

**MINUTES OF MEETING
SUNSHINE WATER CONTROL DISTRICT**

The Board of Supervisors of the Sunshine Water Control District held a Regular Meeting on July 10, 2019, at 6:00 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
Daniel Prudhomme	Vice President
John Tornincasa	Secretary

Also present were:

Cindy Cerbone	District Manager
Lisa Dao	Wrathell, Hunt and Associates, LLC
Al Malefatto	District Counsel
Orlando Rubio	District Engineer
Steve Smith	Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.
Jim Maguire	Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc.
Cory Selchan	Field Superintendent
John McKune	Engineering Consultant
Mike Wilson	Nelson, Mullins, Broad and Cassel LLP
Court Reporter	

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS

Call to Order

Mr. Morera called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Roll Call

Ms. Cerbone called the roll. All Supervisors were present, in person.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS

Pledge of Allegiance

All present recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Recess Regular Meeting/Commencement
of Executive Session**

The Regular Meeting recessed at 6:02 p.m., and the Executive Session commenced.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Termination of Executive Session/Reconvene Regular Meeting

The Executive Session concluded at 6:59 p.m., and the Regular Meeting reconvened at 7:13 p.m.

SIXTH 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.

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Update: West Outfall Canal (WOFC) Project – Construction

- **Geotechnical Report**

Mr. Rubio: I will just give you an update on where we are at; we are waiting for the final record drawings of the finished canal section, from the Contractor. Contractor's surveyor has done all the field work. He is now putting into the plans so we can verify his final quantities. We are looking to close the project out. There are some minor punch list items that I think need to be addressed; nothing major. Last week before the 4th, Steve and I had an outside field meeting with the Broward County Engineer to look at the stabilization under the bridge. The meeting went well, he liked the way the riprap was stacked. He is in receipt of the files I sent him regarding the photographs of before and after under the bridge and the modified section and the Geotechnical Report and we got noticed today that they are still looking at it. We should probably hear from the County by this week. So we should have some kind of response from them hopefully this week and I'll touch base with them.

Mr. Tornincasa: They have been taking their time.

Mr. Rubio: They are taking their time; I mean it was a holiday week.

Mr. Maguire: But you met with them in the field also so that is a substantial process going.

Ms. Cerbone: So when you met with them in the field, obviously there is one sentence in this report that we...

Mr. Morera: A couple of them.

Ms. Cerbone: Yes, right, a couple of them, but one that we wish had not been there. On the record I am going to advise the Board that we do need to address this, that we are still, we have addressed it in prior meetings and right now just to restate the District Engineer's opinion and that we are waiting on Broward County for acknowledgement. We do not think we will get any type of approval. We have not in the past, but at least an acknowledgment with no qualifications or concerns in it. I do not know if you want to address those Orlando or you would like the Board or me to point out the one or two things, and if you like, explain how it was addressed with the County. We can do it either way, let me know what is easier.

Mr. Rubio: So which sentence were you talking about?

Ms. Cerbone: Page 6, first paragraph, last sentence "For these reasons, we recommend the permanent slope angles associated with the Coral Springs Drive Bridge be designed for a minimum Factor of Safety of 1.5." and we look at the table above, we can see that in one figure it was, Figure 13, it exceeds this but the rest of those are below the recommendation.

Mr. Smith: Right, from Terracon's standpoint that is their recommendation, from the standpoint of what is acceptable it is a different story, so it is a matter, really of the County saying, hey we understand that, okay, but, looking at the prior conditions, looking at this condition, this is acceptable to us, and that is what we are obviously hoping to get back from the County, that it is an acceptable condition.

Ms. Cerbone: They have a similar statement two paragraphs below that, but they put a qualifier after that by saying; however, it is noted that the riprap surface should provide better resistance against canal bank erosion than the canal section existing prior, which is good, it, that is what...

Mr. Smith: Yes, I do not think there is any doubt that the condition is a much better condition than what was existing....

Ms. Cerbone: Correct.

Mr. Smith: All I am saying is it is a matter of what you pointed out, they prefer to be at a 1.5, okay, does that mean that is the only safe condition? No, so we just need to have the County come and say okay, yes, we recognize that it is in a better state than it was, it is acceptable to us and....

Ms. Cerbone: Was there any feedback on the fact that District spent their funds covering the County portion of that area?

