

Minutes of TIFA LLC Meeting
May 23, 2017
11:30 a.m.
City of Titusville Water Resources
Mourning Dove Water Plant
2836 Garden Street
Titusville, Florida 32796

Persons in Attendance

Mike Brown, Miami Corporation, TIFA Management Committee Member
Jim Ball, City of Titusville, TIFA Management Committee Member
Sean Stauffer, City of Titusville, Water Resources Director
Chelsea Farrell, City of Titusville, Assistant City Attorney
Andrew Jantzer, City of Titusville, Water Resources Deputy Director
Anna Abreu-Ochoa, City of Titusville
Jim Boyd, Boyd Environmental, representing Farmton Water Resources
David Fuechtman, Farmton Water Resources (by telephone)
Susan Pattock, Farmton Water Resources. (by telephone)
Pat Gagliardi, Farmton Water Resources (by telephone)
Bob Oros, Colinas Group (by telephone)
David deNagy, GMS LLC

David deNagy conducted the meeting.

Action Items

I. Approval of the Minutes of the TIFA LLC Meeting of April 18, 2017 (Presenter: David deNagy)

Member Ball moved to approve the April 18, 2017 meeting minutes. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

II. Well WR-8 Restoration Status and Consideration of Permanent Back Plugging (Presenters: Sean Stauffer and Jim Boyd)

Mr. Oros joined the meeting by telephone at this time.

Mr. Boyd stated, I will pass around the water quality graphs and Bob has a copy of this as well as the folks in Chicago. The first handout is the water quality graph and the second handout is the draw down in the well since it has been back plugged.

The first graph shows the water quality since the well was briefly put in production in October 2015 and from October 2015 through July 2016 the well was operating at its original pumping rate of 260 gallons per minute for 187,000 gallons per day. It started out with the

chlorides in the 20's and 30's until it started spiking in March 2016 and it got up to 137mg per liter in July 2016 at which point we decided to take the well out of service. The well was evaluated with the Colinas Group as part of that evaluation the result of which was to put it back online with a lower pumping rate. It was put back online in November 2016 at a pumping rate of 215 gallons per minute about 155,000 gallons per day or about 82% of its original capacity. The first capacity reduction really didn't work we still had chlorides ranging up to 125 mg per liter so at the first of the year of 2017 we decided to reduce it again and it was reduced down to 180 gallons per minute, which is about 130,000 gallons per day or about 69% capacity. Again, that second slow reduction didn't work and we went one step further in late March 2017 we reduced it down to 100 gallons per minute, which is about 72,000 gallons per day or about 38% capacity and that helped somewhat but chlorides were in the 66 to 87 mg range and still not where our other wells were at. For example the Phase 1 wells were averaging in the 50 mg per liter our other Phase 2 wells except for 9, were in the 20's to 40's. The decision was made by the group to attempt to fix the well by a temporary silica sand back plug and on April 28, 2017 that back plug was installed from the bottom of the borehole up to 170 feet below the well casing flange and on that date Bob and I conducted some flow experiments, water quality samples were taken, we looked at the draw downs and when we did the testing we had chlorides in the 30's, draw downs around 9 feet, very good news as to what we were hoping for. Since that time the city has been operating the well on a daily basis at roughly its original capacity averaging about 256 gallons per minute, which is 98% or 99% of its intended capacity. The chloride concentration since that time has ranged between 42.6 to 59.2 and today we had a chloride result for a sample taken on the 19th shows a chloride concentration of 50.5 and that is really good news. From a water quality standpoint it appears that we took a very appropriate step in that we have significantly improved the water quality of the well.

