

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SUNSHINE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT**

A Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Water Control District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Wednesday, October 14, 2015, at 6:30 p.m., at Sartory Hall, located in Mullins Park, 10150 NW 29 St. (Ben Geiger Drive), Coral Springs, Florida 33065.**

Present at the meeting were:

Joe Morera	President
Jim Maguire	Vice President
Daniel Prudhomme	Secretary

Also present were:

Craig Wrathell	District Manager
Doug Paton	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Rick Woodville	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Alfred J. Malefatto	Lewis, Longman & Walker, P.A
Gene Schriner	District Engineer
Steve Smith	Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.
Steve Zielnicki	Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.
Cory Selchan	Field Superintendent
John McKune	McKune & Associates
Julie Schroeder	Gallagher Benefits Services
Debbie Daniels	Gallagher Benefits Services
Christine McCarthy	Gallagher Benefits Services

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order

Mr. Morera called the meeting to order at 6:50 p.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Mr. Wrathell called the roll and noted, for the record, that all Supervisors were present, in person.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments [3-Minute Time Limit]
(Comments should be made from the microphone to ensure recording. Please state your name prior to speaking.)

There being no public comments, the next item followed.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Presentation: Benefits Package Renewal

Ms. Julie Schroeder, of Gallagher Benefits Services (Gallagher), introduced Ms. Debbie Daniels and Ms. Christine McCarthy, of Gallagher.

Ms. Schroeder presented the renewal benefits package. She reported that the District currently has coverage through AvMed Medical and there was no increase; it will be a flat renewal. Ms. Schroeder noted an overall change in the budget of 3.2%, due to two employees changing age brackets but there were no plan changes.

Mr. Wrathell commented that this is phenomenal.

Ms. Schroeder stated that her office performed a full market analysis and reviewed alternate plans but those had higher rates and fewer benefits.

Mr. Maguire asked why the paperwork showed a decrease of 13%. Ms. Schroeder indicated that the decrease pertained to the benefits.

Ms. Schroeder reported that the current dental coverage is with Ameritas, which will increase 9%; however, this is less than last year's rate. She noted no increases in the vision plan and life insurance.

Regarding the life insurance, Ms. Schroeder indicated that a market check was performed last year, as there are guaranteed issue amounts and flat rate guarantees and, this year, a market check was performed on the short and long-term disability. She noted that life and disability insurance is a niche market and, based on industry and current conditions, the best benefit and value for the District is with Sun Life and Reliance Standard. Gallagher's recommendation was not to change plans.

Ms. Schroeder reported an overall 3.2% increase for medical, dental, vision and life insurance coverage, with no plan changes.

In response to Mr. Maguire's question, Ms. Schroeder indicated that a decision today was not necessary. Based on the proposed coverage, other than employees moving to a higher age

bracket, which increased premiums, Mr. Wrathell recommended that the Board authorize retaining the same plan for next year, unless the Board wanted further evaluation.

Mr. Maguire pointed out authorization would be two months prior to the renewal. Mr. Wrathell advised that, if his company received this renewal package, he would be elated.

Ms. Schroeder reported that, with approval, Gallagher would fulfill open enrollment and meet compliance guidelines.

Mr. Selchan had no complaints, nor had he heard any complaints from his employees. He felt that this is a good policy.

Mr. Wrathell pointed out that the District's employees received lower salaries than neighboring districts but are afforded "richer" health insurance and benefit plans.

Mr. Maguire agreed that the benefits package is reasonable.

Mr. Morera was pleased with the amounts, as he anticipated increases; providing a sound benefits package, with minimal changes, is good news.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, authorization for renewal of the 2015/2016 benefits package, was approved.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Aquatic Herbicides Bid Tabulation

Mr. Selchan presented the aquatic herbicide bid tabulation for the Board's consideration. He highlighted the vendors with the lowest bid for each category and recommended that the Board accept the lowest bids for 2015/2016.

Mr. Maguire asked if there is an advantage to consolidating to one or two vendors. Mr. Selchan indicated that these are sealed bids that are not re-bid, as it would be unfair to the lowest bidder.

Mr. Morera pointed out that this is a public bid and, once opened, vendors can take other bids into consideration for next year's bid.

Mr. Selchan reported that, for Glyphosate, two vendors bid Aqua Neat and two bid Round Up Custom and, if Staff was having problems with Aqua Neat, he would re-bid and specify Round Up Custom, as the bid tabulation said "a chemical name or equivalent". Mr.

Selchan noted that, historically, one year Helena was the lowest bidder but, for the last couple of years, Windfield Solutions and Crop Production Svcs. were the lowest bidders.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the chemical bids, as recommended, were approved.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Discussion: Canal Z Proposed ROW Violation Enforcement Policy

Mr. Paton presented the revised Canal Z ROW Violation Enforcement Policy. The revision included steps for residents violating the vegetative natural buffer (VNB) agreement and residents without agreements; most residents have agreements. Mr. Paton recalled that Mr. Maguire suggested a “third strike” approach, which he agreed is fair.