Mr. Smith: We actually brought that up and let them know very clearly we let John know at the County, hey look it was agreed that the County was going to do, finish this off and really a good faith and good measures we went ahead and just took care of it because we wanted to make sure that there weren't any issues, nothing happened while we were waiting for them to get out there and he actually commented and basically said that was probably a good move because it would take us forever to get out there, so he was happy about that and I think overall very pleased, again we got to wait for him to finish going through everything to make sure that they are going, it is going to be acceptable to him, but yes, that was brought up we let him know that we did him a favor.

Mr. Morera: So was there any indication from his site visit that would leave you to believe that he may not be inclined to support what was done there?

Mr. Smith: No and, as a matter of fact, we also spoke and brought up with him that actually the Bridge Inspector, now obviously this was not a bridge project, if you will, this was a slope protection thing with the canal but we also brought up that the Inspectors had been out and were pleased and good with everything they saw, with regards to the bridge, it had nothing to do with our work or what we did, but, that the condition of the bridge everything looked to be up to snuff.

Mr. Morera: : If the County comes back and says the safety factor does not meet our standard, you need to bring it up to 1.5, at 1.1 we will not accept it, what's Plan B?

Mr. Smith: Plan B, at this point the only really Plan B is going to be, to be able to, if they say that, based on the Table, we would have to add more riprap to it.

Mr. Morera: So if we, we were to do that then we are really going to create a heck of a restriction on the flow of the canal under the bridge.

Mr. Smith: It would be reduced by, well, actually, we do not even have that on this Table do we Orlando?

Mr. Rubio: No, but if you were to put a 2:1 slope on that, you would lose bottom. Looking on Page 6, the Table we are looking at, there would probably be a factor of safety falling in the figure 11 or 12, if you have got to go to a 1, 1.5, now if you're looking at a 3:1, you would pass. We would have to argue that, because again, they cite the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Bridge Design Specifications, and resistance factors say, they do not say shall be, they say should be, so it is not a...

Ms. Cerbone: So we would have to let them know what the consequences would be and that it would be fairly severe consequences.

Mr. Morera: Because, I mean, we have somewhat of a lesser than preferred conditions given the slopes that we have there now. If we have to add more riprap, to add that would create even more of a restriction in there, which will definitely create a huge imbalance for the operation of the canal, but Cory, hopefully now is not the case, I'm just trying to, you know...

Mr. Rubio: No, I don't want any more riprap either.

Mr. Morera: What if scenario, because the District would be in a position to have to cough up more dollars to add to a situation that is not great now, it is okay, it is functional to some degree but it would definitely create an additional problem for us.

Mr. Smith: Yes, I am not saying we can even do that, and, like Orlando said, we definitely would go back to them and fight it. It is not something we just cave in and say we are going to do this, obviously if, it's going to create a problem.

Mr. Tornincasa: It has to be better than it was.

Mr. Morera: It is, yes.

Mr. Tornincasa: It is kind of like when you do something to your house, an inspector comes out but now it is not to code but it was approved. We had this conversation at the last meeting with Orlando about the 1.5 and that the bridge is not going to cave in, it is not going to fall.

Mr. Smith: We hear what you are saying and trust me we do not want to hear them coming back saying, mistakes have been made, and we will fight it tooth and nail, and we will do everything we can. I believe, from our standpoint, it is more than enough at this point, but they got to say, hey, we are accepting it, we are not accepting it.

Mr. Morera: Well we will trust our experts.

Mr. Smith: We are keeping our fingers crossed.

Mr. Morera: Dan, do you have anything?

Mr. Maguire: Well, the project overall, no resident complaints, a little bit of feedback from one person that is at the bridge, who their slope is pretty hard, pretty steep, we are working with him. They were questioning when the fence is going to be put in, we have not put the fence in yet, we are waiting for the final as built, to say the project is done before we put the fence up.

Mr. Morera: Are these the fences that you showed us?

Mr. Maguire: Yes, those are the fences we showed you, so we are waiting until we get all the as builts, we agree that the project is done before we put the fences up. The only other thing is that we suggest that we look at surveying the rest of the canal to talk about what to get in front of it. If we look at what we have done in the past, we have been six months to a year in front of this, as far as communicating to residents and building a plan. So we have Phase 2, which is the pump station to about 100 yards past Riverside Drive, and then Phase 3 and Phase 4. Our recommendation is going to be that we survey the rest of the canal, at least to understand what the work would be down the road, and we have already developed a three-year plan for this, but then you could, as a Board, decide what you do first. To me there are a number of options when you do all the surveys. Do you make this a three-phase plan? Do you jump into the Cypress Park area, which we know is going to be the biggest challenge of them all and work with the City on a plan? But, personally, I think that is going to take a little while, but I think our recommendation is going to be we should do the survey. We have already surveyed all the bridges. We should survey the canal and then start to build a plan and build some recommendations for you, as a Board, to look at of what to do next and keep the ball rolling, but we should be way in front of this and, right now we are in July and, if we were going to do work and you had all the money to do work, and we are not suggesting to do another phase right now, our recommendation is to do a survey of the rest of the canal and then be able to build a plan, build some recommendations going forward.