The second part of the equation is what about productivity and that is on the second graph on the draw down. The city has the ability to record the pumping water levels on a daily basis via the SCADA system so the city has been tracking that for us. Since April 29th through May 21st we had very steady water levels, the pumping water level averages around 27 the static averages between 17 and 18, the draw downs have been roughly average from 9 to 11 but averaging around 9. This is what we wanted to see. When we back plugged the well we were sealing off what we felt where the high chloride water was coming in and when you do that you are going to lose some capacity but if it turns out there is plenty of open hole capacity above the back plug, which enables us to have a very stable flow situation at 100% of the well's capacity with a very steady draw down, drawing at 9 feet is basically where the Phase 2 wells are operating at. One of the Phase 2 wells is around 14 and it is doing just fine so I'm very comfortable personally with this data. So far it looks from a water quality standpoint and from a productivity standpoint we did a very appropriate thing by back plugging the well. If the decision is made if there is no other data that comes to light that is contrary to this we have a timeframe already established and that timeframe is dictated by the well driller. He is onsite for a few more weeks, he is scheduled to remove the temporary back plug on May 30th and if we can make the decision by then to go ahead and proceed with the permanent back plug, which would be a bentonite back plug he would conduct that work the following day on May 31st.

That is basically a summary of how the well has been performing since it was back plugged. I have given my opinion. Bob can chime in and let us know what his feedback is.

Mr. Oros stated, I agree that the back plug solution worked and based on the short term data that we have so far it appears to me that this is going to be a good solution for this well.

What we don't know is what might happen over time. In looking at the water quality data that we collected in the field the day it was back plugged it is possible that the water quality may even improve slightly more than it is right now and I say that because the plug that is in the well right now is not an impermeable plug it is a coarse sand that seals off the solution features of the rock matrix where we believe the high chlorides are coming from and a certain amount of water can permeate through that sand plug in the bottom of the well. When that plug is removed and we put in a bentonite seal that is truly an impermeable seal and therefore, after continued pumping we may even get a slight improvement of water quality because when we first installed the sand plug and pumped it afterwards we had chloride concentrations around 30 mg per liter then they crept up a little bit after pumping it for a couple weeks. It may be that it may drop a little bit because there is no possibility for any of that high chloride water to permeate through the plug when we put bentonite in rather than sand. I think this is probably a good long term solution we just need to keep a close eye on the chloride concentration over the next couple of months and make sure we keep this well at full production.

Mr. Boyd stated, I have a follow-up question about what you said about the possibility we have some permeate coming up through that sand back plug. Do you think it might be enough of a flow to affect our productivity? In other words if we replaced the sand with the bentonite I'm assuming the amount of water that could be coming through that sand back plug is fairly minor and wouldn't really affect the productivity.

Mr. Oros stated, not at all. I wouldn't expect it to affect the well production at all. Chlorides down in that section of the well that we have plugged off with coarse sand those chloride concentrations are apparently high enough it would have a big impact on water quality that is why just a little it is coming through that sand plug can have an impact on the water quality. Once that is plugged off with bentonite we won't have any water permeating at all out of the bottom of that well. That is almost a 100% seal there is not going to be any impact. It won't affect the production at all.

Mr. Boyd stated, obviously assuming that we do install a permanent back plug we need to keep a close eye on it just like we are doing now, testing on a weekly basis. I think we can start out and continue to pump it at its full capacity but keep a sharp eye on that. If it turns out that we don't have a stable water quality at 100% then maybe we back in down to 90% or whatever gets us a stable situation. The possibility exists that we might have to back it down a little bit if we need to in order to keep it stable in the long term.

Member Ball stated, that would be on the basis of data monitoring.

Mr. Boyd stated, absolutely.

Member Ball stated, Bob I want to repeat what I hear is your recommendation and make sure I'm hearing it properly. As TIFA's consultant you are recommending we go ahead with a permanent back plug based on this test and continue monitoring chloride levels to determine if pumping at 98% or 100% is going to be feasible for the long term knowing we can back that off if we have to. Is that your recommendation?

Mr. Oros stated, yes absolutely.

Member Ball asked staff you are good?

Mr. Stauffer stated, yes.

Member Ball stated, you did an excellent job executing this test plan and it turned out that it did produce the result that we were all hoping for. I gather this is a permanent configuration for the well once we do this?

Mr. Boyd stated you could remove the bentonite back plug it is just not easily removed. You would have to set up a drill rig on the pad, it can be done but it is more of a hassle because right now all we have to do is pull one stick of pipe to do what we are doing. We would have to pull a little more piping, we would have to take the fence down to get the drill rig on top of the pad and it is reversible it is just more of a hassle to reverse it once the bentonite plug is installed.

