of the \$6.5 million in total flood safety fees, and Gresham is also a large contributor. Capital funding, which is much larger, depends on the \$150 million General Obligation bond paid by Multnomah County taxpayers, a \$20 million state grant through the Oregon Business Development Fund, and plans to request another \$25 million from the state, since operating revenues cannot fund these massive capital needs.

Commissioner Dr. Will Terry asked a follow-up question: "A levee failure in the Puget Sound area this winter resulted in lawsuits. What can you learn from these kinds of events? Do they impact your prioritization and/or risk process in project selection, and if so, how?"

- **Kayla Calkins** answered that district staff closely follow regional and national levee failures, including the Puget Sound failure. The failed levee sections in Puget Sound were temporary solutions that had been left in place for an extended period and were not designed to meet the permanent standards that this district's levees meet. The risk of damages is heightened when temporary solutions persist. The district's engineering and operations staff are studying the technical failure, how Washington state, county, and city agencies worked with the Corps to respond and repair, and how response agencies coordinated. Projects reducing flood risk receive the highest scoring in the district's annual capital improvement plan (CIP) prioritization. Additionally, the district is developing advanced flood modeling tools to simulate future atmospheric river scenarios to further inform project prioritization.

Commissioner Tod Burton asked a follow-up question regarding the total bond authorization and how much of the capital plan it covers.

- **Lori Baker** answered that the authorized bond is \$150 million. She explained that this is not enough to cover all needs. They originally requested \$195 million but reduced it to \$150 million in consultation with the Governor's office and local businesses due to concerns about the taxation burden in Multnomah County. Their capital planning shows that total capital project needs are well above \$195 million, likely over \$250 million and edging closer to \$300 million, so they are focusing on the highest-priority projects first.

Commissioner Tod Burton asked an additional follow-up question confirming if Portland passes through the fees to citizens through utility bills.

- **Lori Baker** confirmed that is correct, through their stormwater/utility bills.

Commissioner Erik Kvarsten asked an additional follow-up question: inquiring if the county pays for the jurisdictions within the urban growth boundary (UGB) for the fees.

- **Lori Baker** answered that Multnomah County pays for unincorporated areas inside the UGB, which amounts to about \$25,000 or \$30,000 annually. She noted they have a 100% collection rate and very supportive partners.
- **Colin Rowan** clarified that the district's boundaries only cover unincorporated areas of Multnomah County inside the UGB; everything outside the UGB is outside the district.

Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore asked an additional follow-up question inquiring if there is an entity that deals with those areas outside the district's boundaries.

- **Colin Rowan** answered that in Multnomah County, there is no similar entity outside the UGB. However, eastward topography rises ("east and up"), meaning those areas do not face the same severe flood risks as the floodplain.

Question 5: Asked by Chair Matt Donahue: "We recently met with the East Multnomah Soil & Water District and discussed your partnership with them. We'd love to hear more from you - what specific aspects of your mission do the funds utilized by the soil and water district address? How will you measure the success of this work to ensure funds are making a difference in the community?"

- **Kayla Calkins** answered that the district has several expanded statutory purposes related to water quality, environmental uplift, climate resilience, equity, and cultural history. While the district builds these into its multi-benefit flood safety projects, they partner with East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District (EMSWCD) to establish a joint grant program of up to \$400,000 per year distributed to trusted community-based organizations. Success will be measured through programmatic and community reporting, tracking how grants are distributed, what projects are delivered, and how they align with the district's goals of environmental health, climate resilience, and natural resource access.

Chair Matt Donahue asked a follow-up question: inquiring if there were cost savings efficiencies

partnering with them, or if East Multnomah Soil and Water Conservation District is just better at doing this, rather than UFSWQD establishing a brand new program.

- **Kayla Calkins** answered that the partnership creates significant cost savings and efficiencies. The district does not have an internal grant manager or grant administration program, which would require investing in staff and software. Partnering with EMSWCD, which has extensive experience and community trust, allows the district to deliver its statutory responsibilities in a cost-effective way, directing more public dollars to on-the-ground outcomes rather than administrative overhead.

Commissioner Tod Burton asked a follow-up question regarding public feedback, specifically if they had received any concerns over overlap or redundancy between the two agencies, referring to testimony from the previous year.

