

Minutes of TIFA LLC Meeting  
August 25, 2016  
11:00 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  
Richard Broome, City of Titusville, City Attorney  
Andrew Jantzer, City of Titusville, Water Resources Deputy Director  
Anna Abreu-Ochoa, City of Titusville  
David Fuechtman, Miami Corp. (by telephone)  
Barbra Goering, Farmton Water Resources (by telephone)  
Susan Pattock, Farmton Water Resources (by telephone)  
Pat Gagliardi, Farmton Water Resources (by telephone)  
Helen Hutchens, Miami Corporation (by telephone)  
Jim Perry, GMS LLC

Jim Perry conducted the meeting.

**Action Items**

**I. Approval of the Minutes of the TIFA LLC Meeting of July 28, 2016 (Presenter: James Perry)**

Member Brown moved to approve the July 28, 2016 meeting minutes. Member Ball concurred and the motion passed.

**Financial Items and Reports**

**II. Ratification of Expenses Paid from Operating Account and Request for Reimbursement (Presenter: James Perry)**

Member Ball moved to ratify the expenses paid from operating account and request for reimbursement in the amount of \$16,703.08. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

### **III. Presentation of Second Quarter Financial Statements (Presenter: Helen Hutchens)**

Ms. Hutchens presented the second quarter financial statements. The revenues for the year continue to be below the expected budget due to the ramping up of the Phase 2 wells in late January and early February 2016. Our operating expenses are also running below budget. The individual line items that are currently showing as over budget will normalize as the year progresses. These expenses are those that are incurred in lump sums during the first part of the year. The budget represents only six months of the current budget rather than the full year. Our utilities continue to run below budget significantly. As will be presented later in the meeting by Sean Stauffer, we expect to have additional maintenance and investigation costs on the issues related to Well WR-8. We have sufficient excess budget authority that may be reallocated to those expenses as will be requested.

#### **Staff Reports/Informational Items**

### **IV. Update on Rail Trail Project (Presenter: Andy Jantzer)**

Mr. Jantzer stated, for the construction project currently they are actively working on storm sewer replacement and sub-grade and base work. They are currently working along the country club just north of Folsom Road where the rail trail branches off of it. At this point they are starting to encounter City of Titusville raw water main and fiber optic utility duct banks that are going up to the wellfield. This is the beginning of what they are going to be encountering for the rest of the rail trail until they get to the wellfield. In the past three weeks there has been one fiber break, one fiber conduit relocation and replacement of four destroyed pull boxes. We have been on top of it in terms of reacting to the situations and raising the awareness with the field people for the contractor to change how they are doing things and work out in advance relocation planning. It has also come to the designer's and FDOT's attention that they do need to adjust the alignment slightly in order to work with the over 100 fiber optic pull boxes that are on the route. It is now back to redesign for the alignment for that purpose but the FDOT is taking a very proactive role that it is their responsibility to design the alignment so it works with our pull boxes because they are gaining the understanding now that the fiber optic line and the pull boxes just can't be moved so that is positive.

Another positive thing is they did a preliminary review of all of the 20 new or expanded storm sewers and they have found no conflicts with any of the city or TIFA raw water main utilities. That is a good thing because those large pipes would be quite expensive to relocate.

The access control plans for the northern reaches of the rail trail was kind of dropped by the working group between the county and FDOT. They had discussed it in the early stages of design but it got dropped. I brought it up at the last job conference and that sparked them to say we do need to look into whether or not the design or construction activity could be adjusted for access control. They are still not sure whether or not the actual FDOT project will be adjusted for that or if that would be a county effort. I don't think they have those details worked out but the county is working up a recommendation for access control. It is not final and they are still working on it but the way it is leaning now is they are basically looking at bollards and/or gates

to make it clear to motorized traffic that they are not allowed on the rail trail in addition to signs but the bollards and/or gates would also convey that message. I think in the end they are not going to have restrictions that are any tighter than five feet, which is kind of a national standard for bicycle safety, you can't impede upon the bicycle lane width more than 5 feet and that is also tied to Florida code as well. I think that is going to drive the boat and they won't actually be able to put up barriers to restrict ATV size vehicles.

Member Brown stated, it will probably take care of the big vehicles, cars and trucks and that sort of thing.

Mr. Jantzer stated, yes that is where I speculate that is heading based on some discussions I have had with the working group. They might also put in a supplemental vehicle gate to the side if they have the funding and that would allow the multiple chain of locks that occur for the various users of that corridor. That is something we are thinking about but I think that is going to be a county decision in the end.

Member Brown stated, parks and rec would probably have responsibility for that and I assume it will come down to their budget.

Mr. Stauffer stated, I also think the city is going to need vehicular access so we can monitor and check the pull boxes as well as release valves.

Mr. Jantzer stated, whatever is put there such as bollards, the center one would need to be removable and locked.

Member Brown stated, I know some folks who should be a part of that working group.