Ms. Cerbone: So surveys of Phases 2, 3 and 4?

Mr. Rubio: No, we have surveyed Phase 2 already.

Mr. Maguire: We have already done Phase 2.

Mr. Rubio: Encroachment removal was done down there.

Ms. Cerbone: That is true; Phase 3 and 4.

Mr. Smith: Just to be clear, we have the bridges done and we have two done, as far as survey goes. Okay?

Mr. Morera: Two is in front of the pump station?

Mr. Rubio: Yes sir, it is 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. Maguire: And then assume we already, when we did 1C, lopped off another third.

Mr. Rubio: Yes, lopped off a chunk of Phase 4.

Mr. Maguire: Phase 4. I think that is why it opens up, you may want to do this in three phases, but we are going to go through some costs in a minute, also what this has all cost so far.

Mr. Smith: So we have discussed internally on this and wanted to speak with you all about it but, since we have this survey done at the bridges already, we just need to complete a couple of the canal sections. We would like to plan ahead, as far as, how the approach is going to be, as this moves forward, with regards to improvements to the canal into the bridges, we want to get out ahead of that and we would like to go and get some proposals on the bridges, since we did have our issues here with the Coral Springs Drive Bridge. So get proposals from Geotech and from structural folks on how we approach the remainder of the bridges, for the remainder of this project, so at least we have out there now, this is what it is going to take, we know what the prior plan was, as far as budgeting goes, how does this fall into that plan. So we come back and everyone can be working on an educated basis, this is what it is going to take and it is real numbers so we are not guessing hey, we think it is going to be about this, we think it is going to be about that, we have got some proposals in from some geotechs and from some structural engineers to deal with that, going forward.

Ms. Cerbone asked for further clarification about how the canal section and bridge surveys help in making decisions. Mr. Rubio stated the canal survey would show all areas of encroachments in the right-of-way (ROW) and provide accurate data as to how far the City Park is encroaching and ties into what they already surveyed at the bridge, which would provide a bigger picture of the canal and the bridges. Mr. Smith stated surveys show the area's existing conditions, pertaining to elevation, and allows the District to put develop a proper plan and proper model for calculation purposes. The surveys would provide data on whether the District would have adequate remaining room to offer any buffer.

Mr. Morera asked if the survey was done for Phase 2. It was noted that the Phase 2 survey was done and vegetation was removed. Mr. Rubio stated the process would take four months before excavating, widening and deepening; just the canal section between the station and south of Riverside could be completed before the next dry season. He was unsure how long it would take to commence work on the bridge project since it involves engaging a specialty engineer. Mr. Morera stated the Board must be presented with all aspects of a project, including any coordination involving the District and the County, as they cannot have a repeat of the current situation. He asked if the soil under the canals, towards the pump station

in Section 2, were tested and, if not, when they would be tested. Mr. Rubio stated they were not ready to go out for bid, if the District wanted to include the canal at Riverside as part of Phase 2. Mr. Smith stated it is the intent of Craig A. Smith & Associates, Inc. (CAS) to get ahead of certain tasks. He reiterated his earlier statement that, in order to do so, proposals from geotechs and specialty engineers are needed, rather than CAS guessing at the cost.

Ms. Cerbone stated that the District has not closed out the existing bridge project; it was possible it would need to be revisited. She asked if the staff gauges were put in place. Mr. Rubio stated they would be in place by next week. Ms. Cerbone stated, with being in limbo in regard to time frame, now would be a good time for operations and engineering to revisit the results of the staff gauges, since there is the possibility the District may have to revisit the bridge before the District considers proceeding with other projects.

Mr. Morera stated, since Project 1C was not fully completed yet, and 2 was on hold until litigation is settled, he saw no value to adding surveys and getting ahead of projects in Sections 3 and 4, especially if, after the Phase 1, 1C and 2 projects are completed and evaluated and might have corrected the flow of the canal, the other projects may no longer be necessary. Mr. Maguire believed the District would end up completing all the projects, as they already know there are impediments all the way through all the canals. He explained the reason to have the surveys already done was in case the Board receives the settlement for the pump station and decides to move forward not only with the Coral Springs Bridge but Phase 2, as they may want to go up to the next bridge because they have a good price on digging dirt in the canal. If the survey was not done up front, they would not be able to do that.

