Tampa Bay Water

Workshop and Regular Meeting

December 17, 2018 Minutes

The Board of Directors of Tampa Bay Water met in its offices, 2575 Enterprise Road, Clearwater, Florida 33763.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Present: Chair – Commissioner Sandra Murman, Hillsborough County

Vice Chair - Commissioner Dave Eggers, Pinellas County

Commissioner Pat Gerard, Pinellas County

Mayor Rob Marlowe, City of New Port Richey

Councilman Charlie Miranda, City of Tampa

Commissioner Ron Oakley, Pasco County

Council Member Darden Rice, City of St. Petersburg

Commissioner Mariella Smith, Hillsborough County

Commissioner Kathryn Starkey, Pasco County

Staff: Matt Jordan, General Manager

Presenters: Ken Herd, Interim Science and Technical Officer

Andre Dieffenbaker, Hazen and Sawyer

Barrie Buenaventura, General Counsel

Peter M. Dunbar, Special Counsel

Warren Hogg, Water Use Permitting Manager

General

Counsel: Barrie Buenaventura, General Counsel

Peter M. Dunbar, Special Counsel

A list of others present who signed the attendance roster was filed in the permanent files of Tampa Bay Water. Staff and Consultants presenting to the Board are listed above.

Chairman Murman called the Workshop and Regular Board Meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Vice Chairman Eggers lead the Pledge of Allegiance.
The following speaker(s) made public comment to the Board of Directors:

Mark Klotho
David Ballard Geddis, Jr.

Public comment was duly recorded and is filed in the permanent records of Tampa Bay Water.

WORKSHOP TO DISCUSS PROPOSED TAMPA AUGMENTATION PROJECT AGREEMENT AND MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING –

Chairman Murman announced the Workshop and recognized Council Member Rice. Council Member Rice thanked the Board and Tampa Bay Water staff for the opportunity to hold the Workshop to discuss the Tampa Augmentation Project (TAP). Chairman Murman welcomed new Board Member, Commissioner Mariella Smith. Chairman Murman turned the Workshop over to Matt Jordan, General Manager. Mr. Jordan noted the Workshop was requested by Council Member Rice and the City of St. Petersburg. Mr. Jordan provided a brief introduction of the presenters, a brief background and timeline of the process and welcomed any questions during each of the presentations. Mr. Jordan turned the Workshop over to Ken Herd, Chief Science and Technical Officer.

Mr. Herd stated under Agenda Item J1, staff will be requesting approval of the Long-term Master Water Plan (Master Water Plan) as required by the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Herd noted the disposition of the TAP project has no bearing on moving forward and approving staff to continue studying the three short listed projects addressed in Agenda Item J1. Mr. Herd introduced Brad Baird, City of Tampa, to provide an overview of the TAP project. Mr. Baird provided the names of the team members on the TAP project. Council Member Rice asked if any of the team were present to field questions. Mr. Baird responded yes. Mr. Baird briefly reviewed the TAP timeline noting that the City of Tampa (City) has been working on potable reuse since 1984. Mr. Baird explained Alternative II of TAP which is a recharge and recovery project which pumps 50 mgd from the Howard F. Curren Plant north toward the David L. Tippin Water Treatment Facility recharging 25 mgd with the first phase and recovering the water through the City of Tampa’s existing aquifer storage and recovery system. Phase II of that project would involve an additional 25 mgd being pumped further east where it would be recharged and recovered and sent through the Hillsborough reservoir. Mr. Baird reviewed the construction details and the results of the City’s hydraulic and water quality modeling effort. Next, Mr. Baird spoke on pathogen removal and public outreach efforts. Mr. Baird reviewed the benefits from TAP noting the largest benefit to the region includes making up to 20 mgd (on average) (40 mgd at peak) available as well as drought proofing the City of Tampa’s water supply. Mr. Baird asked to go on record stating that the City would not be seeking compensation for nutrient credits for removing nutrients from Tampa Bay.