Member Ball stated, you called it right and that is why we have technical experts and I'm appreciative of that and the execution of the test plan. I'm comfortable authorizing the permanent fix. I would like to continue to get an agenda item update on this indefinitely.

Mr. Stauffer stated, the city will continue to monitor at the current rate WR-9 once a week, WR-8 twice a week and we will continue that for the next meeting or two just so we can track this very closely and each meeting we will give an update on where we stand with the chlorides.

Member Ball stated, obviously we have a strong technical team on this and if you see something over the next couple of weeks that causes you to think any differently as far as I'm concerned you have the flexibility to make an adjustment otherwise I would say you are good to go.

Member Ball moved to approve the permanent back plugging of WR-8. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

Mr. Oros left the telephone conference at this time.

III. Consideration of Flow Meter Calibration Quotes for the Area IV Wellfield (Presenter: Sean Stauffer)

Mr. Stauffer stated, when we first started with the wellfield we came back through a year later and taken a look at the flow meters on these wells and considered calibrating those. The first calibration cycle we went through we noticed some of the meters were out of calibration and since these are also the cash registers for TIFA and what determines the bills and budget and everything else associated it is important that these be accurate as well as they are used for reporting to St. Johns River Water Management District about how much water we are removing from the resource. It is that time of year again and we went out for some quotes to calibrate all 15 meters. I want to thank Jim for doing the legwork on this. We have two quotes both from groups that have been onsite before so they are familiar with our requirements as well as they may have current certificates of insurance with us.

Mr. Boyd stated, actually we make them park their car outside the gate and they ride with city personnel when they are onsite. That is how we deal with that issue.

Mr. Stauffer stated, for all 15 wells the quote received from AWK is for \$2,235 the second quote was for \$3,000 from Water Works and it is TIFA's recommendation to move forward with approval with AWK Industries for \$2,235 to have all 15 production well meters calibrated.

Member Ball moved to approve the proposal from AWK in the amount of \$2,235 for flow meter calibration for all 15 wells. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

Financial Items and Reports

IV. Ratification of Expenses Paid from Operating Account and Request for Reimbursement (Presenter: David deNagy)

Mr. deNagy stated, in your agenda package is the request that totals \$13,246.01 there is an outline of the expenditures made and we just need concurrence ratifying those expenses.

Member Brown moved to ratify the expenses paid from the operating account and request for reimbursement. Member Ball concurred and the motion passed.

V. Presentation of First Quarter Financial Statements (Presenter: Pat Gagliardi)

Ms. Gagliardi stated, in your packet you should have the balance sheets and income statements for TIFA, LLC for the first quarter of 2017 through March 31st. The balance sheet is pretty straight forward. Since March we have accumulated a little bit more cash in our main account approximately \$865,000. There is an accounts receivable on the balance sheet those were water receipts from the city and the city is now current so that number has dropped significantly. There really isn't anything else on the balance sheet to point out that is extraordinary. On the income statement, we show the first column is the income for the first quarter of 2017 as compared to the budget, water sales are up slightly as we started the year pumping a little bit higher in anticipation that wells could go down for any reason such as WR-8. The O&M operating agreement and parts and labor expenses were very status quo for the first three months of the year so those are both below budget and even with the WR-8 work that we have done that we have seen through April those are still below budget. There are a couple items in the expenses that you will see a big difference due to timing, one is the accounting where we are paying a lot of that upfront but that will smooth out during the year and the last item, other taxes, are paid later in the year so that is a timing issue as well.

Member Ball stated, I have a question about flow rates and income and it is more technical than financial question. Are we going to back off on the flow on any of the other wells now that we are going to maybe get close to 100% out of WR-8?

Mr. Boyd stated, I think we can reallocate. What Pat was alluding to was the first part of the year we are pumping 102% just like she said because invariably something happens and we are not able to get 100% so that is why we are doing that but with WR-8 if we can bring it back 100% we had placed a greater burden on some of the other wells to make up the difference and we can reallocate, go back to a previous schedule we had before we had this issue with WR-8.

Member Ball stated, I assumed so I just wanted to get it on the record for discussion that since there was a concern that we may be pumping too hard on the rest of them.

