

**LAKE COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY
REGULAR MEETING ANNOUNCEMENT AND SUMMARY AGENDA**

August 26, 2009 – 3:30 p.m.

Lake County Administration Building

2nd Floor - County Commission Chambers

315 West Main Street, Tavares, FL 32778

- 1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance**
- 2. Approval of Minutes – Budget Meeting July 8 and Regular Meeting July 22, 2009**
- 3. Executive Director Report**
- 4. Discussion Items**

	<u>Presenter</u>
a. <u>Conceptual Dora Canal Dredging Project</u>	Ron Hart

The Dora Canal was dredged by the Delta Canal Company in 1893. In 1958 The Lake County Water Authority contracted to have the canal cleaned to increase flow. No excavations have taken place in the past 50 years.

The St. Johns River Water Management District (SJRWMD) undertook a study to determine how the conveyance of water through the Dora Canal was influencing flooding in Lake Dora. The District evaluated dredging, widening, clearing and grubbing, and the replacement of the railroad bridge to determine if any improved conveyance would have a significant impact in reducing flooding in Lake Dora. The report recommended channel improvements through the swamp and urban reach along with clearing and grubbing. The improvements combined increased the conveyance of the canal by 150 cubic feet per second for the modeled storm event. Based on findings of the report, the district staff decided that the improvements to conveyance were not worth the impact and cost. Dave Walker, SJRWMD, will be present at the meeting to answer any questions by the Board regarding this report.

Over the past 8 years, complaints from residents regarding the canal depth and cypress root masses in the bottom have steadily increased. Staff with the assistance of the Marine Patrol utilized the side scan sonar to view debris on the bottom of the canal. The debris consisted mostly of branches, logs, and tree bases. Staff estimates that approximately 20 of the 100 debris sites can be removed without a dredge and fill permit. Though most of the complaints are caused by debris strikes, an increasing number are related to sediment accumulation and the depth of the canal.

To address these immediate and long term needs, staff has proposed that the Board consider budgeting funds to design and permit the dredging of the Dora Canal. The design would include an evaluation of the existing channel, recommendation for a depth or channel configuration, estimate of the volume of sediment to be removed, a recommendation for a removal technique, a determination of the disposal area for the sediment and an estimation of probable cost for the project. Staff does not recommend dredging any side canals, however, a 30 to 50' access connection may be needed to prevent side canal boating traffic from immediately washing sediment back into the Dora Canal.

Any design would attempt to minimize impact to surrounding structures and vegetation by requiring a setback as recommended by the design firm. However, some will still occur as a result of the increase in depth and the associated boat prop wash and wakes. The width of the recommended bottom channel would also vary depending on the adjacent structures and vegetation. Staff would not recommend any bottom width over 30' to help minimize impacts to adjoining wetlands.

To facilitate discussions, staff has attached a map of the Dora Canal on the following page. Some of the comments that staff has received are “only dredge in the residential area north of Highway 19” and “only remove the logs and stumps in the bottom”. Dredging only the residential areas would not eliminate the shallowest spots which are located in the natural areas. Removing the stumps and root masses in the bottom of the canal would require a contractor to disturb the sediment thus requiring a Dredge and Fill Permit. Furthermore, the time required to design and permit a smaller project would not be significantly less than the proposed project.

It is staff's opinion and recommendation that any large expenditure of funds needs to ensure that all problems are resolved. If not, the public may question our fiscal responsibility when the same reoccurring issues arise during the next drought. As such, staff recommends that our agency investigate the feasibility of a onetime dredging program designed to maximize the benefits of the completed project with the least impact on adjoining properties and wetlands. If the project is done correctly, the Board should not have to revisit this issue for over 30 years.

