

Minutes of TIFA LLC Meeting  
June 20, 2017  
11:33 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  
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)  
Dave deNagy, GMS LLC

Dave deNagy conducted the meeting.

**Action Items**

**I. Approval of the Minutes of the TIFA LLC Meeting of May 23, 2017 (Presenter: Dave deNagy)**

Member Ball moved to approve the May 23, 2017 meeting minutes. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

**II. Consideration of Proposal from Moore Stephens Lovelace, P.A. for Audit Services (Presenter: Pat Gagliardi)**

Ms. Gagliardi stated, at the February manager's meeting there was a discussion that contracts are generally for three years but if we are happy with the vendor we would be willing to do two one-year renewals on their contract for a total of five years before we put it out to bid again. Since that meeting a request was made of Moore Stephens Lovelace for two one-year renewals on their audit and tax prep contract. The original contract was from 2014 through 2016 and it started at \$14,000 with a \$500 increase each year. They actually submitted a proposal for an additional three years, but we are just looking to approve two of those years. They are holding

the fee at \$15,000. We are looking for acceptance of their proposal for two years for 2017 and 2018 at \$15,000 per year.

Member Ball asked that is no increase from the present?

Ms. Gagliardi stated, right they are holding the fee the same as it was for 2016.

Member Ball asked that would be for an extension of two years?

Ms. Gagliardi stated, the proposal is for three years but we want to approve it for just two years.

Member Ball moved to approve a two year extension of the contract for audit services from Moore Stephens Lovelace, P.A.. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

### **Financial Items and Reports**

#### **III. Ratification of Expenses Paid from Operating Account and Request for Reimbursement (Presenter: Dave deNagy)**

Mr. deNagy stated we have the invoice approval included in your agenda package the expenses total \$15,593.36 and an outline of those expenditures are in your agenda package.

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

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

#### **IV. Well WR-8 Restoration Status (Presenters: Sean Stauffer and Jim Boyd)**

Mr. Boyd distributed some graphs and stated, the first graph is the drawdown graph for the temporary back plug and permanent back plug. To refresh everyone's memory Well No. 8 we had a temporary back plug installed in April tested it over about a month's period the results came back really well. We have not had an excessive drawdown with the temporary back plug installed and we had a significant reduction in chloride concentration, which is exactly what we were hoping would happen. Based on the results of the temporary back plug experiment the managers approved installation of the permanent Bentonite back plug that occurred approximately May 31<sup>st</sup> after which the city went through a procedure where they had to disinfect the well and take bacteriological samples and make sure that the well was ready to be placed back into operation. On June 14<sup>th</sup> we did a pump test just to make sure that the drawdowns we were seeing with the temporary back plug were similar under the permanent back plug condition. We conducted that test on June 14<sup>th</sup> since that time, which is always the case the wells are monitored by the SCADA system and you have two graphs that show that the drawdown, the flow rates, the static water level, the pumping water level and drawdown both in a temporary back plug condition and the permanent back plug condition. The first graph you can see how we vary, the flow rates were basically in the 250's 260's drawdowns ranged anywhere from the low 8 to around 11 with an average of about 8.92 over that approximate one month period. Since the permanent back plug has been installed and the well placed back into

permanent operation on June 14<sup>th</sup> we are seeing exactly what we hoped to see. We are seeing basically the same type of drawdown conditions it ranged anywhere from 9.13 to 10.38 with an average of 9.51, an average slightly higher than the 8.92 that we saw for the temporary back plug but we are actually pumping at about 10 gallons per minute more during that period so I would call these very similar numbers. This is very good news essentially we have a well that has a really good capacity, it is back to its 100% operating capacity without an excessive drawdown. We are very happy with this and of course we will continue to track it. The next big thing is to confirm the water quality. The first sample was pulled on the 14<sup>th</sup> and we haven't had the results returned yet. I think we expect to see those results this Thursday or Friday. Hopefully, the chloride concentration will be similar to what we saw with the temporary back plug condition and we will continue to track that over time but assuming those circumstances occur we are going to be really happy with the efforts we made to restore the well.

Member Ball asked how does this drawdown compare to the rest of the wells in the wellfield?

Mr. Boyd stated, I would say it is probably midway, some of the stronger wells like WR-1 and WR-2 are three or four feet, the Phase 2 wells are probably in this 8, 9, 10 category except for Well 4-11, which is 14. It is about midpoint we are very comfortable with that and this is operating at 100% capacity, which was the goal.