Commissioner Oakley asked Mr. Baird if the City is currently pumping from the Tampa Bypass Canal and pulling water out through the wells. Mr. Baird responded no. He explained the TAP project
concept was developed five years ago, but the testing started 2-1/2 year ago. Council Member Rice asked if the City is assuming there is aquifer treatment for pathogen reduction. Chuck Weber, City of Tampa, stated that the credits shown in the presentation do not take credit for aquifer treatment and do not include credit for soil aquifer treatment. He added that there could be additional removal with soil aquifer treatment. Council Member Rice noted on page 35 of the City's report it states there is no definitive studies on how pathogens could be removed. Mr. Weber agreed and stated in further studies the City will measure what happens to the microbial community when the reclaimed water is added. Council Member Rice added that currently there are no studies to back-up that nature can remove the pathogens. Mr. Weber stated there are studies documenting there are processes that will remove pathogens in limestone; however, in this case, studies need to be site-specific to be sure that the other studies would apply in this situation. Council Member Rice stated that in all the years the City needed water, Tampa Bay Water has always supplied water. Mr. Baird agreed. Council Member Rice asked how the 10 mgd referenced in the presentation would get to the South Hillsborough Aquifer Recharge Project (SHARP). Mr. Baird stated by a separate pipeline. Council Member Rice asked if the 10 mgd would come off of the top. Mr. Baird responded yes, either project could take it off of the top. Looking at the demands, the City will have a total of 60 mgd to provide. Chairman Murman stated that would have to be a separate agreement between the City of Tampa and Hillsborough County. Mr. Baird confirmed that it is a separate project. Commissioner Starkey asked if that water is free or is it sold, and who pays for transporting that water. Mr. Baird stated that the water would not be free and the cost would be determined after the project is developed. Commissioner Oakley added that any water being transferred (changing hands) should go through Tampa Bay Water. Council Member Rice expressed concern about the extra 20 mgd available and permit issues. Mr. Weber explained with the Harney Canal Permit, the City does not use all of the water, so there would be 20-40 mgd available even during drought conditions. With a 50 percent recovery (possibly up to 90 percent or more), the City will be able to keep their reservoir full, provide all demands for the City of Tampa (and minimum flows), the City would not need the 6 mgd of finished water, and all of the water from the Harney Canal would be available to Tampa Bay Water. Council Member Rice asked if the City would put in writing that it would not seek nutrient credits and it would not sell the water from the finished product to another entity. Mr. Baird responded yes. Council Member Rice asked if the City has provided all of their reports to Tampa Bay Water staff for review. Mr. Baird noted that all of the reports are available on the City’s website. Council Member Rice asked if the reports have been made available to any other public agencies. Mr. Baird responded yes. Council Member Rice asked if the reports have been shared with other member governments of Tampa Bay Water. Mr. Baird responded certain parts of the report have been reviewed with staff.

Mr. Herd stated that during this portion of the Workshop, staff would be reviewing and answering questions presented to the agency by Board Members. Mr. Herd noted that representatives from SWFWMD, the City of Tampa and Tampa Bay Water consultants were present to address questions.

Question 1 asked about the timing and impact of TAP on Tampa Bay Water decisions. Mr. Herd noted that many factors affect the timing of projects (population growth, the economy, water demands, demand management, optimizing existing facilities, expansion of Alafia River use, changes to permits,
the water shortage mitigation plan, and South Hillsborough County supply solution. A decision will be made by 2020 on what solution will be put in place to solve South Hillsborough County’s need for water (either a pipeline or the SHARP project). Mr. Herd reviewed the two options with or without the TAP project. Council Member Rice asked what are the ramifications if TAP is not functioning or was delayed in 2027 - how would the region get the extra 10 mgd if not from TAP. Mr. Herd explained there is a date certain in the MOU of 2022 for the feasibility to be complete giving Tampa Bay Water sufficient time to develop a water supply project to meet demands in 2028. Mr. Herd reviewed again each scenario with and without TAP. Commissioner Eggens asked if it is correct that, if the pipeline project and TAP are chosen, the region has sufficient supply through 2040. Mr. Herd responded yes. Mr. Herd stated if the pipeline and SHARP were chosen (without TAP), new supply would need to be developed by 2033. Chairman Murman stated that a decision needs to be made at this meeting in order to have something in place by 2020. Mr. Herd stated the first critical decision is to determine a solution for South Hillsborough County. Mayor Marlowe asked if TAP does not happen, would the agency need to look for additional supplies. Mr. Herd responded yes.