Mr. Tornincasa asked whether the District still has an issue with flow, even after mediation, installing the correct pumps and fixing the pump stations. Mr. Selchan stated they already know the volume of water that it will pull; now they are trying to get the channel big enough to flow that volume of water. He felt that the District should place the focus on projects that need to be done now or in the future especially since the bridge is still in limbo, and on whether more work was necessary and there are also four more bridges to do. Mr. Maguire stated, financially, with the items discussed in the previous meeting, CAS would probably have a proposal for the issue with the pump stations prior to the next meeting. Mr. Selchan stated, if the proposal was received, the District would have to refocus everything again because those funds that come from that were allocated to canal projects and may have

to be used to build funds to improve the pump stations, as the proposal may not be sufficient to cover it, and must be considered before they continue working on the bridges and canals.

With regard to financial planning for the next six months, Mr. McKune did not think the District would have anything settled, as to the amount it would receive from the lawsuit.

Ms. Cerbone stated that, if the cost of the survey was minimal and it was needed before commencing work later on, it would be nice to have that information now. The District allocated \$1 million to the Capital budget for Fiscal Year 2020, which, if needed, could supplement the settlement, if they must go back to the pump stations and if the bridges seemed okay. The information from the survey could also help District Staff update the potential capital projects needed in the coming years. Mr. Maguire stated the cost to perform surveys for Sections 3 and 4 was \$45,000. If the settlement and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds were received within the next three months, work on Phase 2 could commence. Mr. Smith stated the only way to get the water to the pump stations was to improve the canal and the bridges along the canal.

Mr. Smith stated surveys are one of the first thing performed before CAS commences a project; it provides CAS with every aspect of the area and the existing condition; it is the least expensive part of a project. Mr. Maguire stated the District would eventually need to work on some creative plans with the City, as the City recently passed a stormwater tax assessment. There were several things that could be done in the park, which do not include eliminating the parking lot or buildings, which, if approved, would be done as Phase 4, since a lot of coordination would be needed to make it happen. Several items were south of the Coral Springs Improvement District (CSID) pipes to the pump station that would make a substantial impact and would need to be surveyed at some point. The Board instructed District Staff to obtain proposals from geotech and specialty engineering firms.

Mr. Malefatto stated the litigation might settle during mediation but the Board should not count on it and should expect it to go to trial on December 2nd. It would then be up to a jury to determine how much the District is entitled to; hopefully all of it, but it is uncertain.

Mr. Tornincasa asked about the District's financial plan in the event that, after trial, the District is \$2 million short of what is needed to correct the pump stations. Ms. Cerbone stated, if the District had to work on the pump stations again, the Board would need to come up with a plan; however, if the work occurs over two fiscal years, the costs could be spread out, as there

was \$1 million in the Capital Plan for the Fiscal Year 2020 budget and another \$1 million for Fiscal Year 2021. There was very little unassigned in the fund reserves, as funds were used for hurricane expenses and minimal savings from the bond refunding, over the next couple of years. She did not see the need to obtain loans for the project.

Mr. Selchan noted that CSID imposed assessments to replenish its depleted hurricane funds, with the caveat that, if the CSID recovered funds from FEMA, assessments would be reduced the following year. When asked which projects were a priority, Mr. Selchan replied the pump station and stated that he wanted to start work sooner, rather than later, to move water along before it rises, to avoid having to explain to the public why something happened when the District knew it was not working properly.

Mr. Smith distributed a revised 2017 Five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and reviewed the costs associated with the projects; about \$7 million was left to complete the remaining projects. Mr. Selchan and Mr. Maguire suggested commencing work on the following two projects, budgeted under "Repairs and maintenance" and in the Five-year CIP:

- Finger canal along the golf course at 112th Avenue: De-muck the shallow and silted canal that diverts water into Canal AA/BB, which, if done, would stop suggestions that the canal was the cause of neighborhood flooding.
- Canal along 123rd Avenue: Would help divert water out of the Westchester area to Canal LL and then into Canal Z.

Ms. Cerbone stated funds could be expended for these projects in Fiscal Year 2020; however, if used, it would reduce the amount available to supplement other projects.