Mr. Boyd stated, that is why we are so happy with what we have seen so far with this.

Member Ball stated, I'm fine with the financials that is a good report.

VI. Consideration of Capital Distribution Notice (Presenter: Pat Gagliardi)

Ms. Gagliardi stated, in your packet there should be a letter for signature for both Mike Brown and Jim Ball, the capital distribution notice we are recommending is a distribution of \$380,000 split equally between the city and Farmton Water. That notice will be signed by both managers and there should also be two wire letters. We thought it would be best to make these distributions by wire to get it into the hands of the members as quickly as possible and make it a little bit easier.

We looked at the cash balance in the account as of March 31 less a maintenance balance of \$300,000 and some smaller expected cash needs. We plan to make distributions quarterly this year after the presentation of each of the quarterly financials. In the 2017 budget we were looking at \$1.1 million in member distributions and this falls in line with where we anticipated we would be.

Member Ball moved to approve the distribution notice of \$380,000 with a 50/50 distribution. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

Staff Reports/Informational Items

VII. Update on Rail Trail Project (Presenter: Andy Jantzer)

Mr. Jantzer stated, today is the second day of a major paving phase of the rail trail project. After today they are scheduled to have paving moving south to north all the way to Rancher Road and everything south of Rancher Road should be paved. With that occurring now that the southern access point through the trail has been paved over they are not running their vehicles over the trail for driving in stone and stuff like that. They are using the north gate more often so we are seeing the job site is extending all the way past the Phase 1 Area 4 wells, the TIFA wells, and in the past couple working days have seen our first rollover damage of some of the pull box facilities, which we have seen throughout the job site so basically the city has an inventory of replacement pull boxes so if we see rollover damage that threatens the fiber we are going in and getting the pull boxes replaced so we don't have rollover that ends up breaking the fiber.

We are also working with the contractor to get them to put our orange barrels on all surface utilities that would be the pull boxes and valve boxes of the TIFA and city facilities raw water main and the fiber optics SCADA facilities and the contractor has committed to doing that and they are actively working on that. With that in place we think that there should be a lot less threat to roll over damage. At this point there are hundreds of pull boxes and valve boxes along the route so we have not been issuing on claims as they happen we are keeping everything operating in serviceable condition as the project rolls along and we expect to have a settlement at the end regarding any damage we are repairing. There is some counter claims that have been discussed of some of the city utilities not meeting DOT spec as far as the placement or depth so there will be some level of negotiation at the end of Phase 2. I think the facilities that are owned by TIFA I believe they do meet DOT spec except for the fact that there may be an argument over whether or not the pull boxes placed in the non-paved stabilized sand ground meets the highway rating spec so there may be some attempt by the contractor to deflect blame for that rollover

damage because of the fact that the pull boxes are not in a paved surface. As long as we can limit the damage to pull boxes and valve box pads and things like that it is going to be a small amount of cost compared to any damage to the water main. So far we haven't had any actionable damage to the water main all the way up from Titusville along the route of the rail trail so that is good news and we hope this continues that the water main stays undamaged.

Member Ball stated, when I drove over Dairy Road this morning I noticed that they had barriers for road closed or road not open and it was interesting because I don't think of it as a road but when you look at it someone could consider it was a road. The question is where you have intersections with streets like Dairy and others are those going to be there for a while or how are they going to regulate the traffic that gets on that trail for the intended vehicles?

Mr. Jantzer stated they plan to do it all with striping and signage they aren't going to put up any physical barriers because they couldn't do that to spec without violating DOT specs for actual bicycle traffic access.

Member Ball stated, somebody is going to test it. How wide is the pavement?

Member Brown stated, it looks to be about 10 feet.

Mr. Jantzer stated, they are going to keep the, road closed barriers, up until completion of the entire project they are not going to open it up in stages.

VIII. Area IV Phase 2 Update (Presenter: Sean Stauffer)

Mr. Stauffer stated, the only thing remaining as far as Phase 2 is some touchup work as well as some punch list items from the painting and also fixing the check valves that are leaking. At the last meeting we reported that the work was done to the check valves and we had staff go out and look at it and found out they are all leaking. That information has been transferred back to the contractor and there have also been requests for a schedule for when they would be back up to address that and at this point I don't think we have anything from the contractor as to when they are going to be back.