Executive Director's Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to include \$120,000 in the FY 2009-2010 budget to design and permit the dredging of the Dora Canal.

b. Resolution of Fencing Issue on M-5

Ron Hart

At the May meeting, the Board requested staff to develop a set of fencing options for the M-5 site. At the June meeting staff was prepared to address the issue, however Ms. Adragna's attorney, Mr. Jim Williams, requested and received a continuance to allow him to complete a title review of Ms. Adragna's and the Water Authority's adjacent properties prior to the Board considering fencing alignments. As a result, Attorney Barice recommended that we be provided time to review the information provided by Mr. Williams before making a decision.

Attorney Barice and Water Authority staff met with Mr. Williams to discuss the issue and try to resolve the issue. Mr. Williams never completed the title search; however, but instead provided case law that, in his opinion, indicated Ms. Adragna may have some claim of ownership of the “dogleg” portion of the property. According to Attorney Barice, the only way to definitively determine ownership is through a judge's decision. Attorney Barice provided several recommended actions to resolve the issue. Mr. Williams agreed to review the alternatives with Ms. Adragna and get back to Attorney Barice. As of the date of this agenda memo, no agreement has been reached. As such, Attorney Barice will be prepared to discuss the proposed options and update the Board at the meeting.

Staff had provided the following information to the Board at previous meetings and is included for the Board's reference. Ms. Adragna has a fence with five gated openings to the Water Authority's M-5 property. Should the Board desire to install a separate fence along the entire

property line, the cost to install the approximately 1950' boundary field fence with one 14' access gate is around \$5,600. A gate costs approximately \$250 to install.

The following attached diagram shows the most viable options pertaining to the access area for Ms. Adragna:

- Option 1 - Utilize only the existing fence Ms. Adragna has installed on her boundary. This option would assume that Ms. Adragna accepts the Board's position of not allowing her animals or placing pens, fencing or other structures on Water Authority property. The Board would direct staff to regularly visit the M-5 property to determine if there are any concerns. This option would not require the additional expense of a separate fence or gate.
- Option 2 - Install a new fence and gate around the "dogleg" portion of the Water Authority property with an extension to the river. This option would restrict Ms. Adragna's access to a 30' wide corridor to the river. The disadvantage is that the fence would also limit staffs access to the same area.
- Option 3 - Install a new fence and gate around the "dogleg" portion of the Water Authority property but without an extension to the river. This option cost about \$70 less and would allow access to both parties to the 30' wide corridor. Staff would still require Ms. Adragna to stay within this corridor and may post No Trespassing signs in place of the 30' fence.

Based on the Board Members comments and the May meeting, staff has included access gates in all of the options. If, however, problems arise associated with any unauthorized use of the property staff would recommend to the Board to permanently lock the gate.

Executive Director's Recommendation:

Because of the on-going discussions between the attorneys and their clients, the status and recommended action will be provided at the Board meeting.

c. FY 2009-2010 Budget

Michael Perry

Staff presented the draft budget for Fiscal Year 2009-10 at the July 08, 2009 Board budget meeting. At that meeting, staff provided an overview of the budget and discussed each budget section and identified any changes made since the budget was distributed at the June 24, 2009 regular Board meeting. The Board reviewed the budget again at the July 22, 2009 regular meeting. Staff has made the following changes to the FY 2009-10 budget as directed by the Board:

- 100-110 Executive Salaries - Eliminated salary increase
- 100-120 Regular Salaries - Eliminated salary increase
- 100-210 Social Security Matching - Reduced amount due to eliminated salary increase.
- 100-220 Retirement Contribution - Reduced amount due to eliminated salary increase.
- 100-364 Commissions - Property Appraiser - Reduced amount based on Tentative Millage
- 100-365 Commissions - Tax Collector - Reduced amount based on Tentative Millage
- 400-120 Regular Salaries - Eliminated salary increase
- 400-210 Social Security Matching - Reduced amount due to eliminated salary increase.
- 400-220 Retirement Contribution - Reduced amount due to eliminated salary increase.
- 700-120 Regular Salaries - Eliminated salary increase
- 700-210 Social Security Matching - Reduced amount due to eliminated salary increase.
- 700-220 Retirement Contribution - Reduced amount due to eliminated salary increase.
- 700-340 Other Contractual Services - Adjusted Beauclair Restoration amount to balance the budget
- 700-460 Repair and Maintenance - Added line for Document Management System Maintenance - part of contractual requirement
- 700-840 Aids to Government Entity - Eliminated Lake County Hollendel Stormwater Project. Project will be completed this fiscal year.
- 100-830 Community Redevelopment Trust Fund Reimbursement - Reduced amount based on Tentative Millage
- Cash Brought Forward adjusted to reflect most recent estimate.