- **Colin Rowan** answered that they have not received any feedback like that this year. They have successfully defined their role and established clear crosswalks to ensure investments benefit the managed floodplain. He noted that they have revamped outreach, using neighborhood associations, social media, and newsletters. To resolve branding confusion, they refocused their public identity from the "Urban Flood Safety and Water Quality District" (which "just doesn't stick") to the Flood Safety District, which has received very positive feedback.

Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore asked an additional follow-up question inquiring if they are having similar conversations with Metro and if there is much overlap between their responsibilities.

- **Colin Rowan** answered that their responsibilities are highly focused and they partner to ensure good governance. They coordinate with Metro, Multnomah County, and local cities on watershed planning to leverage resources rather than duplicate efforts.
- **Steve Fancher** added that the watershed planning process has successfully brought Metro, the county, and the cities together to figure out how to leverage ecological work without duplication.

Question 6: Asked by Commissioner Erik Kvarsten: "What are the organizational and operational challenges you didn't foresee when the district was established three years ago? And have you found any unexpected opportunities and advantages?"

- **Heather King (Board Director)** answered that the district was very intentional in its organizational planning and operational development as they moved into consolidation. As a result, they have not encountered any major unforeseen organizational challenges due to the nature of the development of the consolidated district, which was a highly collaborative process with all partners. She noted they built strong interagency coordination that involved providing adequate operating revenue for the district fund. That said, the district has experienced several positive and somewhat unexpected opportunities as operations matured. Organizational structure changes identified in the current fiscal year are expected to provide measurable cost

savings that are reflected in the 2026-2027 budget. These adjustments have allowed the district to better align resources, streamline responsibilities, and support long-term operational sustainability. In addition, as the district has advanced its capital program, they have experienced stronger alignment and collaboration between departments. Cross-functional coordination among engineering, operations, administration, finance, and environmental programs has improved communication and created a more unified approach to achieving district priorities. The district has also benefited from strong collaboration and support from partners and community stakeholders who share commitment to flood resilience, water quality improvement, and long-term environmental stewardship. These partnerships have created opportunities to leverage resources and coordinate funding more efficiently.

Commissioner Erik Kvarsten asked a follow-up question inquiring if there was a single piece of advice they would give to another drainage or improvement district considering consolidation.

- **Steve Fancher** answered that the consolidation process worked remarkably well, despite consolidating four legacy districts being a massive and daunting endeavor. He shared that they have had other flood safety areas contact them for advice. In fact, he had a call from the City of Rainier a couple of months ago, trying to figure out how to get investment in their levee system because they didn't have the capability as a city financially or administratively to do so. They wanted to know how the district got its partners together to get this massive endeavor accomplished. He noted it was difficult and felt daunting because it has been such a multi-year effort with so many entities involved, making it hard to easily replicate. He suggested that Colin Rowan could speak to Portland State University (PSU) reaching out to study the Levee Ready Columbia success as a project case study.
- **Colin Rowan** elaborated that Portland State University (PSU) has an executive seminar program in Natural Resources, and each year they conduct a case study. For February of 2027, they have selected the Levee Ready Columbia partnership as their case study model. He explained that, in response to Commissioner Kvarsten's question, the process is about setting a table where you have a lot of overlapping responsibilities but no clear jurisdiction. Setting that table to have those conversations is really key, and making sure that you keep on having the conversations and keep people there until you find consensus. That is what the executive seminar program case studies will focus on. He added they plan to bring different people that were instrumental in initially describing the problem, noting that Phil Ralston was there from the beginning when the Port of Portland, local cities, and drainage districts first came together to address their overlapping responsibilities to the Army Corps and FEMA. Additionally, Rowan shared that Harney County recently experienced major flooding, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been interested in learning from the district's model. Specifically, they want to understand how to establish a funded public system that can be operated, as they currently have a breakdown between private and public ownership with no clear lines of responsibility.

Commissioner Erik Kvarsten noted how impressive the consolidation was and congratulated the directors and staff.