Mr. Boyd stated, the ball is in their court.

Mr. Staffer stated, we will keep you up to date on that.

Other Business

Mr. Boyd stated, I have had something come to light that affects one of the TIFA monitoring wells. I will pass out some graphics that will illustrate the issue we are having. One is an aerial view and one is a plan view and this has to do with TIFA saline water monitoring well no. 4. For overview purposes the saline well SWMW-4 is located within the rail trail and it is also unfortunately located within an existing crossing easement that was granted many years ago to Farmton and these crossing easements were put in because Farmton knew they were going to have to access their property across the rail trail right of way at some point in the future, which for this particular crossing has arrived now. There is an agricultural road that is under construction within this crossing easement S-200 and it is obvious when you look at the aerial you can see the road and basically the well is not in the middle of the road but definitely in the travel way, which creates a safety issue, it is an obstruction and basically this well needs to be relocated for that reason. Obviously, it is a TIFA asset and there is a cleared area where we are

showing the relocated well and it is basically along the tree line to the north. Mike has installed fencing to fence off the rail trail right of way, a 20 foot wide cleared area and another tree line. We propose to relocate the well basically it is a 190 foot offset, it would be on Farmton property, a TIFA asset now on Farmton property. As far as access the city could still utilize their existing raw water main easement that runs along the corridor to get to Farmton property as we head to the southwest this existing crossing easement could be utilized from that then it would be a question of once we reach the Farmton property line we would have to develop a separate easement that would be granted from Farmton to TIFA to access the relocated well. By virtue of the fact that the well is located within this easement it needs to be relocated we feel this is a TIFA responsibility. I have talked about Jeff Hausinger because he has been onsite doing other things for Farmton and I approached Jeff about if he could assist us with constructing a replacement well and he said he could but time is running out. He is going to be onsite for two or three more weeks and I did obtain a cost estimate from him. I did the best I could on available information, there is record information that indicates that the well is 160 feet deep it is screened for 10 feet from 150 to 160 feet, this replacement quote provided by Hausinger & Associates essentially would replace what is there now, actually it is a little bit of an upgrade I think the well now has a 2" diameter and this would give us a 4" diameter. Again it would be installed to the same depth as the existing well.

We believe this is a TIFA responsibility in a perfect world we would like to go ahead and proceed because Jeff is available to do the work we know he does good work he is approved for everything, for site access, his insurance is approved, etc. It is just an opportunity at this time and we think it would be beneficial for those reasons if we could reach a decision very quickly if we could proceed and have him do this work while he is still available. I also contacted Bob Oros of the Colinas Group and he gave me a price of \$5,839 to provide construction oversight for this well replacement. This cost also includes abandoning the existing well. We would have to go through permitting with the district but we think that is a slam dunk we just went through the same thing with Well no. 6 several years ago and that was just a letter modification it was obtained very quickly. This issue has come to light we wanted to bring it up today to put everybody on notice regarding the need to relocate the well and if at all possible if it would be feasible since Jeff is available if we could act quickly enough to authorize him to proceed with the work that is the question that is on the table right now.

Mr. Staffer asked when was salt water monitoring well 4 drilled?

Mr. Boyd stated, I think 4 was drilled at the same time 5 and 6 were drilled and both wells show completion date of January 23, 2008 and that is the best guess I have not having the well completion report for well no. 4.

Mr. Stauffer stated, in general the well has been there for nine years and when was the agricultural road built?

Member Brown stated, the easement was in place in 2007 for the agricultural road.

Mr. Stauffer stated, my first question is why if we are building a road why didn't we know that we had an asset there and why did we build the road through the well. Why didn't we see that as an obstacle and then move the road around it or rearrange or do something so we don't have to now relocate this well?

Member Brown stated, I think it had to do with the complication of the easement, having that easement moved once it was settled on by DEP.

Member Ball asked why did we put a well in an existing easement? Did we not know the easement existed?