d. Menzi Muck Remover

Ron Hart

At the July meeting, the Board requested staff to provide a presentation on the use of a Menzi Muck Excavator. Staff contacted John Kiefer at BCI, our dredging consulting firm, and asked if he would be able to provide a presentation that shows the uses and limitations of this particular piece of equipment. Mr. Keifer was selected over a Menzi Muck representative because he provides an independent nonbiased opinion on the subject.

Executive Director's Recommendation:

For information and discussion purposes only. No action required

e. Review of 60% Beauclair Restoration Plans

Lance Lumbard

Staff distributed draft copies of the 60% plans for the Lake Beauclair Restoration Project at the May 27, 2009 LCWA board meeting. The plans have been updated since that time and reflect the correct dredge limits within the Venetian Village canal. BCI may make some minor changes related to pipeline configurations prior to submittal of an Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) application to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and the US Army Corps of Engineers. Additional changes can be implemented as required during the next design phase as plans progress toward 100%. Often, these changes are a result of the permitting process. Bid specifications will also be developed during the next phase.

Trustee Dillon asked that staff provide the board with an overview of the 60% plans. Staff will provide a page-by-page explanation of the plans and BCI will be available for questions.

Executive Director Recommendation:

For information purposes only. No action required.

f. Crooked River Tree Removal

Ron Hart

At last month's board meeting, Trustee Harris requested staff to evaluate fallen trees that pose navigational hazards in Crooked River. The trees were remnants of the damage caused by Hurricanes Charlie, Frances, and Jeanne in 2004.

Staff evaluated the trees and found that 26 trees pose a potential navigational hazard in the river between Lake Louisa and Lake Minnehaha. The attached map shows the locations of the 26 trees in this stretch of the river.

During a visit to the site, staff identified, marked, photographed, and collected information on each tree. The randomly selected photos show the potential hazard trees and are followed by a list that provides information on each tree:

ID	Types	diameter	length	other
1	Cypress	16	20	dead stump
4	Cypress	14	20	dead stump
3	Cypress	8	20	dead stump
2	Cypress	13	20	dead stump
5	Ash	8	20	whole tree
6	Cypress	12	30	whole tree
7	Cypress	8	30	on top
8	Cypress	16	40	partially submerged
9	Cypress	12	40	partially submerged
10	Cypress	14	20	partially submerged
11	Cypress	24	30	partially submerged
12	Cypress	13	12	cut 11 ft length above water
13	Cypress	13	40	cut 30 ft length above water
14	Oak	22	35	partially submerged
15	Oak	10	10	cut branches 15' above water
16	Oak	10	10	cut branches 15' above water
17	Holly	10	20	partially submerged
18	Cypress	18	35	partially submerged
19	Cypress	22	40	partially submerged w/branches
20	Cypress	5	15	big stump/ little trees
21	Cypress	24	35	partially submerged
22	Cypress	15	25	partially submerged
23	Cypress	15	25	almost submerged
24	Holly	20	35	almost submerged
25	Cypress	16	35	above tree
26	Holley	17	35	partially submerged

Under the existing Emergency Tree Removal Contract rate, the cost to remove the 26 trees would be \$18,200. The benefit would be that the trees could be removed immediately; however the cost to remove the potentially hazardous trees utilizing this contract would exceed the amount recently approved by the Board and would not allow for any true emergency tree removal until FY 2009-2010 begins on October 1, 2009.

