

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
SUNSHINE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT**

A Regular Meeting of the Sunshine Water Control District's Board of Supervisors was held on **Wednesday, April 12, 2017, 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:**

Cindy Cerbone	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Alfred J. Malefatto	District Counsel
Gene Schriener	District Engineer
Steve Zielnicki	Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.
Orlando Rubio	Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.
Cory Selchan	Field Superintendent
John McKune	McKune & Associates
Tony Grau	Grau & Associates

**FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Call to Order**

Ms. Cerbone called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

**SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Roll Call**

Ms. Cerbone 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 of Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2016, Prepared by Grau & Associates**

Mr. Tony Grau, of Grau & Associates, stated that the “Independent Auditor’s Report”, on Pages 1 and 2, reflected a clean opinion with respect to the financial statements of the District, in accordance with Government Auditing Standards (GAS). On Page 5, the “Changes in New Position” reflected an increase of almost \$1.2 million, from Fiscal Year 2015 to Fiscal Year 2016. The “Independent Auditor’s Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters”, on Pages 24 and 25, the “Independent Auditor’s Report on Compliance with the Requirements of Section 218.415, Florida Statutes”, on Page 26, the Management Letter on Page 27, the “Report to Management”, on Page 28, reflected that the District was in compliance with the provisions of the Auditor General; there were no findings and it was a clean audit. Mr. Morera was proud that the District received a clean audit for many years, and hoped that this report showed how well the District’s finances were being managed.

**\*\*\*Mr. Grau left the meeting.\*\*\***

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Consideration of Resolution 2017-3, Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2016**

Mr. Morera presented Resolution 2017-3 for the Board’s consideration.

**On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, Resolution 2017-3, Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2016, was adopted.**

**SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Consideration of FASD Membership**

Ms. Cerbone stated that the District did not renew its Florida Association of Special Districts (FASD) membership for Fiscal Year 2016. To renew, the District must complete an application and pay a \$3,000 renewal fee. Mr. Maguire recalled that Mr. Morera attended FASD events, in the past. Discussion ensued regarding why the membership was not renewed for Fiscal Year 2016, the benefits of FASD membership, FASD conferences, etc. Mr. Prudhomme favored renewing, if all Board Members were committed to attending and would address the criteria for being selected "District of the Year", at each meeting. Mr. Malefatto stated that Mr. Lewis recommended that the Board renew its membership and attend the conference. Mr. Lewis frequently spoke at conferences.

**On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, renewal of the District's FASD Membership, for 2016/2017, was approved.**

Ms. Cerbone stated that the annual conference will be held from June 12 to June 16. If there was no quorum, for the June 14 Regular meeting, it could be cancelled or rescheduled.

**EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Approval of Minutes****A. March 8, 2017 Landowners' Meeting**

Mr. Morera presented the March 8, 2017 Landowners' Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

Ms. Cerbone stated that changes submitted by District Counsel would be incorporated.

**On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the March 8, 2017 Landowners' Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.**

**B. March 8, 2017 Regular Meeting**

Mr. Morera presented the March 8, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes and asked for any additions, deletions or corrections.

Ms. Cerbone stated that changes submitted by District Counsel and the District Engineer would be incorporated.

The following changes were made:

Line 282: Change “the City” to “Hoerbiger, the new company that bought the property”

Line 283: Change “the City” to “Hoerbiger”

Line 286: Change “City” to “City’s contractor”

Line 180: Change “Uncontaminated” to “Contaminated”

**On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the March 8, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended, were approved.**

**NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Supervisors’ Communications**

Mr. Maguire toured the Broken Woods canals with Mr. Selchan and received an update on the County’s University Drive project, which was helpful and educational. Mr. Maguire stated that the District’s goal was to ensure proper drainage, not to beautify.

Mr. Morera stated that The Taste of Coral Springs raised \$40,000, which would be donated to several worthy organizations. This year, 900 people attended. Mr. Morera thanked those that participated in the event.

Mr. Morera met Mr. Ron Stein, the City’s Construction Project Manager, who was aware of the issues with the Municipal Center and would speak to the contractor about fulfilling the District’s requirements, according to the timeline.

Mr. Morera stated that the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual World Fest, which highlighted the diversity of the City’s residents, was held on April 2 and was well attended.

**TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Approval of Unaudited Financial Statements as of February 28, 2017**

Ms. Cerbone presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of February 28, 2017. Assessment revenue collections were 87%.

**On MOTION by Mr. Maguire and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Unaudited Financial Statements as of February 28, 2017, were approved.**

**ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS****Staff Reports****A. District Counsel: *Lewis, Longman & Walker, P.A.***

Mr. Malefatto received communication from Mr. Michael Wilson, of Broad and Cassel, the attorney representing the District in the IBI litigation. Last month, Mr. Malefatto reported that the complaint was amended to add the claim to recover money from the Lanzo settlement. It was accepted by the court but, the attorneys for IBI Group Inc., (IBI) filed a motion to dismiss the claim. Mr. Wilson did not think the dismissal would stand and the matter would be set for hearing soon.

Mr. Morera asked if the timeline was typical. Mr. Malefatto stated it was normal. Documents were being exchanged and the District would soon hear from Mr. Wilson about coordination of the documents relating to the two pump stations. Mr. Morera recalled that the Lanzo litigation was resolved quicker. Mr. Malefatto stated that the process was the same and did not know why this litigation was taking longer; he would ask Mr. Wilson about the delay. Ms. Cerbone recalled that the Lanzo litigation commenced in January and was settled by June. Mr. Schriener stated that the Lanzo claim was a contractor claim for added dollars and the District was now seeking damages. Mr. Malefatto stated that this is a contract claim and a design defect claim. Mr. Malefatto believed that it was proceeding normally if not quickly.

**B. District Engineer: *Craig A. Smith & Associates*****• Monthly Engineer's Report**

Mr. Schriener presented the Monthly Engineer's Report. There were no permitting items.

- **Coral Springs Drive Bridge Improvements**
- **West Outfall Canal Improvements**

Mr. Schriener stated that the construction plans were completed but the specifications were not.

Mr. Rubio reported the following:

- CAS and the Structural Engineer were developing a scope and the Structural Engineer must prove to Broward County that lowering the canal bottom would not affect the stability of the Coral Springs Drive bridges.

Mr. Schriener stated that the Structural Engineer would provide typical and worst case scenarios, versus performing expensive testing. The Structural Engineer had major experience in repairing bridges. Mr. Morera asked if the County would be receptive. Mr. Rubio believed there would be no pushback from the County, as the Structural Engineer would provide signed and sealed documentation. Mr. Schriener stated that the Structural Engineer was satisfied with the revetment and how the piling would be protected.

- The South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD), Environmental Resource Permit Application, SFWMD Water Use Permit Application and Broward County Pollution Prevention Division (BCPPD) Dewatering Application were submitted and would be issued. The only pending application was the Broward County Environmental Resource License (BCERL) Permit for dredge and fills.

Mr. Rubio stated that approval must be obtained from BCPPD, before an application could be submitted to the BCERL. Ms. Cerbone stated that approval was received today, and the District Engineer and District Counsel would explain the wording. If the Board was comfortable with the permit, it would be executed by the District Manager.

Mr. Malefatto recommended approval, and stated that the duplication in efforts was due to SFWMD and BCERL requiring dewatering, due to a concern about prior contamination from a Dryclean USA site, which must be monitored. Any contamination, to the water and/or soil, during the dewatering process, must be disclosed. Mr. Rubio stated that the Dryclean USA site was northeast of the project location but there was a plume; as long as the contractor used a pump with a capacity of no more than 1,500 per minute, the radius of influence would be 1,000' from the plume. All of these standards were included in the permit, which the contractor must follow.

Mr. Morera asked if, during dewatering, water would be pumped toward the pump and not into Canal Z. Mr. Schriener stated that it depended on whether water levels were down. Mr. Rubio stated that dewatering should be performed during the dry season. The canal would be dewatered in segments, starting with the north section into Canal Z. Mr. McKune stated that the plume would not come toward the District, as long as water levels in the canal were up. Mr.

Rubio stated that, in the northeast corner of the intersection, there was a small ditch that would act as a barrier. The contractor must follow the conditions and, if there were changes, the permit must be modified. Mr. Malefatto advised of the contract specification that the contractor was representing the District and must follow all permit conditions; violations and fines were the contractor's responsibility. Mr. McKune recommended that the contract stipulate that monitoring would be performed during construction. Mr. Rubio stated that the BCERL had standard conditions for turbidity monitoring. Mr. Malefatto stated that there must be effluent monitoring.