The second question asked why the 10 mgd of reclaimed water from TAP is restricted to the SHARP project. Mr. Herd indicated that Mr. Baird had addressed this question previously but added that the City does not intend to provide the benefit of reclaimed water credits directly to Tampa Bay Water. The City will either develop the TAP project or provide the 10 mgd to Hillsborough County for the SHARP project. Chairman Murman asked if that was negotiable. Mr. Baird responded that above the 10 mgd would not be negotiable because the water is not there. Commissioner Starkey asked if 60 mgd is the most that would be produced. Mr. Baird stated by the time both projects are implemented, they would have 60 mgd. Going forward, there would be more water for Hillsborough County. Council Member Rice expressed her concern that the MOU would be irrevocable and the Board needs to work through the questionable language.

Question 3 asked if SWFWMD’s co-funding the TAP would reduce co-funding possibilities for other member governments. Mr. Herd introduced Brian Armstrong, Executive Director of SWFWMD (District), to address this question. Mr. Armstrong explained the District has been funding the feasibility project on TAP for the past two years and the District concludes that it is a potential source of water. The District has a policy which will only provide funding for a potable alternative water supply through a regional water supply authority. Over the next 10 years, the District will be allocating approximately $60-$65 million for cooperative funding and, if the District Board chooses, will prioritize $100-$120 million for alternative water sources, reducing the reserves by a significant level. However, the decision to move forward on a certain project falls to the Tampa Bay Water Board. Chairman Murman asked if the language that the District can only deal with Tampa Bay Water concerning changes are in the statute or the Tampa Bay Water contract. Mr. Armstrong explained that it is District Board policy. Council Member Rice asked if there was any discussion why Tampa Bay Water could not be a co-applicant for the funds to produce the study. Mr. Armstrong stated the District viewed the study as feasibility and the District will fund feasibility. Commissioner Starkey stated that the Pasco County Reservoir project cost was $36 million and was funded partially by SWFWMD ($12 million) and the residents paid the remaining balance. Will the same ratio be used for
the TAP project. Mr. Armstrong stated it is undetermined until Tampa Bay Water’s Board decides if the TAP project is a regional solution for the future. However, the District is targeting funding at 50 percent. Chairman Murman asked if District funding has increased due to the passing of Amendment 1. Mr. Armstrong stated the District received an increase for operations and maintenance. Council Member Rice asked what is the total discharge of reclaimed water into Tampa Bay. Mr. Armstrong explained that discharges into Tampa Bay fall under the jurisdiction of the Department of Environmental Protection. Commissioner Eggers asked if SWFWMD has addressed the credit issue question concerning the SHARP project. Mr. Armstrong explained that the feasibility they received on TAP shows an initial recovery of 56%. SWFWMD’s feasibility on SHARP/SHARE shows an approximate recovery of 75%. Commissioner Gerard stated Tampa Bay Water’s previous assumptions were based on 100% of the of 50 mgd. Mr. Armstrong stated it was based on 50% of 50 mgd. Mr. Weber stated the City anticipates recovering more than 50%. Mr. Herd explained that Tampa Bay Water’s assumptions included 50 mgd that could be withdrawn when needed on any given day from the TAP project. Commissioner Starkey asked if SWFWMD has any big projects that would require a large amount of funding. Mr. Armstrong stated he is not aware of any.

Question 4 asked what permitting is needed for TAP and how it affects Tampa Bay Water’s permits. Mr. Herd explained the agency has two permits that could be affected by TAP: Harney Canal Permit and Hillsborough River/Tampa Bypass Canal Permit.