Regarding residents under the vegetative buffer agreement, Mr. Paton explained that District Staff will report the violation and determine if the resident has an agreement. If the resident has an agreement, the first step is initial notification, which is a door hanger. Step two, two weeks later, the resident will receive a formal notification letter, indicating the terms of the agreement, the District’s intent to withdraw the agreement, if the violation is not corrected and the resident will be responsible for reimbursement of all costs. Mr. Paton pointed out that, if there is no response to step two, a certified mail final notice of intent to void the agreement and clear all encroachments is sent to the resident, upon Board approval.

Regarding residents with no VNB agreement, Mr. Paton indicated that the first step is the initial notification, via a door hanger, and, after two weeks, the City of Coral Springs Code Compliance is contacted. He noted that Code Compliance volunteered to assist the District, even though there is no agreement between the District and the City. If there is no response to Code Compliance actions, a certified letter of intent to remove the violation is sent to the resident, upon Board approval.

Mr. Morera asked if the certified mail final notice includes the payment of legal fees and penalties and the consequences for no response. Mr. Paton replied affirmatively. Mr. Morera asked if the notice waives any liability to the District for fence removal from a ROW, because the District followed the proper notification steps. Mr. Paton replied affirmatively.

In response to a question by Mr. Morera, Mr. Selchan indicated that, if the resident lives in the District, a lien can be placed on their tax bill; the intent to lien would get the resident's attention.

Mr. Paton reported an issue with grass on Canal Z not being maintained; some residents are maintaining their grass but others are allowing it to grow. Mr. Selchan advised that a resident is planting in the District's ROW, after repeatedly being told by District Staff not to do so, which is the purpose of developing the enforcement policy.

Mr. Selchan felt that making an example of one resident will signal residents that there will be consequences for noncompliance.

Mr. Morera asked if the Board must take action or if the revised policy was for informational purposes. Mr. Selchan indicated that the policy has not been implemented and is a template for District Staff to act on, without Board action, until a policy is established.

In response to Mr. Maguire's question, Mr. Paton advised that there are 60 houses on the south side of Canal Z, from Coral Ridge Drive to Coral Springs Drive, which do not have agreements and is where most of the issues are. Mr. Paton noted that residents had the option of signing the agreement to use the 10' buffer or not signing the agreement and not using the 10' buffer; most residents signed the agreement and are responsible for maintenance. Residents that did not sign the agreement are supposed to maintain their buffer, per City Code.

Mr. Maguire asked what property was in the Coral Springs Improvement District (CSID). Mr. Paton indicated that Canal Z borders the District and the condos pay assessments to the District but, on the south side, 60 houses in Cypress Run pay assessments to CSID. Mr. Maguire pointed out that CSID residents must maintain their grass. Mr. Paton concurred.

Mr. Maguire wondered why the Board needs to be consulted if this is a "third strike" approach. Mr. Selchan explained that the Board will only be consulted if the resident does not respond; three quotes to remediate the violation must be obtained and presented for Board approval. Mr. Paton believed that it was contentious to hire a contractor to remove vegetation, since some residents claim to have bird habitats.

Mr. Morera commented that Mr. Paton and Mr. Selchan did a great job and thanked them for their time and effort, as this streamlines the process.

Mr. Morera recalled that two or three residents were supposed to receive notification letters. Mr. Paton confirmed that the letters were not sent, as this policy will go into effect.

In response to Mr. Prudhomme’s question, Mr. Malefatto indicated that Board consensus was sufficient.

Mr. Paton pointed out that this policy will be amended, as needed.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of September 9, 2015 Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Morera presented the September 9, 2015 Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

On MOTION by Mr. Prudhomme and seconded by Mr. Maguire, with all in favor, the September 9, 2015 Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Minutes, as presented, were approved.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisor’s Communications

Mr. Morera attended the Art Walk grand opening, on October 9, 2015, and was pleasantly surprised that both the Mayor and City Manager recognized the District for participating in the project; the District provided the land on which Art Walk is built on.

Mr. Morera hoped that Mr. Selchan and his employees are receptive to the insurance changes, as the Board strives to provide benefits that the employees deserve for all of the work that they provide to the District.

Mr. Selchan acknowledged that benefits are what motivate employees to work hard. He appreciated the Board’s consideration to keep benefits at a reasonable level.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. Attorney: *Lewis, Longman & Walker, P.A.*

Mr. Morera asked about the status of Mr. Lewis. Mr. Malefatto indicated that Mr. Lewis is leaving next week for his sabbatical and Mr. Capko will be returning tomorrow.

B. Engineer: *Craig A. Smith & Associates*

- **Monthly Engineer’s Report**
 - **September 3, 2015 – October 6, 2015**

Mr. Schriener presented the Engineer’s Report.