Member Brown asked is our threshold 14?

Mr. Boyd stated personally I didn't feel comfortable inducing a drawdown that was greater than what our highest drawdown well was. I was willing to go up to 14 based on that circumstance but fortunately we are lower than that, which is good solid news.

Member Ball asked what is the simplest explanation of drawdown?

Mr. Boyd stated, the aquifer has a certain level. As an example on June 14<sup>th</sup> before we started pumping the well if we measured from the top of the well casing down to where the water was in the well casing it was 17.59 feet. We turned the well pump on and pumped it for a while in the graph actually reflects a 12 hour pumping cycle, the pumping water level slowly increases then stabilizes over a 12 hour period, which is normal. It got down to 27.9 and the difference between these two numbers is 10.38 it drew down 10.38 feet on that day. Since then it has been lower it has been in the low to mid 9's similar to what we saw with the temporary back plug. This permanent back plug is a little tighter so I wouldn't be surprised if we have a slight difference between the two but the drawdown levels we are seeing are very acceptable.

Member Ball asked Sean are you happy from city staff standpoint with what you have seen?

Mr. Stauffer stated, very happy, it looks good.

## **V. Abandonment of Surficial Aquifer Well PW-4 (Presenters: Sean Stauffer and Jim Boyd)**

Mr. Boyd distributed aerial photographs and stated, at the last meeting I was proposing something that turned out to be not necessary. The first aerial shows what the situation was. You can see the new agricultural road being constructed by Farmton and the pushpin I have labeled surficial aquifer well PW-4 we thought was a saline well no. 4. We were under a misconception so at the last meeting I said this well is in the way we need to move it and we talked about that. Member Ball made some very good points during the meeting, we went back and studied things further, we dug into it harder and it turns out there are actually two wells in

this area, one of which was obvious and as it turns out surficial aquifer well PW-4 was the test production well, which was constructed I think in the late 1990's early 2000's as part of some of the testing that was done by the city along the rail trail corridor back at the time when the possibility existed where they were going to have surficial aquifer stores for water production. Basically I think the intent was to use the surficial wells to augment the wetlands to make sure there was no negative wetland impact from the proposed withdrawal. As it turns out the above grade well that is in the way is one of those old test wells, it is only about 50 feet deep. The real saline monitoring well no. 4, which you can see is kind of hidden in the weeds is on the next page on the aerials that is no. 4 and built at grade and fortunately it is out of the way so it is not an issue for the new agricultural road. Obviously, this is very good news and we coordinated with Sean and his staff since this well PW-4 was a city asset not a TIFA asset we coordinated with staff and it was determined that there was no use for this well. It was part of an obsolete program that is no longer in effect and is not necessary to use that well anymore so we were given permission at Farnton's expense to abandon PW-4. The next page shows PW-4 in all its glory when it existed and the last graphic shows that it has been removed. Farnton contracted Hausinger & Associates who assisted with the restoration of Well-8 to abandon the well. They came out filled it with cement grout and cut off the top, three feet below grade so it is gone. As confirmation of that I will pass around the well completion report that was prepared and submitted by Hausinger & Associates to document that the abandonment was properly permitted and the abandonment occurred in a proper fashion.

Member Ball asked did you furnish all that to St. Johns too, do they care?

Mr. Boyd stated, we had to get the abandonment permit from St. Johns and they issued the permit and the completion report was provided to them. Consider this a happy ending, we are happy, the well is out of the way, we didn't have to spend a lot of money relocating saline well no. 4.

Member Ball stated, thanks to everybody for taking a deep breath and figuring it out.

## **VI. Request for Proposals for Annual Wetlands Monitoring and Reporting (Presenters: Sean Stauffer and Jim Boyd)**

Mr. Stauffer stated as Pat mentioned earlier contracts with TIFA are typically approved for three years then we can agree to extend those in one-year increments for a total of five years. At this point I believe we are three years into the contract with the contractor that does the wetland monitoring and reporting for TIFA and based on recent performance we decided to bid this project out again. We have prepared a request for proposals, the same RFP documents that we used three years ago, there have been some minor modifications to that but it will generally be the same proposal that we sent out three years ago. The plan is to do direct solicitation to companies that we have worked with before either through the city or TIFA. I think we have a list of five at this point. The city has also committed to put this RFP out on DemandStar, which is a product that the city uses to advertise all manner of purchasing and contracting items and that will reach a very wide audience. The proposal documents have been approved and I don't know if it needs board action for us to advertise this RFP.