Member Ball asked on the system damages you highlighted who takes care of paying for fixes and how do we validate it is fixed correctly?

Mr. Jantzer stated, as an FDOT project generally the convention is that if there is a conflict with surface utilities such as valve boxes, it is up to the utility owner to relocate and bear the cost of the relocation. As we are going along we were glad to see that there were no conflicts with the larger water main, the big cost items, and we are trying to work out low cost options for the fiber optic conduit as well. One thing that we worked out in the field with this one crossing and each crossing has its own characteristics but we were able to do this one conduit relocation without any significant cost because we were able to retract the conduit from a nearby pull box and they excavated a sloped alignment of the relocation and we were able to put that in without significant cost. The fiber optic line went in with enough slack to be able to do things like this. As long as it involves vertical relocations there shouldn't be a big cost impact. For quality control we have set up a protocol where our electronic services personnel are inspecting and in some cases implementing the relocations and this also included the pull box replacements where we were onsite in addition to FDOT inspectors making sure that the fiber was being handled according to industry standards in addition to the physical civil engineering type of work that was occurring.

Member Ball asked if their work damages our system but we are responsible for fixing it and getting it out of their way they are not obligated to inspect the installed infrastructure and avoid damaging it?

Mr. Jantzer stated, if they damage it that's on them. For instance, the pull box replacements are on the contractor so they have used pull boxes from our inventory but they are going to reimburse us for that and any labor and equipment cost is on them for that.

Member Ball asked if we have installed pull boxes and fiber optic runs that were there before they started the project and they had the benefit of that, it is our problem if there is a conflict?

Mr. Jantzer stated, if there is a pre-identified physical conflict they have an obligation to adjust their design and that is what they are going through now, they are redesigning to avoid conflicts but the convention with FDOT projects is for the utility owner to move it if it there is not a reasonable way to avoid the conflict.

Mr. Stauffer stated, if there are conflicts with design then we are responsible for moving it and part of that is because this is not City nor Miami Corp owned land it is actually state property we only have an easement. FDOT takes a pretty hard line about their rights of ways and their roads and that is kind of what this is. It is not a road but it is very similar and since they are running the project and since we don't have ownership that is why we are moving it. Plus the other thing to consider is as we went forward with this project building the raw water main and all the systems we were well aware and were warned ahead of time that this would be a trail.

Member Ball asked we had our design before they had theirs, is that the issue?

Mr. Stauffer stated, they had their plans to turn it into a trail well before we had our designs and our pipe there. We went forward with the knowledge that there would be adjustments and changes because we would be occupying the trails. The original idea was that FEC gave the property to the state to turn it into a rail trail then the city saw that as an opportunity that now it is publicly owned so we can probably get an easement over it easier from the State of Florida than we would have from FEC. We knew in the beginning it would come to this.

Member Ball stated, we had easements for our utility system requirements to utilize knowing they were going to be constructing over that stuff or close to it. I understand things happen but if we had their design they had our design.

Member Brown stated, they didn't have theirs at that time. They just knew they were going to put a trail they had no design in mind.

Member Ball stated, you go ahead and build your system and use our easements but understand when we get to our design if we end up stepping on you that is your problem you have to relocate.

## **V. Area IV Phase 2 Update (Presenter: Sean Stauffer)**

Mr. Stauffer stated, the first item is the wellhead fixes. The contractor has resubmitted shop drawings and they have been approved by CPH and at this point the stainless steel wellhead replacements are under fabrication. We were given a timeline of about five weeks for fabrication and that started last week with the approval of shop drawings. Probably by the next meeting I will be able to give you an update of when installation will start. Part of the plan that we approved includes once they are fabricated they will be tested and we will have a representative onsite to make sure they pass the pressure test and that will confirm if there are any holes in the wellheads and we will look over it very good. We want to make sure they are 100% before they are put in the ground.

Last time we had some limited information on WR-8 and I shared that we have elevated chloride levels. We have done a little more investigation and out of an abundance of caution we have shut of WR-8 so it is no longer running and our consumptive use permit allows us to withdraw 2.75 MGD from the entire wellfield so we have redistributed the flows among the different wells and we have done that based on their performance and salinity levels. Our best

wells will pump a little more than the ones that are not quite as good. Currently, we are back to getting 2.75 MGD even though WR-8 is off. One of the other things we have done is increased the salinity monitoring frequency, some were on a quarterly basis some on a monthly and they are all going to be checked monthly now that we have increased the flows. Since we had the issue with WR-8 taking a closer look at it at this point is prudent.

Member Ball stated, the flows equate to the revenue from the water sale so you are back where you would have been. We had an interruption in flow and therefore, revenue but that has been restored. On the well fixes as those are being replaced are we going to interrupt flow on each of those as we go through the replacements?

Mr. Stauffer stated, there will be a short interruption. What we have required the contractor to do is to do two at a time and he will replace them I would hope he would be able to get the two replacements done in one day then the wells need to go through a two-day bacteria testing so we are expecting pretty minimal down time, two wells at a time just for a few days. We will schedule them during the week so that we can get the samples, get the permits, get them turned back on as soon as possible.