- **Permit Approval Recommendations**
 - **Comcast Communications LLC [Canal D Aerial Crossing]**
 - **Comcast Communications LLC [Canal J Aerial Crossing]**

Mr. Zielnicki presented permit applications from Comcast Communications LLC (Comcast) for proposed aerial line crossings at Canal D, on the north side of Sample Road, on the east and west side of Riverside Drive, and at Canal J, on the northwest corner of University Drive and NW 31st Court, at Art Walk. The plans call for 18' high poles. Mr. Zielnicki indicated that everything is in order with both plans and recommended for the Board's consideration.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Comcast Communications LLC: Canal D Aerial Crossing permit application, was approved.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Comcast Communications LLC: Canal J Aerial Crossing permit application, was approved.

Mr. Morera asked about the current cost recovery process. Mr. Zielnicki recalled that Mr. Paton mentioned not obtaining cost recovery on small projects. Mr. Malefatto asked if cost recovery was covered under the \$350 permit fee.

Mr. Schriner explained that several cost recovery projects were already in place and, for future projects, he will determine if the \$350 permit fee is sufficient to cover Craig A. Smith & Associates' (CAS') hours; if not, the applicant will be invoiced for cost recovery. He noted that the Comcast projects were minimal. Mr. Zielnicki concurred.

Mr. Morera wanted to ensure that the District is following what is in place, as a number of cost recovery projects were completed and, even though minimal, he felt that the applicant should have been billed. Mr. Wrathell confirmed that he saw invoices and Mr. Zielnicki is billing applicants, as part of the permit process, and applicants are sending checks as the cost recovery component.

Mr. Schriener confirmed that CAS invoices separately for cost recovery projects. Mr. Zielnicki verified that applicants have not been billed because there were no new projects.

Mr. Wrathell recommended verifying, before permits are issued, that the applicant is being billed for cost recovery and the bill is paid. Mr. Schriener will ensure that the Comcast permits are within the \$350 permit fee.

Mr. Morera stressed that he did not want the District to incur unnecessary expenses. Mr. Schriener understood and pointed out that, when they noticed a project that was going to take a lot of effort, a cost recovery program was discussed. Mr. Morera indicated that he saw invoices charged for cost recovery, which made him wonder how this was being handled.

Mr. Wrathell suggested verifying that District Counsel's time is included, in the case of the District Engineer coordinating with District Counsel. The final hours will not be known until the permit is issued; for example, when CAS sends an invoice to the District and it is paid, there should be an invoice to the applicant and the check received by the District before the permit is issued.

In response to Mr. Schriener's question, Mr. Morera indicated that CAS is supposed to invoice the applicant. Mr. Malefatto will provide a flowchart to Mr. Schriener and advised that cost recovery dollars must be collected upfront before the permit is issued.

Mr. Malefatto pointed out that projects, such as Broken Woods at Coral Lago and The Reserve, should have been cost recovery projects. Mr. Schriener believed that these projects were set up for cost recovery but will verify if the money was collected.

Mr. Prudhomme asked if the cable industry is installing underground cables instead of aerial cables. Mr. Schriener indicated that he has seen underground cables. Mr. Zielnicki recalled that a Comcast application, which will be provided to the Board next month, called for underground cables.

Regarding document scanning services, Mr. Schriener reported that the initial cost to scan the documents was \$2,500 but the actual cost was \$2,627.08. Mr. Morera asked if last month's motion should be amended. Mr. Malefatto replied affirmatively, as the Board approved a not-to-exceed amount of \$2,500.

Mr. Maguire asked if any further documents must be scanned. Mr. Schriener replied no.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, authorization to increase the not-to-exceed amount from \$2,500 to \$2,627.08, for Forensis to scan IBI documents related to Sunshine Water Control District, was approved.

Mr. Schriener has two discs, which he will provide upon request and requested copies of the Lanzo Construction (Lanzo) documentation. Mr. Malefatto will provide. Along with the two discs, Mr. Schriener has six boxes of documents.

Mr. McKune advised that the General Contractor for the pump station provided shop drawings of the electrical components free of charge.

Regarding Pump Station #1, Mr. Schriener recalled that additional Florida Power & Light (FPL) testing was in process; it started on Friday, October 2, 2015 but the results were not yet released.

Mr. Schriener provided a summary report of findings for Pump Station #1. He reported that the initial three pumps were installed between 1964 and 1966, which discharged 35,000 gallons per minute (GPM), each. Reports were then issued by CH2M Hill and IBI Group (Florida), Inc. (IBI), recommending the replacement of the existing pump stations with new pump stations. The new stations were replaced in 2012/2013, with four vertical propeller pumps with 125 horsepower (hp) motors, discharging 37,800 GPM at a total dynamic head of 9.3'. Since that time, the District experienced problems with the operation of the pumps. Some issues were a result of the design not following the Hydraulic Institute Standards and, through observation and pump tests, vortexing was discovered.

Regarding motor performance, Mr. Schriener reported that Open Drip Proof (ODP) motors were installed vertically; ideally, they are mounted horizontally and totally enclosed, which is more expensive but they are heavy duty motors that last longer. Regarding electrical performance, Mr. Schriener noted that the Electrical Engineer determined that the electrical components are not performing as intended, due to the transformer. FPL is performing additional tests. He indicated that two tests were performed; one on May 21, 2015 to operate the pumps and the second test on August 8, 2015, which tested the electrical components.