Mr. Morera asked what would happen if there was contamination and who would ensure cleanup, to the extent required by existing regulations and the level of contaminants. Mr. McKune stated that, until the extent of the affected area was known, the cost could not be estimated but the cost could be extensive. Mr. Rubio stated that the only known contaminants could potentially come from the Dryclean USA. Mr. Malefatto stated that the primary concern was to ensure that there were no contaminants from Dryclean USA but the statement was broader; it could be anything under State regulations. A thorough monitoring program for the effluent must be enacted. Any contamination, not just Dryclean USA contamination, must be reported, to ensure that it did not spread. The contractor should be responsible for the related cost but, because the District was the permittee, the District would be responsible. Mr. McKune asked if the permit could be transferred to the contractor. Mr. Malefatto stated not without the County's consent. Mr. McKune asked if the specs would contain enough monitoring requirements, so the contractor understood, prior to bidding, that monitoring would be required. Mr. Malefatto agreed that it should be part of the specs.

Mr. Morera was concerned that dewatering must cease if there were any spikes outside the County's levels and asked how County criteria addressed the scenario of runoff from a District canal contaminating a body of water with roadway contaminants. Mr. Schriener stated that dewatering would stop until the problem was remediated. Mr. Morera asked if the water must run through a filtering system to eradicate contaminants before it was pumped back into the canal. Mr. Rubio stated that it was a possibility, if standards were not met, which would necessitate remediation, in order to proceed. Mr. Selchan recommended that the District continue working in the dry, even though it was not required. Discussion ensued regarding the risk threshold for contamination. Mr. Selchan stated that the parts per million tested was

extremely high and the odds of contamination were low. District staff tested the water frequently, for phosphorus, nitrogen, etc., and the levels were very low. There must be a high level that would affect human public safety and health for the work to be shut down, which was unlikely. There must be ways to mitigate, if it occurred.

Mr. Morera asked if the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines must be followed. Mr. Malefatto stated that the State guidelines were followed. The primary concern was that the dewatering does not spread the contamination from Dryclean USA. Dewatering and pumping into another canal was not a risk. Mr. Rubio stated that the chances of turbidity issues occurring were greater than contamination issues. In response to Mr. Morera's question, Mr. McKune stated that the Dryclean USA contamination affected CSID only. Mr. Morera suggested making the General Contractor (GC) responsible for on-site investigations and contamination cleanup, if required. Mr. Malefatto stated that the County would look to the District for responsibility and the District could put that responsibility on the GC. Mr. Rubio stated that the contractor was responsible for the cost of dewatering and monitoring but, if something unforeseen was discovered, the District will need to respond and issue a project change order to cover the additional costs and time needed to address the remediation (or could hire a third party to address same).

Mr. Malefatto stated that, unless there were objections, Mr. Wrathell should be authorized to return the BCERL Permit for dredging and filling. Ms. Cerbone stated that typically, Management did not bring permits that were being executed to the Board; this was an exception because of the verbiage. There was Board consensus for Staff to continue with the West Outfall Canal (WOFC) project. The permit was distributed for discussion purposes, not for consideration.

- CAS and District Staff continued to develop a resident outreach document and approach; the draft document would be presented.
- CAS communicated with the local cable company regarding relocating cable lines to outside the District ROW. Plans were provided today and Mr. Rubio advised his contact that construction would begin in the Fall.
- The tentative project timeline schedule remained the same and appeared on track for Fall 2017.



- District Staff initiated preliminary courtesy conversations with the City Arborist regarding canal encroachment and tree mitigation issues, which would be followed with a meeting between CAS, District Staff and the City to determine the best project approach regarding these matters. Over the next few months, public outreach methods would be explored.

Mr. Selchan spoke with the City Forester, who was reviewing the plans and informally, asked for a tree-for-tree deal; however, the arrangement would not be formal until City Staff made a determination. Once a decision was made, the District would make a formal request and meet with the City Forester. The deal must be approved by the City Commission. Mr. Maguire believed that a decision must be made first by the City Managers and Planners before going before the Commission. Mr. Selchan spoke to Mr. Wrathell about calling the City Manager; however, the former City Manager has not been replaced.