Member Ball asked will this be a TIFA contract?

Mr. Stauffer stated, that is correct. We will be advertising it directly as TIFA and also listing it on DemandStar as TIFA.

Mr. deNagy stated, I would think that you would want board action on this.

Member Ball asked did the incumbent have additional extensions permissible and you decided not to exercise them?

Mr. Stauffer stated, we had the option to extend but based on performance we chose not to extend.

Member Ball asked does the RFP package include experience and past performance as an evaluation factor?

Mr. Boyd stated, I know we put together the scope of work such as insurance requirements and what have you. I'm not sure that there is a boilerplate section that would be included with it.

Mr. Stauffer stated, I don't think we have a list for work experience. People we have done direct submissions to have experience in this and they have done this same work for either the city or TIFA in the past.

Member Ball stated, it is like a professional services contract it is not a low bid necessarily.

Mr. Stauffer stated, we are not bound by that. As TIFA operates we have the opportunity when we evaluate these responses if somebody comes in with a low bid that has absolutely no experience in the process I don't think we are bound or required to award it to them.

Mr. Broome asked is the contract an automatic renewal that requires you to provide them with written notice of your intent not to renew and have we done that per our contract?

Mr. Stauffer stated, no.

Mr. Broome stated a lot of them have renew for consecutive years automatically unless you provide notice within 60 days of the end date of your intent not to renew.

Mr. Stauffer stated, I believe the original contract we signed was for three years.

Mr. Boyd stated, that is correct. There was no provision for renewal.

Mr. Stauffer stated, about three or four months ago we brought to the board this opportunity to at the end of our typical three year contracts to allow staff to administratively extend in one year increments.

Mr. Broome stated, I just wanted to make sure we were complying with the contract.

Member Ball moved to authorize staff to issue an RFP for wetlands monitoring and reporting. Member Brown concurred and the motion passed.

Member Ball asked will the outcome of that come back to us for action on award of that contract?

Mr. Stauffer stated, we will provide you with the results of our RFP as well as our recommendation of who we think should be awarded the contract.

Member Brown asked do you have a timeline on that?

Mr. Stauffer stated, I believe we have a 30 day response period.

Mr. Boyd stated, we don't have to have somebody on board until September. They need to take photographs in September the report itself isn't due until March of next year but we do want to get somebody on board no later than the September meeting. We would want to approve that at the August meeting.

Mr. Ball stated, just to be sure that the board has clear knowledge that it makes a decision in which past experience with a particular responder comes into play and then we are good to base our decision on that.

Mr. Broome stated, you look at the most qualified. I'm sure they will be evaluated, I don't know if there is a point system for selection or criteria by which you are judging them by because you want the most qualified at the best price. Will there be a committee or is it just you who will be evaluating the RFPs?

Mr. Stauffer stated, we hadn't planned to set up a formal committee.

Mr. Broome stated if you are going to have any committee that is going to weed anyone out then that would have to be in the sunshine because you are exercising discretion if you are weeding anybody out. If you are just going to review them or provide those packages to the board with a recommendation then you can certainly do that and then it would be up to this board to decide which is the most qualified to perform the work.

Mr. Boyd stated, we have five firms that we know are good, well qualified and one of them did the work before this latest firm. Do we have to go through DemandStar or can we just solicit bids from these five entities?

Mr. Broome stated, my recommendation is that you do DemandStar you don't just hand pick a group but I think through your RFP your qualifications are going to be such that you are going to want to have firms that have that experience.

Mr. Stauffer stated, if the experience requirements are not in the RFP we will make sure that is part of the RFP. The idea is that we will make sure as we cast a wide net on DemandStar and the people that are considered are qualified and have reached a minimum level of experience. Member Ball stated, I think any time you do a procurement that your procurement process should allow you to evaluate past experience with a particular vendor if they are to be considered amongst the rest that the city or TIFA's past experience is something that can be considered as opposed to not being able to consider for some reason. There should be no reason why that can't be considered.

Mr. Stauffer stated, we will make sure that is part of it.