Mr. Schriener reported the following conclusions:

1. Field testing has verified that the pumps are under powered and do not meet specification whether on FPL power or when on back-up generator power.

Mr. Maguire asked if the pumps are not generating enough power or not running at the power they are supposed to run. Mr. Schriener indicated that the pumps do not have enough hp to operate the pumps, meaning that the motor is not large enough, i.e., 125 hp versus 150 hp. Mr. McKune explained that power from FPL is coming to the motor sufficiently but the motor is too small to provide the power that the motor is trying to draw, due to the pump load. Mr. Schriener explained that the motor must spin the shaft to lift the water but it does not have enough power to properly spin the shaft, which heats up the components.

2. The pump station sump design is flawed and was not designed or constructed in accordance with the Hydraulic Institute Standards.
3. The pump station intake basin is too shallow, too narrow and too irregularly shaped, resulting in high inlet velocities and vortexing.
4. The anti-vortex inlet baffles, provided by MWI, have reduced pump inlet vortexing.
5. As-Built Information and dimensions regarding pump station electrical and mechanical components are not available to CAS.
6. The pumps have never been certified and start-up reports were never performed or provided.

Mr. Schriener indicated that, after the pumps were put into service, a start-up report was never provided.

7. The pump design was tested at MWI and, reportedly, met the design specification under ideal laboratory test conditions, without any reserve power.

Mr. Schriener indicated that testing a pump in a laboratory at ideal conditions, at 100% of the motor, with no reserve and irregularities, creates problems.

8. The pump motor had no reserve power (at 100% motor full load amperage of 140 amps) when tested under ideal MWI factory test conditions.
9. Actual field conditions are not ideal; therefore, pumps and motors should be designed with a safety factor. Ideal power is not present in the real world.

Mr. Schriener advised that he would not design a pump with a 100% safety factor; he would design a larger motor, so the components do not heat up.

10. Suggested practice of pump station design is to provide for a safety factor to account for unanticipated field conditions.

11. Smaller motor drive pulleys, as recommended by MWI and CAS, were installed and demonstrated satisfactory operating results.
12. A 9% speed reduction to 91% of the original pump design speed will result in a capacity reduction to 91% of the original specified 37,800 GPM design point to 34,400 GPM (9% reduction in capacity).

Mr. Schriener explained that there is a 9% reduction in the actual pump capacity with the pulleys.

13. A 9% speed reduction to 91% of the original pump design speed will result in a head reduction of the original specified 9.3 feet TDH design point to 7.7 feet TDH (17% reduction in head).
14. A 9% speed reduction to 91% of the original pump design speed will result in a required horsepower requirement from the full load 125 hp design point to 94 hp (25% reduction in power required).

Mr. Schriener stated that the pump will run more efficiently and effectively but not at the design point, thereby, not providing the desired output.

15. A 9% speed reduction to 91% of the original pump design speed will result in a reduced pumping capacity of 33,500 GPM at the initial design head (TDH) condition of 9.3 feet.

Mr. Schriener summarized that pulleys were installed to get through the storm season, allowing the operation of two pumps. He noted that this will require the operator to “jockey” the pumps. Mr. Schriener pointed out that the pumps with the pulleys, at a lower pumping capacity, can pump through a higher range, resulting in a higher static head, so the operator can pump down further.

Mr. Wrathell asked if the pumps can operate effectively, when the water level is high. Mr. Schriener indicated that the pumps will still run. Mr. Wrathell surmised that, at a certain level, two pumps can run with the pulleys, so they can drain down to a certain point; the ability to drain down further with the pulleys further lessens the effectiveness of the ability to drain down further. Mr. Schriener concurred and recalled that, prior to this, the pumps tripped when Mr. Selchan tried to draw down the basin, as there was too much of a static head on the inlet side versus the discharge side.

Mr. Schriener estimated that, with the two modified pumps and two original pumps, the total GPM is 142,600, versus the initial 151,200 GPM, for a difference of 9,000 GPM, or 5.7% less; this is the difference between what was purchased and what the District currently has.

Mr. Schriener advised that it would be difficult to operate the current pump station because Mr. Selchan must keep the two pumps with the pulleys or bring in two additional pumps when the flows are low, which is not the way that the pumps were intended to perform.

Mr. Schriener recommended the following:

1. Replace all electrical components, including circuit breakers and starters, with the proper equipment and sizes. (Estimated construction cost: \$150,000)
2. Replacement of all four 125 hp motors with 150 hp motors. (Estimated construction cost: \$319,000)

Mr. Schriener indicated that these are the priority items and replacement entails removing all existing pumps and reconfiguring the motor.