- Preparation of contract bid documents and specifications would follow the permit approval process.

- **DRAFT SWCD Presentation**

Ms. Cerbone presented a District overview and five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The purpose was to present the information to the City, for feedback, to avoid a repeat of what happened with the Canal Z project. The document was not final; it would continually evolve and would eventually be presented to the City Commission, for input, revised, presented to the Board, for final approval, and posted on the City Website.

Ms. Cerbone discussed the following:

- *Slide 2: Agenda*
- *Slide 3: Mission Statement*

Ms. Cerbone included the Mission Statement from the District's Handbook and the website. Mr. Maguire suggested including the purpose of the District, which was in Chapter 298, Florida Statutes. Mr. Malefatto stated Chapter 298, was for Water Control Districts. Mr. Zielnicki would provide the language to include:

- *Slide 4: District Wide Map*

Ms. Cerbone recommended highlighting the canals. Mr. Maguire suggested highlighting the western canals, such as Canal Z, which were the largest.

- *Slide 5: Five Year CIP*

Ms. Cerbone stated that the goal was to improve and keep costs down. Mr. Morera suggested changing “keep taxpayers cost down” to “being fiscally responsible to landowners”. After further discussion, the five-year CIP would read, “Our goal is to continue to improve the overall canal infrastructure, while remaining fiscally responsible to landowners”. Mr. McKune suggested changing “overall canal infrastructure” to “water management infrastructure”.

➤ *Side 6: What’s been done - Recent*

- *Slide 7: Pump Station 1*
- *Slide 8: Pump Station 2*
- *Slide 9: Canal Z*
- *Slide 10: Canal Z Culvert Replacements @ Coral Springs Drive*

Mr. Selchan stated that the picture for the Canal Z culvert replacements did not correlate with the description. Culvert work was completed as part of the capital improvement projects and included the control structures. After further discussion, Ms. Cerbone would change Page 10 to “Canal Z Control Structures @ Coral Springs Drive”. She would include a slide for the Canal Z culvert replacements, if a photo was provided. On Page 9, Ms. Cerbone would add “and two culvert replacements” to “Canal Z”.

➤ *Slide 11: Five Year CIP table of projects, location and estimated time frame*

On the table, Ms. Cerbone included the four phases of the WOFC improvements, Canal Z, Westchester Canal KK and Canal LL, Canal NN and Canal 20. Ms. Cerbone asked if anything other than WOFC should have dates or “TBD”. Mr. Morera liked “TBD”. As projects were completed, dates could be added. Mr. Morera stated that Canal Z should include bank restoration, behind the Eagle Trace properties. Mr. Selchan stated that the bank slope was 2:1 but should be 3:1. Discussion ensued regarding the canals. Mr. Maguire suggested removing the phases and having one large item for “WOFC Improvements”. Mr. Zielnicki stated that it should be segmented.

➤ *Slide 12: Current Improvement Plan – West Outfall Canal*

Ms. Cerbone stated that there was no statement regarding why the WOFC was the next project, versus the Corporate Park, and wondered whether there should be a transition slide or justification. Mr. Selchan stated that it depended on the District Engineer’s analysis. Mr. Schriener stated that the first bullet for “WOFC – primary conveyance” was sufficient; however, there was no “main drain”, it was the only drain.

➤ *Slide 13: Map of WOFC Phases (started)*

➤ *Slide 14: WOFC Summary of Hydraulic, Cost & Landowner Impact*

Ms. Cerbone referred to a map of each Phase of the WOFC work, from where the work started and currently and a summary of the hydraulic, cost and landowner impact. Mr. Rubio suggested removing the “total” column. Mr. Maguire theorized that Canal Z was like a “straw” that would be widened, so that water could flow properly into the pump station. Mr. Selchan stated that Phases 1 and 2 had the worst congested bridges. Mr. Maguire believed that there was a numerical thought process, based on hydraulics, cost and taxpayer impact. Mr. Zielnicki stated that the high landowner number meant the least impact and the high hydraulic number meant a good impact. Mr. Morera stated a resident reading the document must be able to understand the value of the numbers, what they represent and the logic. Mr. Zielnicki suggested simplifying the table by showing what was intended, versus having starting, mid and end points. Discussion ensued regarding the phases. Mr. Zielnicki asked if each phase must be bid separately. Mr. Selchan replied affirmatively, because the scope of each phase would change.