District Staff was directed to obtain proposals, based on cubic yard work, from Rio-Bak Corporation and vendors who submit bids to the County and City and present those and the project timelines for consideration at the next meeting, along with an updated CIP.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS**Presentation of Audited Financial Report
for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2018,
Prepared by Grau & Associates**

Ms. Cerbone presented the Audited Financial Report for Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2018 and described the information that could be found on each page. The audit was consistent with past audits. It was a clean, unqualified audit; there were no findings or instances of noncompliance.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2019-08, Herby Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2018

Ms. Cerbone presented Resolution 2019-08.

On MOTION by Mr. Prudhomme and seconded by Mr. Tornincasa, with all in favor, Resolution 2019-08, Herby Accepting the Audited Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2018, was adopted.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Consideration of Resolution 2019-09, Designating Dates, Times and Locations for Regular Meetings of the Board of Supervisors of the District for Fiscal Year 2019/2020 and Providing for an Effective Date

Ms. Cerbone presented the proposed Fiscal Year 2020 Meeting Schedule.

The following change was made:

DATE: Change "June 10" to "June 17"

Ms. Cerbone presented Resolution 2019-09.

On MOTION by Mr. Tornincasa and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, Resolution 2019-09, Designating Dates, Times and Locations for Regular Meetings of the Board of Supervisors of the District for Fiscal Year 2019/2020, as amended, and Providing for an Effective Date, was adopted.

ELEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acceptance of Unaudited Financial Statements as of May 31, 2019

Ms. Cerbone presented the Unaudited Financial Statements as of May 31, 2019.

On MOTION by Mr. Tornincasa and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Unaudited Financial Statements as of May 31, 2019, were accepted.

TWELFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Approval of June 12, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes

Ms. Cerbone presented the June 12, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes. The discussion of the West Outfall Canal was transcribed nearly verbatim. All edits submitted to Management were incorporated into the final version; none of those changes were significant.

On MOTION by Mr. Prudhomme and seconded by Mr. Tornincasa, with all in favor, the June 12, 2019 Regular Meeting Minutes, as amended to incorporate all edits previously submitted to Management, were approved.

THIRTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Public Comments

There being no public comments, the next item followed.

FOURTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Supervisors' Communications

Mr. Prudhomme asked about Mr. Hollweg's reaction to his retirement gift. Mr. Selchan stated the gift would be presented to Mr. Hollweg in person when he gets back in town.

Mr. Tornincasa stated he would have surgery soon.

Mr. Morera stated Mr. Shawn Cerra was elected the New Coral Springs City Commissioner. He would be travelling July 25th through the 31st on business but would be available via telephone. He thanked everyone for their continued work and care of the District.

FIFTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Staff Reports

A. District Counsel: *Lewis, Longman & Walker, P.A*

Mr. Malefatto officially requested a "Shade" Executive Session on August 14, 2019 at 6:00 p.m., to discuss the results of the mediation. The regular meeting would follow.

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

• Monthly Report

The Engineer's Report was included for informational purposes.

• Permit Applications

Mr. Rubio presented the following permit applications:

○ **Cable Wiring Specialists, Inc.**

- **BH Pines Park Directional Bore, *Royal Palm Blvd. & N. University Drive, Coral Springs***

On MOTION by Mr. Prudhomme and seconded by Mr. Tornincasa, with all in favor, the Right-of-Way Permit Application, CAS Project No. 15-1826, submitted by Cable Wiring Specialists, Inc., on behalf of the MCImetro Access Transmission Services Corp, for the BH Pines Park Directional Bore, for the installation of 2-2" HDPE conduits with Fiber Optic Cable (FOC) at the south ROW of Royal Palm Boulevard on North University Drive, subject to the requirements, specifications and special conditions, as set forth in the CAS recommendation letter dated June 27, 2019, was approved.

- Comcast ABB Management Corp.
 - CATV Subaqueous Crossing, *W. Atlantic Blvd. at West Outfall Canal, Coral Springs*

On MOTION by Mr. Tornincasa and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Right-of-Way Permit Application, CAS Project No. 15-1826, submitted by Focus Engineering Services, Inc., on behalf of the Comcast ABB Management Corp., for CATV Subaqueous Crossing, for directional bore installation of 1-4" HDPE Conduit with Fiber Optic Cable, at the north ROW of Atlantic Boulevard (bridge) crossing the West Outfall Canal, subject to the requirements, specifications and special conditions, as set forth in the CAS recommendation letter dated June 27, 2019, was approved.