3. Modifying the inlet design basin to conform to the Hydraulic Institute Standards to install separator walls between pumps, eliminating the columns in front of pump intakes, repairing the inlet basin; there is an inlet slope ramp that is at 17%, which should be 3%, at the most, that should be wider, longer and deeper. (Estimated construction cost: \$1,150,000)
4. Lower the intake another 4'. (Estimated construction cost: To Be Determined)

Mr. Schriener pointed out that these are optional recommendations. He spoke to the contractor who built the intake and there may be some issues with the existing structure. Mr. Schriener highly recommended establishing a protocol for the pumps.

Mr. Maguire commented that this was a good report but it is disturbing because these were brand new pump stations with new reservoirs, pumps and motors. Mr. Schriener concurred.

Mr. Morera requested Mr. McKune's opinion.

Mr. McKune recognized that Mr. Schriener did an incredible job disseminating all of the facts and his recommendations were extremely accurate, based on what needs to be completed and what should be completed, eventually. Mr. McKune went back and forth for months regarding the Hydraulic Institute Standards and vortexing and believed that the problem with the pump station is that the motors are too small. He recommended spending \$500,000 to install larger motors and correct the electrical switches and breakers, to accommodate larger motors.

Mr. McKune noted that items three and four will only provide marginal improvement for a large amount of money.

Mr. McKune provided the example of a speedometer on a car, with the red line at 6,000 RPM, which represents the pump motor. The motor should be able to run at its full required fuel and amperage draw and be less than the red line. He pointed out that if the pump is pumped more than the required design because of a storm and the head must be increased, it will go almost to the red line but will still be below its maximum recommended power draw and nothing bad will happen. Mr. McKune noted that the red line area is the service factor on an electrical motor, which is 140 amps on a 125 hp motor; when the pumps are running, they go beyond the 140 amps and into the red line, which is bad. He recommended using a 150 hp motor.

Mr. McKune surmised that the unbalanced voltages, currents and angles are a result of FPL issues. He pointed out that FPL acknowledged that the amperages appear within their standards and the District needs to “live with it”. Mr. McKune believed that, if the motor was big enough, perhaps the District can “live with it”, unless the District wants a ‘D’ rated station that will not be able to pump over an extended period of time. He recommended repairing the motors as quickly as possible, by contacting MWI to find out how to mount a larger motor, as the repair must be completed in a specific way.

Mr. Maguire wondered why a 125 hp pump was ordered and the reservoir was incorrect, if MWI reviewed the specifications and IBI agreed, and whether Mr. Schriener was the best option to resolve this matter.

Mr. Selchan recalled when IBI made their recommendations; they designed the pump station and presented it to the Board and MWI manufactured the pump, which works fine but the motor attached to the pump does not have enough horsepower to drive it to its full potential. He stated that the pump manufacturer provided the pump that they were asked to provide and IBI was satisfied with the motor working on that load. Mr. Selchan noted that no one mentioned to District Staff or to the Board that the pump would be running as fast as it could run; therefore, IBI is at fault. Mr. Selchan recalled IBI saying, many times, that they were pump experts; the Board and District Staff were under the impression that the pumps were superior to the components in the old pump station. It was not until the pumps were operating that it was discovered that they were not operating as they should. He recalled IBI reporting that everything was fine and there was no vortexing, which were false statements. Mr. Selchan voiced his

opinion that IBI was not trying as hard as they could to resolve this issue and, when CAS was hired, they spent a great deal of time and effort to find out what was occurring.

Mr. Schriener reported that some value engineering was applied to the design, at some point, as 150 hp motors were initially included in the design and then changed to 125 hp motors, which MWI was asked to provide. He believed that MWI recommended 150 hp motors and a deeper basin, based on the Hydraulic Institute Standards but could not substantiate his belief. Mr. Schriener explained that most engineers design a pump station based on the Hydraulic Institute Standards but others design it according to their standards and hope that it works. He pointed out that the Hydraulic Institute Standards is the bible on how to design a pump station.

Mr. Schriener agreed with Mr. McKune's recommendation to install larger motors and correct the electrical switches and breakers, to accommodate larger motors. He noted that items three and four were based on Hydraulic Institute Standards and would only provide minimal pump operation improvement.

In response to Mr. Morera's question, Mr. Zielnicki confirmed that the price of each pump station was \$3.5 million.

Mr. Prudhomme recalled the analogy that the District purchased a BMW but received a Volkswagen and wondered if IBI can be asked to pay the difference to get the pump station back up to a BMW, or whether this was a lost cause. Mr. Wrathell did not believe it was a lost cause and recalled, several meetings ago, saying that the Board needed documentation substantiating that IBI's recommendation was inaccurate. Mr. Wrathell pointed out that this analysis is exactly what the Board needs to understand the problem and develop a plan to make the District whole.

Mr. Morera indicated that the District paid \$3.5 million for a design to achieve a goal and, two years later, the building is designed but nowhere near the expected goal; now the District has a proposal to remediate the problem, at 46% of the \$3.5 million. Mr. McKune pointed out that the \$3.5 million did not include engineering services. Mr. Schriener concurred. Mr. Morera voiced disappointment that the District "has to knock down the building with a bulldozer and start all over again" because of the issues.