Mr. Stauffer stated, I know that it is within an easement that we have from the state, whether or not there were plans for a road at some point I don't know if that was known at that time.

Member Ball asked there was a common easement for the well and the road?

Member Brown stated, the easement I'm referring to is perpendicular to the rail trail that was in place in late 2007. It is a 30 foot easement.

Member Ball asked how many monitoring wells do we have?

Mr. Boyd stated, we have seven saline water monitoring wells.

Member Ball asked what is the risk of just walking away from it and not replacing it?

Mr. Stauffer stated, we have to have it per St. Johns. You lose history when you relocate, it will be close it is only 190 feet but one of the concerns is we have nine years of good data at that spot and all that gets wiped away when you go to another location. We lose history as well it is not just cost. I wonder if there is something we can do to protect it, put it in a vault or something we could do so it wouldn't have to be moved.

Member Brown asked how is this different than the one that was on someone else's property that was moved?

Mr. Stauffer stated, the landowner told us to get it off.

Member Ball stated the dirt road looks narrower on the west. Does it need to be as wide as it looks like? It looks like tracks through it so you are running over the well right now.

Member Brown stated, that is my concern that and the primary use of that road is going to be for a low truck. The concern is you have to make almost a southerly turn to get to where our gate is going to be located and at that point my concern is that you are going to drag a trailer over the well. The well is protruding from the ground about 18" or so.

Mr. Jantzer stated, just for background the city is going to request the state for additional easement kind of as-built phase of the easement on the rail trail property for a couple spots where our raw water main was relocated to get around a culvert or some obstruction. We will be approaching the state regarding making adjustments to or additions to easement. I wonder if moving the existing Farmton agricultural easement 50 feet north or something like that does it make sense with how things are laid out? There is a substantial civil works project.

Member Brown stated, that would be my concern with that approach to it at this point.

Member Ball stated, I'm not sensing from city staff an urgency to decide this right now. It is the first time I have seen the issue can the parties get together and explore whether there is any options other than this one?

Member Brown stated, I think to Jim's point speaking as a manager the reason we wanted to bring it up today is that it may be less costly to do it with things in place. We have the time element right there and right now I can't use that road, which presents an issue for me and I will work through those problems. What we have is a situation that the well is a hazard in the road and there will be a concern going forward.

Mr. Boyd stated Jeff had intended to use water from the existing well to drill the new well. Right now things are in flux and three or four months from now we may be farther along with the rail trail construction it might be more of a construction hindrance, the rail trail will be in a condition where it presents more of a hindrance to relocate the well in the future than it does now.

Member Ball stated, I'm looking at the area to the southeast and I don't know if you can move the part of the structure that is above the surface without relocating the entire well. Is that feasible?

Mr. Boyd stated, no you have to move the entire well.

Ms. Farrell asked what is the anticipated schedule for paving?

Member Brown stated, that is an unimproved road there are no plans to pave that.

Mr. Stauffer stated, I don't see there being any conflict with the rail trail with this. All they are going to do is put blacktop on what is there now.

Mr. Boyd stated Jeff was going to have a hose running from the existing well over to the new well location as the water source which he said he could work around right now since it is under construction but two or three months from now if we don't act we can still drill the well but they may have to bring in the water instead of using the existing well as the water source. It just makes it a little more expensive. We have a guy who can do the work and we have to let him know real quick before he leaves the Farmton area. If we could make a decision quickly we would like to go ahead and pull the trigger on that and that is why we are presenting it for your consideration.

Member Ball stated, I would like to give staff a little bit of time to work on some options. I'm available any time can we do it telephonic if need be? We got a couple of weeks.

Mr. Stauffer stated, I don't think we can do that. It is outside of the sunshine. I think you actually have to be present and it has to be a physical meeting where someone from the public could come and be present.

Mr. Fuechtman asked can I throw out for consideration authorization for the manager because we have a proposal on the table and somebody we have worked with before that both sides would agree would be certainly a potential candidate to do this type of work if in fact staff and Farmton people come to agreement that this or something close to it needs to be done. Could we authorize at this meeting maybe a budgeted dollar amount and let city staff and Farmton come up with a plan to implement something not far from what we are looking at currently, which would be routing and moving the well and if what we come up with moves the well a shorter distance or a cheaper manner or whatever we might come up with that we are not looking at we have the ability to go ahead. If it is something we can't agree on or we can't come up with something so far askew from what we have or planning to do that we could reconvene.