One of the other things we have done is gone out and done at least one investigation of WR-8, we had staff pull the pump take a look at the pump to make sure everything was fine, it seemed fine and there were no issues with that. They also measured the depth of the well to compare it to its original drilled depth and we found about seven feet of material that is now at the bottom of the well. We are not sure exactly what it is we just know that it is there.

What are the next steps? I have handed out to each of you a report that details some of the history as well as our recommendations for moving forward. If you look at the report it talks about the salinity levels that went from about 30 to about 100 from March to July. That is what started this investigation. We have identified there is about seven feet of infill and we don't know exactly what it is but we are currently terming it as a partial bore hole collapse. There has been a lot of history with this well, I can provide that to you at a later date if you want it but we did have some issues when we were drilling the well and it was rather complicated to get it finished but we did get it done and it did get operating and everything was fine. We are not sure if that has something to do with the current issue or not. To get some answers we are proposing to bring in a contractor to do geophysical logging of the well itself and they would go in and do multiple measurements of the caliper, salinity levels, flows, temperature there is a gambit of testing that is completed when a well is finished with construction. I want to go back and do that as well as video to see what has changed from when it was first drilled. That logging will happen under pumping scenario as well as under a static scenario. The idea is to compare it to what it was when the well was brand new and hopefully, we can identify what has happened. The recommendation I have is so far we have received one quote from Hausinger since it is over \$1,000 we do want to get two more quotes and we are working on those now. I wanted to note that we are not completed with this report but I wanted to take the opportunity since we had the meeting and the recommendation for the cleaning and geophysical logging of the well we would like you to approve an amount not to exceed \$12,500. That includes the quote for the work that Hausinger has proposed as well as a 25% contingency. We are recommending that contingency because if something is discovered in the field at the time we may need to do additional work so we have some unit prices from them, we don't know what it might be but we would like to take care of this as soon as possible and avoid two mobilizations and with that contingency that would give us that flexibility. The goal is to get two more quotes and we would like to recommend a not to exceed amount with the idea if we came in with a lower quote we can go with a different

contractor but if this happens to be the low quote then we will be able to move forward with the work.

One of the other things we recommend is that we have an expert onsite, a Hydrogeologist onsite so they can be there to review the material that is cleaned out from the borehole take a look at what it is as well as they can be there and view the results of the logging as it occurs as well as the viewing so if there are additional things that the expert needs to look at they can take advantage of that while the folks are onsite. We would like to have a 25% contingency for the Hydrogeologist to cover anything else that might happen particularly if there is a recommendation to do work immediately on the well then that will cover those costs for the Hydrogeologist to be out there for perhaps another day or perhaps perform some other tasks that may need to happen. Those are the two recommendations that we have. We have sufficient funding in the budget and there are no issues with being able to afford the work. All these things have been discussed by TIFA staff. We also discussed with independent Hydrogeologist about how to move forward and this seems to be the best path to figure out what has happened to the well.

Member Ball stated, I think it is clear from reading the scope but I would like to get it clear on the record, task 6 is basically a corrective action set of recommendations.

Mr. Stauffer stated, yes, go in clean it out, take a close look at it with various instruments to see what has changed.

Member Ball stated, that is part of the diagnostics of what happened so we are going to get a clear set of recommendations on what these experts believe to be the right course of action to restore this well to its original anticipated capacity.

Mr. Stauffer stated, that's the two main things, we have asked the Hydrogeologist to get back to us within a day or so after he has been out there and let us know what he found as well as a full report on what his recommendations are moving forward whether that be rehab, additional back plugging, a different pumping scenario or to abandon the well. We need a full report on the next steps we need to take.

Member Brown asked who are the other two quotes you are looking to get?

Mr. Stauffer stated, we are going to reach out to ABS, RM Baker did the original so we are going to reach out to them too. Part of our purchasing policies require each time we go over \$1,000 for work like this that we get three quotes.

Member Ball asked did these guys just respond to a solicitation or have you worked with them before?

Mr. Stauffer stated Hausinger actually drilled the wells for Phase 1 and they have been working with Miami Corp. to do some work as well. They are familiar and another thing that Hausinger has an advantage and will probably make them the low bidder is they already have the appropriate insurance certificates and insurance levels to be on the Miami Corp. property. That has been a barrier for some of our other smaller subcontractors.

Member Ball moved to approve staff's recommendation and authorize them to proceed with geophysical logging of WR-8 in an amount not to exceed \$12,500 and an amount not to exceed \$4,250 for the Colinas Group for hydro services. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

## **Other Business**

## **Public Comment**

## **Next Scheduled Meeting**

Mr. Perry stated, our next scheduled meeting will be September 29, 2016 at 11:00 a.m.

## **Open Items**

## **Adjournment**

Member Brown moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:32 a.m. Member Ball concurred and the meeting adjourned.