Mr. Prudhomme pointed out that IBI could claim that the project failed in round 2.

Mr. Morera was displeased because he understood that the pump station had a 50-year life expectancy, which is now incorrect. He voiced his opinion that either the engineer was incredibly incompetent and did a bad job or willfully or neglectfully, with malfeasance, made accommodations knowing what the end project would be.

Mr. Wrathell warned the Board about making accusations of malfeasance without evidence. Mr. Morera stressed that this was his opinion.

Mr. McKune pointed out that IBI did everything they could to keep costs down, as much as possible, which is an engineer's objective. He recalled telling IBI not to value engineer themselves into the ground.

Mr. Morera admitted to using the wrong terminology for expressing his feelings and indicated that IBI should take responsibility for not providing what they promised.

Mr. Wrathell proposed that the Board authorize the District Engineer to proceed with the analysis of Pump Station #2 and, upon completion of said analysis, strategy should be discussed.

Mr. Malefatto asked when it first became apparent that there was a significant deficiency in Pump Station #1. Mr. McKune indicated that the deficiency was noticed in the results of the pump test that MWI performed, prior to installation of the pumps. Mr. McKune recalled that, when MWI was asked why a 125 hp motor was installed, they said that they were told to provide a 125 hp motor. Mr. McKune voiced his opinion that MWI provided what they were asked to provide and it was up to IBI staff to say "yes" or "no".

Mr. Malefatto questioned when this occurred because there is a statute of limitations. Mr. Prudhomme recalled that the pumps were installed at the end of 2012 or beginning of 2013. In response to a question, Mr. Malefatto indicated that the statute of limitations depends on whether this is negligence or breach of contract, which is four years. Mr. Schriener reported that MWI submitted their plans to IBI in May, 2011. Mr. Malefatto advised that the real question was when District Staff became aware of the problem. Mr. Schriener noted that MWI performed a pump test in December, 2011. Based on the discussion, Mr. Malefatto heard IBI saying that there was no problem.

Mr. Wrathell recalled that this issue was the reason for the change in engineering firms because, when the pump station was originally built, the Board and District Staff relied upon the expertise of an IBI licensed engineer. He pointed out that a year-and-a-half later, when the Board finally changed engineering firms, problems were detected, although, the first inclination of a problem was when Mr. Selchan was running the pumps during a storm event and the pumps were tripping. He recommended that documentation and information from the testing be compiled to substantiate this.

Mr. McKune recalled that, when the pumps were first running, they tripped immediately and IBI staff determined that the transformer provided by FPL was too small. After FPL

provided larger transformers and the pumps continued to trip, District Staff realized that there was a problem. Mr. Selchan confirmed that IBI informed District Staff that the problem was with the FPL transformer.

Mr. Maguire questioned what happens if the Board does not take action on the pumps. Mr. Selchan advised against taking no action because District Staff is not certain about how the pumps will react in any situation. Mr. Selchan explained that the electrical components have a safety mechanism but, once it reaches a certain point, the pumps will blow up or automatically shut off.

In response to Mr. Maguire's question, Mr. Selchan expected that the pump will trip from continuous pumping. Mr. Morera asked how long the pump must remain turned off, once the pump tripped. Mr. Selchan indicated that it depends on how hot the components get because they must cool down; in an eight-hour period, the pumps can only be turned on and off so many times before the electrical components and motors are damaged.

Mr. Maguire recalled that the pulleys were replaced and asked if they helped. Mr. Selchan indicated that the pulleys reduced the amount of water pumped, which reduced the hp requirement. Mr. Schriener pointed out that, with the reduced hp requirement, Mr. Selchan can pump for a longer time with fewer amps. Mr. Selchan estimated that 9,000 gallons of water were lost per minute.

Mr. Maguire asked if the District would be liable should the Board elect to take no action on the pumps at this time and, hypothetically, a hurricane event delivers 20" of rain in two days, plus flooding. Mr. Malefatto could not advise the Board to do nothing, based on the recommendation from the District Engineer, as the District would be facing a significant liability issue. Mr. Schriener advised that doing nothing would shorten the lifespan of the motors and equipment.

In response to Mr. Maguire's question, Mr. McKune indicated that MWI provided an extended warranty of five years on the pumps because they were aware of Staff's concerns but noted that the problem was not with the pumps. Mr. Maguire believed that MWI would claim that they were not liable because that is what was ordered. Mr. Schriener agreed.

Mr. McKune advised that he has extensive experience with pump stations and strongly recommended that the Board proceed with the remediations, immediately.

In response to Mr. Malefatto's question, Mr. Schriener recalled conversation about MWI recommending 150 hp motors but could not confirm the validity of the statement. Mr. McKune

pointed out that the District does not have all records but acknowledged that MWI was professional and extremely knowledgeable about the type of pump needed for the set amount of water pumped, based on the conditions, and even provided a spreadsheet of the pump, amperage, etc. Mr. Maguire suggested obtaining documentation from MWI.