- Florida Communication Concepts, Inc.
 - East Outfall Canal, *7955 Royal Palm Blvd., Margate*

On MOTION by Mr. Tornincasa and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Right-of-Way Permit Application, CAS Project No. 15-1826, submitted by Florida Communication Concepts, Inc. (FCC) on behalf of Blue Stream Communications, LLC, for the directional bore installation of 2-2" HDPE conduits with Fiber Optic Cable (FOC) at the north ROW of Royal Palm Boulevard under an East Outfall Canal (EOC) segment and for the installation of 1-5/16" strand on the east ROW of the EOC, subject to the requirements, specifications and special conditions, as set forth in the CAS recommendation letter dated July 2, 2019, was approved.

- Canal L, *7955 Royal Palm Blvd., Margate*

On MOTION by Mr. Tornincasa and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, the Right-of-Way Permit Application, CAS Project No. 15-1826, submitted by Florida Communication Concepts, Inc. (FCC) on behalf of Blue Stream Communications, LLC, for the directional bore installation of 2-2" HDPE conduits with Fiber Optic Cable (FOC) off the northeast intersection of Royal Palm Boulevard and Riverside Drive, subject to the requirements, specifications and special conditions, as set forth in the CAS recommendation letter dated July 2, 2019, was approved

Mr. Rubio stated that a Letter of No Objection (LONO) was issued to the Broward County Addiction and Recovery Center for the addition of outdoor exercise equipment on internal patios within the facility at 3725 N.W. 99 Way.

C. District Engineering Consultant: *John McKune*

There being no report, the next item followed.

D. District Field Supervisor: *Cory Selchan*

Mr. Selchan reported the following:

- 5" of rain was already received. Although it rained everyday, the West Basin water levels were still one-tenth below the normal mean water level but the East Basin was two-tenths above the mean water level of 7.5'; almost one-tenth was lost within one day.
- West Outfall Canal Project: Mr. Selchan recognized Mr. Maguire on a fantastic job and stated that his hard work was the reason for only minimal feedback once the construction phase was completed. Mr. Morera agreed that the District benefited from Mr. Maguire's efforts. Mr. Maguire appreciated the recognition and stated the outcome was due to teamwork on the project.
- City Staff toured the facilities and park area and the City Parks Director was very happy with the results and of how the District restored the areas used during construction.

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

Ms. Cerbone stated she received two LONO requests for fences, which would require clearing the District's ROW. The residents executed the Agreements but she had not. Since there were budgeted funds still available, Ms. Cerbone recommended approving the lowest of the three bids to proceed with the obstruction removal and to issue the LONOs.

Ms. Cerbone discussed the District's revised permit process, which is in line with the City Ordinance such that, before a LONO to build a fence is issued, removal of any obstructions in the ROW is required and the costs would be incurred by the District, if budget funds remained,

or by the resident. With the recent Temple Beth Orr issue, Mr. Selchan stated District staff would need to amend the policy to reflect that businesses or commercial properties would be required to pay a share of that expense for Board approval.

Ms. Cerbone presented a proposal for 9041 NW 27th Place and, since a cost proposal was not obtained for the request at 10906 NW 41st Drive, she requested authorization for Staff to engage the lowest bidder and approve a not-to-exceed amount of \$2,000. She confirmed that she and Mr. Selchan toured the area and found it to have limited obstructions.

On MOTION by Mr. Prudhomme and seconded by Mr. Tornincasa, with all in favor, the E-Z Growing Landscape proposal, for obstruction removal at 9041 NW 27th Place ROW, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$2,100, and issuance of a LONO, was approved.

Mr. Prudhomme thought he should recuse himself from this vote, as the wife residing at NW 41st Drive is his brother's home health aide and he was asked for his guidance on the matter. Mr. Malefatto stated this issue does not qualify as a conflict, since Mr. Prudhomme does not have any personal financial interest.

On MOTION by Mr. Tornincasa and seconded by Mr. Prudhomme, with all in favor, authorizing District Staff to engage the lowest bidder to remove obstructions at 10906 NW 41st Drive ROW, in a not-to-exceed amount of \$2,000, and issuance of a LONO, was approved.

- **UPCOMING MEETINGS**
 - **August 14, 2019 at 6:30 P.M.**
 - **September 11, 2019 at 6:30 P.M.**

The next meetings will be held August 14 and September 11, 2019. A Shade Session will be held August 14, 2019 at 6:00 p.m.

SIXTEENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS

Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.


Secretary/Assistant Secretary


President/Vice President