Question 5 asked about the agency’s debt service and each member government’s share in paying off the debt service. Mr. Herd turned the presentation over to Christina Sackett, Chief Financial Officer. Ms. Sackett first offered an explanation of the City of Tampa/Pasco County $7 million calculation description. Commissioner Eggers asked for an explanation of the dividing by 2. Mike Carballa, Pasco County, explained that the division was a recognition that TAP provided certain benefits to Tampa Bay Water and the other member governments. Chairman Murman asked if that division was agreed to by the City of Tampa. Mr. Carballa stated that it was discussed and agreed upon and is included in the MOU. Next, Ms. Sackett reviewed the current and estimated future debt, estimating outstanding debt with TAP functioning would be $829.9 million in Fiscal Year 2028. Ms. Sackett explained how fixed costs are calculated and stated that the Interlocal Agreement does not provide for a way to structure an availability charge. Ms. Sackett explained the three approaches that were considered when calculating member government’s share of the debt service. Commissioner Starkey asked for discussion concerning the City of Tampa’s payment of $7 million. Mr. Weber stated the $7 million was not calculated to offset debt, it is for consideration for the assignment of rights to the wells. City of Tampa will still contribute toward the debt when it buys water during drought conditions until TAP is fully functional. Chairman Murman expressed her concern on the growth of the agency debt over time causing higher fees which are passed down to member government constituents. Mr. Weber added that the amount of debt the TAP project would save the region offsets what the City of Tampa would have contributed by buying water from Tampa Bay Water. Council Member Rice stated the figures in the City of Tampa’s consultants’ report differ from that of the Raftelis report. Mr. Weber stated the City of Tampa would be responsible for the $350 million project cost. Tampa Bay Water would not incur any additional costs. Council Member Rice stated that the TAP project cost would
be co-funded by SWFWMD and could impact Tampa Bay Water. Mr. Weber responded maybe. Ms. Sackett clarified that the forecasted numbers take into consideration the City of Tampa no longer purchasing water from Tampa Bay Water after 2027 and the projections are based upon TAP being fully functional.

Mr. Herd addressed Question 6 which asked for an explanation of the Harney Canal Permit (20/40) permit, and if TAP will make 20 mgd available each day. Mr. Herd provided an overview of the system explaining how the different systems work together and provided a brief history on the use of the Harney Canal Permit. If TAP becomes fully operational and the Harney Canal Permit is redirected for the benefit of the Tampa Bay region, water could be withdrawn from the middle pool of the Tampa Bypass Canal during a low flow period so there would be no need to build an additional pump station and the Harvey Pump Station could be taken offline. Mr. Herd noted that historical data and modeling data are consistently aligned concerning what the potential yield could be from the Harney Canal Permit. The scenarios assumed there would be no augmentation from the Harney Canal to the City of Tampa and that TAP would be fully functional at 50 mgd. Council Member Rice asked Dr. Alison Adams, Intera Incorporated, to describe the circumstances in which Tampa Bay Water could utilize 20 mgd from the Harney Canal. Dr. Adams provided a detailed explanation of how the Harney Canal functions within the system. Council Member Rice expressed concern that the 20 mgd of water the City of Tampa states will come from the Harney Canal with TAP could actually be lower than the reports are suggesting. Mr. Weber stated the figures on their chart are average numbers and the City has been able to pull as much as 40 mgd from the Harney Canal. With the TAP project, the City would be able to control the level in the Hillsborough Reservoir and would be able to maintain a level of 10 feet or less between the Harney Canal and Hillsborough Reservoir.