An alternative is to release a bid for the work. Staff estimates that bids for the removal of the 26 trees could range from \$11,000 to \$14,000. It would take approximately 3 months to create a bid package, advertise, receive responses, report back to the Board, get insurances, and give notice to proceed before work can begin. If the Board desires to proceed with this project, staff would recommend that the budget item for waterway tree removal already included in the FY 2009-2010 draft budget be increased by \$13,000 (from \$30,000 to \$43,000).

Executive Director’s Recommendation:

Direct the Executive Director to increase the FY 2009-2010 waterway tree budget to \$43,000 and authorize staff to release a bid to remove 26 potentially hazardous trees in Crooked River contingent upon the final approval of the FY 2009-2010 budget.

5. Public Comment (5:00 pm or as soon thereafter as possible)

6. Legal Staff Report

7. Action Items

a. Approval to Surplus Inventory Items

Linda Marino

All inventoried property requires Board approval prior to disposal. Staff is seeking Board approval to surplus the following items. All computer hard drives have either been destroyed or cleaned using a software program designed for this purpose. The following items will be taken to George Gideon Auctioneers, Inc., for public auction.

Inventory Number	Description/Model	Reason for Surplus
36	Bell & Howell 16 mm Projector , 2585B	outdated, no longer used
54	Metal Chair (1 of 29)	broken
61	Hydraulic pole saw	no longer used
82	Stanley Hydraulic Power Unit	no longer used
104 & 105	Double Slide Projector	outdated, no longer used
246	Ice-o-Matic Ice machine	broken, repairs too costly
249	Dell XPS T600R	broken
267	Dell Power Edge 2500 Server	broken
297A	Dell 670 GIS workstation	broken

Executive Director Recommendation:

Authorize Executive Director to surplus inventory items 36, 54, 61, 82, 104, 105, 246, 249, 267, and 297A.

b. Approval to Process Post-Audit Budget Transfers Linda Marino

Each year the Cash Brought Forward budget amount is an estimate based on projected expenditure and revenue transactions that occur between the time of the estimate and the end of the fiscal year. Once the prior year's audit is finalized the exact amount becomes known and may require a budget adjustment. As a result of the audit, this year's Cash Brought Forward amount needs to be adjusted.

The largest adjustment is the result of a change in the Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) NuRF grant reimbursement schedule. Late in September of 2008, DEP revised the reimbursement schedule to "as needed" rather than the lump sum reimbursement staff was expecting. Revenue from DEP of \$1,718, 514 was recorded in FY 2007/2008, but was not included in the Cash Carry Forward estimate. To accurately reflect this change FY 2008/2009 Cash Carry Forward needs to be increased and the DEP revenue item decreased by the same amount.

Estimates for the current year's interest have fallen below expectations and Hickory Point revenue will also fall short.

Finance has recommended making budget adjustments to more accurately reflect these items. Staff is requesting the budget transfer as described in the Executive Director's Recommendation below.

Executive Director Recommendation:

Authorize Executive Director to process the following budget transfers:

- Decrease Account: 9898100-361100 by \$190,009 (Reduce Interest)
- Decrease Account: 9898400-347201 by \$10,500 (Reduce Hickory Point Revenue)
- Decrease Account: 9898700-335393 by \$1,718,514 (Reduce the DEP NuRF Grant)
- Increase Account: 9898100-389999 by \$1,919,023 (Increase Beginning Fund Balance)

8. Board Member Comments

9. Board Member Items for Future Agenda

10. Information Items

- a. Staff Report**
- b. Monthly Financial Reports – July 2009**

11. Announcement of Upcoming Meetings and Events

- Tentative Budget Hearing – Wednesday, September 9, 2009 (5:05 pm) BCC Chambers/Admin. Bldg.
- Board Meeting – Wednesday, September 23, 2009 (3:30 pm) BCC Chambers/Admin. Bldg.
- Final Budget Hearing – Wednesday, September 23, 2009 (5:05 pm) BCC Chambers/Admin. Bldg.

- Legislative Delegation Meeting – Wednesday, September 30, 2009 (1:00 pm)
Lake Sumter Community College, Paul P. Williams Auditorium

12. Adjournment