Mr. Schriener stressed that the District purchased a pump that pumped a set GPM number and, now, this number is reduced because of heat, tripping and amperage problems. He pointed out that District Staff observed physical issues occurring at the pump station, indicating that the motors are not large enough.

Mr. Morera questioned how this can be challenged. Mr. Schriener did not know. Mr. Morera suggested that District Staff compile information and timelines, as soon as possible, and provide to District Counsel so he can proceed with drafting the legal documents to address the potential monetary impact. Based on Mr. Schriener's recommendation, Mr. McKune's input and District Counsel's advice, Mr. Morera surmised that the Board must make a decision on the top two recommendations provided by the District Engineer and spend approximately \$500,000 or more to correct a problem that the District should never have encountered. Mr. Morera recommended presenting IBI with the facts and the resolution and hearing their response regarding their responsibility.

Mr. Morera acknowledged that every "yes" vote he cast for this project was based on IBI telling him "We are the engineer and I know what the project is and this is our recommendation". He noted that the Board follows recommendations of the District Engineer and District Staff.

Mr. Wrathell previously asked Mr. Selchan to recollect the storm event where the pumps tripped, as he recalled discussion at a Board meeting, in 2013, about issues with the pump stations when the storm event occurred and Mr. Selchan had to pump. Based on what Mr. Malefatto stated, Mr. Wrathell pointed out that this was the first time that District Staff realized there was a problem and suggested locating the minutes where this discussion occurred, as a starting point. Mr. Wrathell recommended that the Board authorize the District Engineer to proceed, as quickly as possible, to complete the Pump Station #2 analysis and, using this information to determine the direction to proceed, either for the District to allocate funds to correct these issues or put IBI on notice that the District will pursue litigation.

Mr. Morera agreed and noted that repairs should be completed prior to the beginning of next year's rainy season. Mr. McKune and Mr. Schriener concurred. Mr. Morera pointed out that they have six months to make repairs and stated that MWI is busy and needs advance notice.

Mr. Schriener will provide a proposal for replacement of all electrical components and all four 125 hp motors with 150 hp motors in both pump stations.

Mr. Morera remarked that this was the most frustrating report he received. He did not blame Mr. Schriener or CAS for providing this information to the Board. Mr. Morera expressed disappointment in believing that, what was a sound project, which was exactly what the Board was asking for, on behalf of residents, was not so sound.

Mr. Schriener pointed out that thermal circuit breakers were placed in each panel for each pump, which was not necessary, because there was thermal protection in the motor and other components.

Mr. Maguire questioned what Mr. Schriener would say to IBI if this happened to CAS. Mr. Schriener indicated that, when he makes a mistake, he acknowledges it but did not know what IBI would say, other than blaming FPL. Mr. McKune stated that, when he makes mistakes, he owns up to them and offers suggestions on how to fix the mistakes, which is why the District Engineer carries professional liability insurance.

Mr. Maguire asked if there are 200 hp pumps in Pump Station #2. Mr. Selchan indicated that there are four, 200 hp pumps. Mr. Schriener estimated that the basin is 500 acres. Mr. Selchan pointed out that the difference in Pump Station #2 is the generator, which is costly; he noted that he was unsure whether the generator will generate enough power to run all four pumps, in the event of a power failure, under extreme conditions. Mr. Schriener advised that the generator in Pump Station #2 is the same size as the one in Pump Station #1.

Mr. Morera voiced concern about who he can trust, as recommendations were provided by a qualified individual. Mr. Wrathell acknowledged that, in the Districts he represents, sophisticated land developers rely upon the professional opinion of a licensed professional engineer, as they are hired to provide this expertise. Addressing Mr. Morera's question, Mr. Wrathell advised that the Board relies on the professional in this arena, which is the District Engineer and voiced his opinion that IBI misled the Board.

Mr. Maguire questioned the cost of the pump station analysis. Mr. Schriener estimated approximately \$40,000 and requested authorization.

Mr. Schriener pointed out that CAS has very experienced engineers, who provide their expertise on stormwater pump stations and recalled that, during the last request for qualifications (RFQ) process, when CAS was vying for the engineering contract, Rhon-Ernest Jones was awarded the contract and the firm was eventually sold to IBI. Mr. Schriener contended that Rhon-

Ernest Jones had no experience with pump stations. Mr. Morera had the same recollection. Mr. Schriener reported that, when CAS was selected as District Engineer, they had recently completed two pump stations across the street that were operating with no problems and were the same size as the District's pump stations. Mr. Schriener acknowledged that his firm can be trusted but reminded the Board to be careful about hiring professionals who are more of a land development engineer.

Mr. Morera questioned if Rhon-Ernest Jones was part of IBI when his firm was selected. Mr. Schriener replied no. Mr. Wrathell recalled that IBI purchased Rhon-Ernest Jones around the time of the engineering selection, when an updated Water Control Plan was completed, IBI was involved in the pump station renovations.

Mr. Wrathell recommended that the Board authorize a not-to-exceed amount of \$40,000 for the District Engineer to prepare the pump station analysis for Pump Station #2.