Question 7 asks if Tampa Bay Water staff have reviewed the Tampa Augmentation Project Feasibility Report and is the projected recovery of 1 gallon of potable water created by each one gallon of reclaimed water is feasible. Mr. Herd noted that staff and agency consultants have reviewed (and continue to review) the feasibility report. Further study is needed over the next two to three years to address questions and determine whether the project is feasible. Council Member Rice asked Andre Dieffenthaller, Hazen and Sawyer, to the podium to address questions. Council Member Rice asked for an explanation as to the importance of calculating the recovery rate and how it impacts the cost of the project. Mr. Dieffenthaller explained the recovery rate is important because they need to understand if the entire supply can be made available not only to the City of Tampa, but to Tampa Bay Water as well. This could affect the timing of Tampa Bay Water projects for additional supply. Council Member Rice asked if there are any concerns as to how the water is disinfected from the Current Plant before it is injected. Mr. Dieffenthaller stated that the current method of using UV is a proven technology and would be adequate, but additional feasibility and assessment will help to determine if additional treatment is needed.

Commissioner Eggers asked where does the water from TAP go for the City of Tampa. Mr. Dieffenthaller stated the City will use the recovered water to maintain the Hillsborough reservoir to keep it full. Commissioner Eggers asked where would the extra water come from for Tampa Bay
Water. Mr. Dieffenbacher stated potentially through the Harney Canal. Commissioner Eggers said no water will come from the Hillsborough Reservoir to Tampa Bay Water. Mr. Dieffenbacher responded not from the Hillsborough River Reservoir. Commissioner Eggers stated that the structure will no longer effectively operate because the two waters would be separate. Mr. Dieffenbacher responded technically, yes. Commissioner Eggers stated we are not introducing TAP water into our water system. Mr. Dieffenbacher responded no, not with the City of Tampa's proposal of the Tampa Augmentation Program. We are not taking water directly from that to Tampa Bay Water. Commissioner Eggers asked what about indirectly. Mr. Dieffenbacher said indirectly through the benefits of what Mr. Herd mentioned earlier there may be potential available supply because the City of Tampa is not using as much supply because they're supplementing their own supply and keeping the reservoir full, so there may be additional supply available to Tampa Bay Water. That is indirect because it is not being used to supply Tampa Bay Water the way TAP is currently configured for the City of Tampa. Commissioner Eggers stated he did not want any TAP water in Tampa Bay Water's system. Mr. Dieffenbacher stated that is not what is currently proposed. Commissioner Eggers stated he wanted to make sure that the extra water coming to Tampa Bay Water is not from the Hillsborough Reservoir.