➤ *Slide 15: WOFC Current & Future Phases (where we are now)*

Ms. Cerbone would change the phases, as they did not match the physical map. Instead of a straight line approach to the WOFC work, work would commence at the north end, go to the south end and the next portion would be re-evaluated. Phase 1 would be evaluated before Phase 2 commenced and Phases 3 and 4 would be determined.

➤ *Slide 16: WOFC – Phase 1 (Designed; in permitting)*

➤ *Slide 17: WOFC – Phases 2 (Planning)*

Ms. Cerbone stated that Phase 2 would be completed separately. A new picture would address Phase 2. Mr. McKune suggested showing the pump station and taking it further south, to show the intersections of the C-14 canal. Phase 2 would still include the pump station modification at the ramp. Mr. Schriener stated that the pump stations were not included in the five-year plan.

➤ *Slide 18: WOFC – Phases 3 and 4 (Planning)*

Mr. Morera stated that Phases 3 and 4 should eventually be broken out.

➤ *Slide 19: Project Timeline – Phases 1 to 4*

Ms. Cerbone stated that Phase 1 would be completed in Fall 2017, Phase 2 in Fall 2018, Phase 3 in Fall 2019 and Phase 4 in Fall 2020.

➤ *Slide 20: Project Timeline – Phase 1*

Ms. Cerbone stated that surveying was completed in Fall 2016, design/permitting would be in Spring 2017, communication and feedback from the City and CSID in Spring and Summer 2017, outreach in Summer 2017, bidding in Summer 2017 and construction in Fall 2017.

➤ *Slide 21: Consideration of a Vegetative Buffer*

Ms. Cerbone stated that the goal was for the bid packages to allow some minimal buffer, preliminarily 5' from the property line, on each side of the canal; however, future projects may not be able to accommodate the same or any vegetative buffer.

➤ *Slides 22-24: Adjacent Property Owners to Canal*

Ms. Cerbone stated what homeowners could expect, such as temporary construction fencing along construction areas, no District work on private property, without the consent of the owner, vehicle and construction equipment on the District ROW, utilities permanently relocated, excavation and dredging, material storage on the ROW to be hauled off at the appropriate time, ongoing discussion with the City about a Tree Mitigation Plan, temporarily capped off irrigation lines during construction, which would be returned to functional use after construction, removed or moved encroachments, such as trees, shrubs, other vegetation and structures. For the removal of encroachments, there were two options; in Option 1, the District would complete removal at the District's expense but the owner would maintain after removal. With Option 2, the owner would request removal of certain encroachments, if on the approved list, to be moved to within the buffer area. No structures would be allowed, only vegetative items on the approved list. Mr. Selchan stated that the District would bulldoze encroachments, unless the property owner wanted the encroachment and signed an agreement.

Mr. Malefatto recommended that "certain encroachments" be changed to "certain vegetative approved landscaping". Regarding Option 2, in response to Mr. Maguire's question, Mr. Selchan stated that the homeowner would have the option to move anything from District property onto their property. Mr. Maguire stated that it should be defined that encroachments would be moved at the owner's expense and the District would only pay for the bulldozer to remove encroachments. Ms. Cerbone stated the District would also pay for the relocating of plants to the buffer area, if requested. Mr. Selchan stated that, if the District granted residents along the canal a buffer area, it would be a one-time deal, to remove plantings on the approved plantings list, with execution of an agreement. Mr. Selchan recommended a general statement in

the first bullet for residents to be given an opportunity to remove any structures, plantings, etc. onto the resident's property, prior to construction, by a time certain.

Mr. McKune asked about the 5' buffer and the fence policy. Mr. Selchan stated that no structures were allowed in the 5' buffer, only plantings. Mr. Prudhomme favored enacting a policy for the 5' buffer and making an exception for residents who spent \$100,000 on landscaping. Mr. Selchan stated that the purpose of the buffer was to keep a firestorm from occurring, such as what occurred with the Canal Z project and delayed it for two years. Mr. Selchan felt that all residents should be treated the same. Mr. Malefatto stated that there must be defined criteria to allow an exception. Mr. Maguire stated that the 5' buffer provided flexibility and showed that the District compromised with residents. Mr. Selchan stated that the District must follow what public, health and safety dictated, not how pretty the trees look or how much the resident spent on landscaping.