- **Kayla Calkins** agreed and emphasized that it is also important to mention just how critical their staff is. She stated that the staff is incredible, as they organize, adapt, and are constantly looking for opportunities to improve after experiencing such massive and significant change. She noted that while there was a lot of heavy lifting by the interim board, Levee Ready Columbia, and everyone who got them to this point, the staff really carries the work forward in every way.

Commissioner Dr. Will Terry asked a follow-up question inquiring to what extent was the state involved in encouraging these smaller districts to consolidate.

- **Steve Fancher** corrected the premise, explaining that the consolidation was not actually driven or mandated by the state. He recalled that the process was sparked when the executive director of the drainage districts at the time they were notified by the Army Corps of Engineers that they might lose their levee accreditation because standard requirements had changed significantly after Hurricane Katrina. He described that notification as a "pretty motivating moment" to figure out a regional solution, as the legacy districts only had the capability of taking on projects in the range of a few million dollars, not the hundreds of millions required. Although the state did get involved from an early standpoint to offer support, they did not drive the process from the start.
- **Colin Rowan** added that the local partners conducted a pretty deep dive into what the ideal governance options would be, exploring whether to house the system under an existing agency like Metro or Multnomah County. That evaluation showed that housing it with an existing regional agency was clearly not a good fit. Instead, the group focused on educating the legislature and getting local legislators interested in introducing customized new legislation. This effort resulted in the creation of ORS Chapter 550, which is explicitly just for Multnomah County within the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). Rowan noted that this customized approach was requested specifically by the Coastal Caucus and other legislators who did not want a "copy and paste" model applied across the state. He observed that while other regions would need to go through a similar, capacity-intensive process involving local, regional, and state conversations, this thoroughness is valuable because it requires all community members to find consensus.

Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore asked an additional follow-up question: "So, if you had to put a date, when did it really first start?"

- **Steve Fancher and Colin Rowan** confirmed that the formal notice and call from the Army Corps of Engineers arrived in 2012, meaning the entire consolidation and modernization effort had been 14 years in the making prior to this budget hearing.

Chair Matt Donahue commented: "I would say I've had a front row seat, maybe like an eighth-row seat watching this, and it was touch and go there for a little bit. It's quite satisfying to see that how well it's going."

- **Eric Mueller** noted that while the district is technically in its third year of operational existence, their success is largely due to this long, structured gestation period. Because different parties were at the table for over a decade talking through overlaps, conflicts, and configurations, the

district had the unique advantage of a long lead time to prepare for post-consolidation operations, rather than having only 60 days to figure things out after approval. He noted that the Governor's office had sponsored Levee Ready Columbia as a collaborative organization, which provided critical state-level support for a local, consensus-driven solution rather than an imposed one. He recalled that the enabling legislation was passed in 2019, allowing for several years of additional lead time before the consolidation formally began.

- **Phil Ralston (Board Vice Chair)** added that the consolidation was born out of financial and operational necessity. The four legacy drainage districts were running out of money and lacked the modern statutory tools required to raise enough revenue to regain or assure system certification from FEMA and the Army Corps. He explained that each district was severely constrained by its own obsolete, legacy special district legislation, leaving them with no financial mechanisms to address massive, deferred maintenance and modernization needs. As the boards of the four districts came together with community members, they identified a clear, common problem: they simply did not know how to raise the money required to solve their real-world flood safety risks.

Commissioner Erik Kvarsten made a clarification, asking if the four existing drainage district boards came together and recognized they had a common problem and risk, necessitating coming together.

- **Phil Raulston** confirmed that the shared recognition of severe, mutual risk served as the primary motivator, and that the boards shared a clear understanding that they had to address these issues together. He added: "So, if there's a message—this is just my personal opinion about two other districts considering consolidation—start from the ground up in partnerships, build the political will, and refine the problem statement. Refine the solution needed and then use that community-based power and common political will to raise it up through the system at whatever level it needs to be to start garnering political support. This eventually leads to either changing the statutory language to get more tools to raise more money to solve the problem or securing other kinds of authorities needed to actually modernize and deal with the current and future situation instead of using tools that are obsolete. But from the ground up, partnerships are absolutely key, and having staff that are expert in their field and respected for what they do is essential." He concluded by noting that they are very fortunate to be in a community where people had faith in each other to work on a common problem and find a way to solve it.