Mr. Baird approached the podium to address Commissioner Eggers' concerns. Mr. Baird stated the TAP project would produce up to 50 mgd, Tampa's demand is around 80 mgd, so the recovered and treated reclaimed water would never make it back up into the Bypass Canal or Harney Canal, because Tampa's demand is higher than what would be introduced into the system. Commissioner Eggers asked if water would be put into the reservoir from time to time. Mr. Baird replied correct, water would be put into the Hillsborough Reservoir which is downstream from the Harney Canal. If Tampa's demand is greater than what is added to the Hillsborough Reservoir, it is physically impossible for the water to get upstream into the regional system. Mr. Baird said they would be putting in more water than is pulled out. Commissioner Eggers stated but you are co-mingling the waters, right. Mr. Baird responded correct. Mayor Marlowe expressed his confusion that it has been stated that the water would not be co-mingled, then that it would be co-mingled. Mr. Baird explained the City of Tampa withdraws its water upstream of the Hillsborough River Dam. Demands are in the high 70's to low 80's mgd. TAP would introduce water at the same location it takes water out making it impossible for the water to travel upstream and enter into the Harney Canal. Commissioner Starkey asked if it is possible for Tampa Bay Water to pull 20 mgd from the reservoir first to ensure it gets 20 mgd. Mr. Baird explained that the water is coming from the Hillsborough River Watershed to the green swamp. Commissioner Starkey asked if Tampa Bay Water can be guaranteed the 20 mgd from the TAP project. Mr. Baird stated 20 mgd average (up to 40 mgd - peak) is what is permitted and available for Tampa Bay Water if TAP is built and it comes from the watershed. Commissioner Smith asked if it this is still true in the case of extreme storm and flooding situations. Mr. Baird responded it would be true. Commissioner Eggers asked what happens during drought conditions. Mr. Baird explained when the Bypass Canal was constructed, the aquifer was breached three times and that is where the water will come into the Bypass Canal and then be used in drought conditions. Commissioner Eggers asked if the City of Tampa can guarantee that Tampa Bay Water will get 20 mgd from the TAP project. Mr. Weber stated he can guarantee that, instead of City of Tampa pulling 20 mgd from the reservoir, the
City will use 20 mgd from TAP, making the other 20 mgd available to the region. Commissioner Eggers asked Dr. Adams and agency staff their thoughts on this issue. Mr. Herd stated, looking at the year 2040 in the Master Water Plan modeling and assuming the TAP project is fully functional, a long-term average will provide 5 mgd. During a drought year, it could provide up to 20 mgd. Commissioner Eggers stated that with TAP, Tampa Bay Water will not need any new capital with the TAP project. Mr. Herd agreed, if TAP is fully functional. Commissioner Eggers asked what if TAP is only partially functional. Mr. Herd stated they would need to look at it again — we will not know the answer until the end of 2022. Mr. Jordan stated that it is predicated on the yield and how the TAP project unfolds to be able to answer some of the questions more definitively. The agency looks at the long-term drought in determining the need for new supply. With TAP fully functional, demands that would have gone to the City of Tampa during a long-term drought (because the Harney Canal is fed by ground water), could come to Tampa Bay Water which would move the need for supply past 2040. Dr. Adams added that the key to getting more surface water from the Tampa Bypass Canal system is to optimize the Surface Water Treatment Plant. Otherwise the additional yield, based on modeling, would be only 1 to 3 mgd. Council Member Rice asked if it is correct that more than 20 mgd has only been withdrawn from the Harney Canal twice since 1985 during drought conditions. Mr. Herd responded yes.

Ms. Sackett addressed Question 8 which requested a calculation of the actual rate per 1,000 gallons (including unitary rate and true-up costs) paid by the member governments over the last five years. Ms. Sackett explained how the Fixed Rate and Uniform Rate are calculated and stated that the budgeted uniform rate of $2.5590 per 1,000 gallons has been the same rate for the last 8 consecutive years. Annually, a variable rate is calculated and charged monthly to each member government based on its actual usage for the previous month. Fixed costs are charged monthly to each member government based on their previous fiscal year’s percentage of demand. At the end of the fiscal year, each member government’s portion of fixed costs are trued-up to their current fiscal year’s percentage of demand. Ms. Sackett added that any change in any member government’s demand will have an impact on what the actual Uniform Rate will be.

Commissioner Starkey asked if it would be more beneficial to change the Interlocal Agreement rather than the current course of action. Mr. Dunbar stated the member government attorneys were tasked with meeting and bringing recommendations to the Board that would not require changes to the Interlocal Agreement. Mr. Dunbar explained the process we would take if changes were made. Commissioner Eggers asked about an opt out arrangement. Chairman Murman asked if there is an opt out of the MOU. Mr. Dunbar responded yes. Commissioner Eggers expressed concern over the precedence being set. Mr. Dunbar stated that it sets the precedent that when questions arise, they will be resolved within the context of the Interlocal Agreement. Council Member Rice asked Barrie Buenaventura her thoughts on the recommendation on the TAP Agreement and MOU, and whether George Nickerson had been consulted on this issue. Ms. Buenaventura stated that it was her opinion that the document presented to the Board in October and during this meeting is in compliance with the Interlocal Agreement. If the City of Tampa proceeded without the Agreement and MOU, or without being assigned the rights to the wells back to the City of Tampa, that would be outside of the Interlocal Agreement. She stated she is not aware if Mr. Nickerson has been consulted. Council
Member Rice asked if there is an opt out of the Agreement and MOU. Ms. Buenaventura stated that if the Board approved the Agreement and MOU, it would allow the City to move forward to seek co-funding, continue their feasibility analysis, and continue their investigation and analysis of the project. The City would continue to report back to the Board annually so the Board could continue to evaluate the progress of the project. The Board would also gain information on potential benefits available to the region. Council Member Rice asked the difference between Tampa Water Resource Recovery Project and TAP; and why Tampa Bay Water could not be a co-applicant with the City of Tampa for the funding and feasibility work on this project. Mr. Baird explained the difference between the two projects. He said the City has determined that both versions of the TAP project Tampa Bay Water has proposed would be more costly. Council Member Rice asked why couldn’t Tampa Bay Water be a co-applicant on the project. Mr. Baird stated it is the City of Tampa’s water use permit.