➤ *Slide 25: Communication Plans*

Ms. Cerbone stated that the target to meet with City Staff and CSID was May or June to review plans, provide an update at the June meeting and present draft letters to residents. The WOFC Phase 1 informational letter to residents would be sent in July or August. If bid packages were not available, a follow-up letter to residents regarding the buffer may be necessary. Mr. Rubio recommended defining the buffer, prior to going out for bids. Ms. Cerbone understood that a buffer of 5', on either side of the canal, was in the bid scope; however, in some areas, there was no room for a buffer. She asked if residents should be informed about all four phases or only Phase 1, for now. Mr. Morera favored sending the letter to residents affected by Phase 1; at some point, the District may consider a workshop if the City determined that there was a need.

Mr. Schriener received an email from Mr. Malefatto, this afternoon, regarding an update to the Water Control Plan. Mr. Zielnicki was in the middle of revising it to include the five-year plan and Phase 1 WOFC. Mr. Malefatto spoke to Mr. Zielnicki about the requirement for the Public Facilities Plan. The City must be notified of major improvements or modifications.

Mr. Maguire stated that the canal on University Drive, by Coral Lago was supposed to be cleaned on the west side of University Drive, from Wiles Road to Sample Road. Mr. Zielnicki stated that preliminary plans were submitted to widen the road but he did not receive the permit application. Mr. Selchan stated that the property owner would be asked to clean the canal. Mr. Zielnicki stated that there were off-site improvements; a certain portion of the canal was

improved at the culvert. Mr. Selchan stated that the contractor was required to dig where the canal goes under University Drive to the next canal flowing to the south and 10' to the north, towards the construction, to improve the drainage. The District already discussed asking the County to improve the canal all the way down. Mr. Zielnicki stated that the District did not own the canal. Mr. Selchan stated that the property owners own to the University side of the canal.

**C. District Engineering Consultant: *John McKune***

There being no report, the next item followed.

**D. District Field Supervisor: *Cory Selchan***

Mr. Selchan stated that the District did not receive much rain and canal levels were continuing to fall. The water level in the East Basin was slightly above 5', with the recharge and receiving 1" of rain. It was keeping some water in the District, for the time being. This area of South Florida was minus 6" of rainfall for this time of year. Hopefully it would rain in the next month or the District would run out of recharge water and, possibly need to ask for an emergency allotment.

Shortly after the last meeting, Mr. Selchan contacted Mr. Stein, who immediately sent an email to Kaufman Lynn Construction (KLC), asking them to expedite the work around the Municipal Center. Mr. Selchan was on-site, today and the Foreman for Downright Engineering (Downright), the subcontractor, did not understand why they were being pressured to complete the work right away. KLC requested that Downright complete the work prior to hurricane season, which would commence on June 1. Downright was working diligently; at the rate they were proceeding, the work should be completed by next month.

Mr. Selchan toured the community, on the east side, with Mr. Maguire and spoke about resident calls about rats in trees along the canal. The District does not harm wildlife. Mr. Selchan also received calls from residents about not being able to use their sprinklers because of dry canals. District canals were not supposed to be used for irrigation. Reliable sources of water were wells or an irrigation meter from the City.

Mr. Selchan stated that the Coral Lago project was proceeding. All canals were dug and canal banks were reshaped. The project should be completed shortly. District Staff provided comments to the Reserve on cleanup items in the southern portion and received reassurance that items were soon to be completed.

**E. District Manager: *Wrathell, Hunt & Associates, LLC***

- **NEXT MEETING DATE: May 10, 2017 at 6:30 P.M.**

Ms. Carbone indicated that the next meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 10, 2017 at 6:30 p.m., at this location. The proposed budget would be presented.

**TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Adjournment**

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

**On MOTION by Mr. Morera and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.**

[SIGNATURES APPEAR ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

*Cindy Carbone*  
Secretary Assistant Secretary

*Joe E. Young*  
President/Vice President