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

Mr. Jantzer stated, the DOT contractor has released their paving schedule and the next upcoming paving is July 24<sup>th</sup> and that will be paving the rail trail from Rancher Road going north 2 ¾ miles, which is a little over halfway up to the county line on that particular stretch north of Aurantia Road. In doing that the city is doing a lot more coordination in preparing the various valve boxes and fiber optic pull boxes so that they are at the right elevation so they are in good shape before the paving goes down. We are currently involved with staging and the process to get the city forces involved with raising those pull boxes and we are doing a couple coordination items with the contractor right now. We are asking the contractor to bring out construction barrels to mark each of the boxes once they have been brought into proper condition and also in places where the boxes are in the middle of the haul road we are asking the contractor to put down a little extra lime rock so that the haul road will go around the boxes and there won't be any temptation for the drivers to straddle the boxes. At this point these later stages we are getting near paving. We don't want our boxes to be damaged before the paving goes down. Those are the precautions.

Another thing we have done this past month is we submitted to the Department of Transportation the locations for the various well access crossing points that are associated with the wellfields and monitoring wells. We gave to them by DOT station number so they know to put down a concrete pad on the asphalt partway in addition to the stabilization so that vehicles can enter and exit the rail trail to get to our well access points without causing any damage to the rail trail. In addition to giving them the list of DOT crossings we also asked that any points where we have crossings of swales that they put down stone stabilization of those swale crossings as well so our vehicles can get across the swales to our monitoring wells basically on a year round basis. They still envision to be complete at the end of August and that would mean if we do end of July paving the final paving will be occurring at the end of August. As a result they are doing a lot of preparation now in the northern sections in the vicinity of the current wellfields.

Member Ball stated, we are only anticipating crossing the rail trail with vehicles at discreet points to get access. We are not driving on the rail trail.

Member Brown stated, you have to drive it for a portion of it.

Mr. Jantzer stated, yes in fact for that side of the wellfield the access is kind of set up right now to drive down the rail trail in order to get to them from the county line. Currently Volusia County is considering requesting those arrangements to be changed but that is how it has been set up since the beginning as far as the easements are concerned.

Member Ball asked have they changed the arrangement such that you are not driving on the rail trail?

Mr. Jantzer stated, for the Volusia County portion, which would be just an access type of route they are suggesting that we find another way and basically our response was that is the way that everybody decided and the state granted that easement over it many years ago to do that. They are going back and reviewing the situation now to see if they have any proposals to change that.

Mr. Stauffer stated, the city has easements and we have every right to be on it. If they want to build us another road that is fine, but that will be at their cost.

Mr. Broome asked what is the length you are talking about driving?

Mr. Brown stated, three or four miles. I just got done building 13,000 feet of fence for that stretch from Maytown to our south property line, 27,000 total so 13,500 that is a little over three miles one way.

Mr. Jantzer stated, probably since we told Volusia County it would be on them their position is probably going to change now.

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

Mr. Stauffer stated, we have just some minor things to take care of for Phase 2. There is some touchup paint as well as we continue to have problems with the check valve hinges leaking. We have spoken with Felix, they have gotten with the folks that made the check valves and right now we are looking at scheduling an opportunity for them to come out and repair the check valve hinge pins with the goal of stopping the leaks. I think there are still some issues that staff is discussing about how to do the bacteriological tests and Jim if you have some time after the meeting I would like to talk to you. We are still working through some of that process and hopefully they will start this work within the next couple of weeks.

### **Other Business**

Member Ball stated, in talking with Sean there was an item he was recommending be discussed under other business as a request for an agenda item for the next meeting.

Mr. Stauffer stated, I mentioned this to Jim Boyd, it has been at least a year or two since the TIFA board has discussed Miami Corporation's consumptive use permit and plans for the area in Volusia County. I know some time ago Miami Corp. made a commitment to the city and TIFA to provide us updates and I think this would be a good opportunity and it has been quite a while. I would request that at our next TIFA meeting that Miami Corp. provide an update to TIFA on the progress of Miami Corporation's wellfield.

Member Brown asked do you have specific information that you are looking for?

Mr. Stauffer stated, no just an update of how things stand.

Member Ball stated, a situational update.

Mr. deNagy stated, we will add that to the July agenda.

### **Public Comment**

### **Next Scheduled Meeting**

The next scheduled meeting will be Thursday, July 20, 2017 at 11:30 a.m.

### **Open Items**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting at 12:08 p.m.