Member Ball asked is Farmton willing to explore options that leaves the well where it is? Is there a way to protect it and still stay there? The dollar amount is not shocking so we need to be fiscally responsible about that as the TIFA managers but I'm hearing Sean express at least a technical concern that we have a history of data from the well. I don't know the right answer but are you willing to include in that discussion options that would leave it where it is or is that just not something you are willing to consider?

Mr. Brown stated, if it can be protected all options would be on the table at this point. If we can tear it up we typically do.

Mr. Fuechtman stated having had the discussion with Mike before we will have the discussion and I wouldn't leave anything off the table.

Member Ball asked what do you want to do Sean?

Mr. Stauffer stated, we can do the contingent approval and we will talk with you and let you know if we come up with something that we consider viable then we can present it to staff and try to bring that back.

Member Ball stated, I think you can appreciate half your management team is seeing this for the first time so I'm not uncomfortable with a motion that would at least provide authorization for a not to exceed of \$30,000.

Mr. Boyd stated, if you add in construction oversight it would be more like \$32,000.

Member Ball asked what about permitting costs?

Mr. Boyd stated, permitting cost is included in the cost estimate.

Member Ball stated, then let's say not to exceed \$34,000. I want to give you a little cushion. Not to exceed \$34,000 with agreement that options including not relocating the well will be thoroughly explored by our team before moving forward.

Mr. Boyd stated, I just want to reiterate from a practical standpoint if we want Jeff to do the work he would probably need to know this week. That is the timeframe because he is getting ready to pull up stakes, he is going to be here two or three more weeks, he has a big job in Bonita Springs he is getting mobilized for and I just want to make that clear and clarify that one more time.

Member Ball asked how challenging is drilling a salt water monitoring well? Who drilled these?

Mr. Boyd stated it can be challenging.

Mr. Stauffer stated, it can be. How deep is this one?

Mr. Boyd stated, 160 feet.

Mr. Stauffer asked is this the one, another 250 isochlor?

Mr. Boyd stated, I will have to go back and see where it is right now.

Mr. Stauffer stated, see what the requirements are. Some are shallow and are easy to drill it is not a big deal and some can be extremely complicated and I'm not sure if this is one of those deep wells. We need to look and see.

Mr. Boyd stated, no. 6 is 60 feet deep this is 150 feet deep and no. 5 is 190 feet deep.

Mr. Stauffer stated, then this one is based on just the depth?

Mr. Boyd stated, I think so. I know we were trying to hit that isochlor later in 11, 12 and 13.

Mr. Staffer stated, we will get confirmation on that because that makes it basically putting a hole in the ground to actually studying and coming up and almost developing a well, it is different. In one you just drill to a depth and in another one you drill to a quality of water and that can be found anywhere from 200 foot to 400 feet and you don't know. There is testing and that is a \$200,000 well.

Mr. Boyd stated, this price is just drilling it to the same depth. It is replacing what is there now.

Mr. Stauffer stated, we will want to be real sure that is the goal of salt water monitoring well no. 4.

Member Ball stated, just to provide the flexibility I'm willing to go along with that proposal to set a not to exceed number of \$34,000 given that my preference is to exhaust all reasonable options to not spend that money and leave the well where it is if it works out. That would be the preference and you go work it out so the mangers are not standing in the way of going forward if that is the right thing to do.

Member Ball moved to approve an amount not to exceed \$34,000 to relocate the SWMW-4 monitoring well and to research possible options other than relocating the well. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

Mr. Fuechtman stated, thanks Jim it all makes sense and just tell Jim Boyd and Mike because of the timing element to get together with the city representatives and let's move on this as quickly as possible.

Public Comment

Next Scheduled Meeting

The next meeting will be June 20, 2017 at 11:30 a.m. in the same location.

Open Items

Adjournment

Member Brown moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:30 p.m. Member Ball concurred and the meeting adjourned.