Question 7: Asked by Chair Matt Donahue: "The board has made the decision to continue using outside counsel for legal services, rather than hiring FTE. What other services are you contracting out vs providing in house? How do you determine which path is the most cost effective?"

- **Eric Mueller** answered that utilizing outside counsel is highly cost-effective because the district faces a wide variety of complex legal issues, and hiring a large, multi-specialty in-house legal team like the City of Portland or Multnomah County is not realistic. Outside counsel provides access to highly specialized attorneys as issues arise, which has actually resulted in cost savings. The district also contracts out for real estate services, geotechnical investigations, and engineering design for pump stations and levee systems. Generally, the district's approach is to minimize costs by hiring internal staff for ongoing, multi-year responsibilities (such as hiring

project management staff to support the 10-year bond-funded capital projects) while contracting out short-term, project-specific tasks.

Chair Matt Donahue asked a follow-up question inquiring what legal firm the district works with.

- **Eric Mueller** answered that the district works with Miller Nash.

Question 8: Asked by Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore: “This budget decreases the amount budgeted for houseless coordination from \$150,000 in FY 26 to \$28,500 in FY 27, consistent with what was actually spent in FY 25. We recognize this is a very small percentage of your budget but are curious about the change. What does houseless coordination entail and why are you projecting a decrease in funding needed?”

- **Heather King** answered that the proposed budget decrease reflects a greatly improved situation around the district's infrastructure, such as pump station properties. The City of Portland and Multnomah County have been highly productive and effective at managing illegal camping and preventing associated environmental impacts that would otherwise require district resources. Because they do not anticipate this situation changing in the near term, they did not allocate more than what was spent in FY 25.

Chair Matt Donahue asked a follow-up question inquiring how coordination works operationally.

- **Steve Fancher** answered that the results are due to excellent coordination between the city, county, and district staff. They have become highly programmatic, establishing a routine where staff contact city/county assistance partners before scheduled maintenance activities, and it is working very well.

Question 9: Asked by Commissioner Tod Burton: “The district has done quite a bit of equity work in determining project priorities and in operations. How are you adjusting to federal requirements that remove the equity lens, when equity work is a primary part of the district's purpose?”

- **Kayla Calkins** answered that the district is a public agency deeply committed to protecting all communities from flooding, including areas of greater geographic risk or limited access to mitigation. They embed equal opportunity, inclusivity, and belonging across all operations. However, to ensure federal compliance, the Board updated its Local Contract Review Board rules in December 2025 to address new procurement requirements at the federal level. This refocused their efforts on equity in procurement, specifically expanding outreach and encouraging participation in procurement activities across a diverse number of contractors while aligning with federal requirements.

Commissioner Dr. Rita Moore asked a follow-up question inquiring if they heard any chatter from the Army Corps about equity being an issue.

- **Steve Fancher** answered that during PMLS project coordination, highlighting federal changes as they occurred forced the district to "scramble a bit" to revise, cancel, and re-tender several active contracts to ensure alignment with the changing Corps regulations, which has been challenging.

Closing Remarks and Certification

Chair Matt Donahue thanked the representatives for the thoughtful discussion, their expertise, and for answering the commission's follow-up questions. He expressed the TSCC's appreciation for the district's critical mission and work. He officially closed the budget hearing and opened the TSCC's regular business meeting.

Staff Recommendations & Certification

Allegra Willhite (TSCC Executive Director) gave a public thank you to the Urban Flood budget and finance staff. She noted their partnership with staff throughout the budget review process, and throughout the rest of the year. She stated that TSCC staff found the budget estimates to be reasonable for the purposes stated and in compliance with budget law. Executive Director Willhite concluded by stating that the staff suggests no recommendations or objections to the fiscal year 2026-27 approved budget.

Vote to Certify

- **Chair Matt Donahue** moved to authorize the commission to sign the certification letter as recommended by staff.
- **Commissioner Burton** seconded the motion.
- All commissioners present voted "Aye" (unanimous).
- The Urban Flood Safety and Water Quality District's FY 2026-27 Approved Budget was certified by the TSCC.

There being no other business, Chair Donahue closed the meeting.