Mr. Schriener suggested that the Board consider replacing all electrical components and all four 125 hp motors with 150 hp motors in both pump stations. Mr. Wrathell recommended that the Board take the next 30 days to consider this recommendation and that Mr. Schriener provide a plan, so this project can be placed out to bid.

Mr. McKune reported that the electrical system for the pump station was installed by Current Connections, who did a great job and are continuing to assist the District. Mr. McKune advised against placing a public bid and recommended using Current Connections and MWI, as they were not at fault. Mr. McKune asked if Staff can contact MWI and Current Connection, based on the purchasing policy and request that they submit proposals. Mr. Malefatto indicated that the work can be considered emergency repairs, under the current contract. Mr. Wrathell recommended that District Staff speak with MWI and Current Connection regarding the cost and the specifications of the work and that Mr. Malefatto advise the Board on the process of hiring these companies, whether through an emergency repair or as a sole source provider.

Mr. Schriener advised that the pumps were fine but the shafts may need to be modified. He will prepare a small schematic drawing on the control panel, as the components must be replaced.

Mr. Morera asked if a credit can be obtained from the manufacturer. Mr. Schriener believed that MWI will provide some proration or discount for retaining the District's business. Mr. Maguire suggested repairing two pumps at a time. Mr. McKune recommended repairing one pump at a time.

Mr. Wrathell believed that the scope of the work was replacing all electrical components and all four 125 hp motors with 150 hp motors in both pump stations, at a not-to-exceed amount of \$500,000. Mr. Maguire pointed out that the initial cost was \$500,000 and \$100,000 was necessary for Mr. Malefatto’s time to go after IBI. Mr. Wrathell noted that this project and the West Outfall Canal project would utilize the entire “Capital Projects” fund for this year.

There was consensus from the Board to defer further discussion of this matter until the next meeting.

Mr. Malefatto will speak to his partners about the best legal approach.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, authorization for the District Engineer to prepare the Pump Station Analysis for Pump Station #2, in an amount not-to-exceed \$40,000, was approved.

Mr. Schriener discussed the District Wide Stormwater Modeling of the Interconnected Pond Routing (ICPR), showing the flow of water through canals. He reported that CAS reviewed the IBI model and the bridges were not included. CAS recently completed a survey of the bridges and are now including them in the model. Mr. Schriener hoped to provide the results of the modeling at the next meeting.

C. Engineering Consultant: *John McKune*

Mr. McKune reported that, between now and the next meeting, he will contact Current Connection and MWI to discuss the pump station repairs and provide estimates to the Board.

D. Field Supervisor: *Cory Selchan*

Mr. Selchan thanked the Board for considering the employees’ insurance benefits, which was a positive step. He reported that, since the last meeting, the District received over 9” of rain. No pumping was necessary at Pump Station #1, as water levels were at 8.7’ and were down to 8.1’ this morning, even with the large amount of rainfall that occurred two weeks ago. Mr. Selchan noted that Pump Station #2 was operating continually, since the last meeting but problems occurred every time four pumps were running, simultaneously. The pumping ceased, as the water level in front of the pump station was low and the pumps will not be turned on until the pump station analysis is performed by the District Engineer.

Mr. Selchan reported that Pump Station #2 is experiencing the problems that Pump Station #1 experienced, where the water level gets low and the amps increase, which shuts off

the entire building. He noted that District Staff tried to start the generator but it shut off and everything had to be reset and only three pumps could run. Mr. Selchan indicated that, even though the District received a lot of rain in a very short period of time, especially two weeks ago, when over 2" of rain was reported in half an hour, the pumps kept up with the water, which was fine. Had it been a longer event, the outcome would have been different.

Mr. Selchan advised that, if the generator becomes an issue in the pump station analysis, this could be costly, in addition to the other items that must be addressed.

E. Manager: Wrathell, Hunt & Associates, LLC

i. Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of August 31, 2015

Mr. Wrathell presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of August 31, 2015. He reported, on Page 2, that assessment collections were slightly above 100%.

Referring to Page 3, Mr. Wrathell stated that the District's overall expenses were only at 47%, year-to-date. He noted that, of the \$844,250 budgeted for "Capital outlay", only \$180 was spent and the remainder will be rolled over into Fiscal Year 2016, which most likely will be used for the pump station renovations.

Mr. Wrathell advised that the "Debt service fund", on Page 4, reflected the November 1, 2014 and May 1, 2015 bond payments. The next bond payment is scheduled for November 1, 2015.

Mr. Wrathell referred to the "Capital Projects Fund", on Page 5, and reported that, as of August 31, 2015, the fund balance was \$123,290.

On MOTION by Mr. Prudhomme and seconded by Mr. Maguire, with all in favor, the Unaudited Financial Statements as of August 31, 2015, were approved.

ii. NEXT MEETING DATE: November 4, 2015 at 6:30 P.M.

Mr. Morera indicated that the next meeting will be held on November 4, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. at this location.


ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned.

On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]



Secretary/Assistant Secretary



Chair/Vice Chair