Chairman Murman thanked everyone involved for their thorough presentations.

The Board recessed briefly at 12:46 p.m. and reconvened at 12:56 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

A. GENERAL MANAGER

1. Board Minutes for October 15, 2018, Regular Board Meeting – Approve
2. Public Affairs
   a. Cross Bar Ranch Education Center Funding – Approve

B. GENERAL COUNSEL

1. Special Counsel Services Contracts – Approve

C. WATER PRODUCTION

1. Project Closeouts:
   c. Morris Bridge Wellfield Collection Main Condition Assessment, Project No. 11011–Closeout– Approve
2. First Amendment to As-Needed Engineering Services Contract No. 2017-023 with CDM Smith, Inc. – Approve
3. Eldridge-Wilde Wellfield Pumps and Motors Replacement Project 50016 – Environmental Resource Permit (ERP) Application – Approve
4. South-Central Hillsborough County Supply Improvements Program – Status Report
5. Capital Improvements Program- Task Order Authorization- Approve
7. Real Property- Regional Facilities Site- TECO Easements- Facilities Site Permanent Easement to TECO- Approve
8. Mowing & Grounds Maintenance Services – Award Contract No. 2019-001 to the lowest, responsive, responsible bidder, Albert E. Roller, LLC – Approve
10. Fleet Management Contract with Enterprise F M Trust – Fiscal Year 2019 Fleet Purchases, Disposals, and Maintenance – Approve
11. Sodium Hypochlorite Supply Services - Award Contract No. 2019-005 to the lowest, responsive responsible bidder, Odyssey Manufacturing Company – Approve
12. Fuel Products – Amendment One to Agreement 2016-707 with Port Consolidated Inc. – Legislative updates and renewal extension – Approve
14. Sodium Hydroxide Supply Services, Contract No. 2019-012 – Reject All Bids
15. Sodium Hydroxide Supply Services – Contract 2016-006 with Brenntag Mid-South Inc. – Price Amendment, Legislative Update and Option Year 3 – Approve
16. Aqueous Ammonia Supply Services – Award Contract 2019-004 to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder – Tanner Industries, Inc. – Approve

D. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. Hydrologic Conditions Update – Status Report
2. As-Needed Well Construction and Rehabilitation – First Amendments to Contract Nos. 2017-010 & 2017-011 in the amount of $600,000 per contract – Approve
3. Option Year 1 Renewal and Second Amendment with Hazen and Sawyer, P.C., Contract 2015-011 for Long Term Master Water Plan Update and Feasibility Program and Professional Engineering Services at no net additional cost – Approve
5. Regional Water Supplies and Member Demands – Status Report
6. Member Conservation Report- Status Report
7. Florida Water Loss Pilot Technical Assistance Program- Status Report
E. FINANCE

1. General Manager’s Quarterly Travel Report – Approve
2. Information Technology Software, Equipment and Services Procurement - Approve

F. CONSENT DISCUSSION

Motion: Commissioner Eggers moved for approval of the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Oakley seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

Chairman Murman requested a motion to amend the Agenda to hear Agenda Item J1, and then Agenda Item H1 out of order.

Motion: Commissioner Eggers moved for approval. Councilman Miranda seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

J. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. Long-term Master Water Plan 2018 Update – Presentation and Approve

Ken Herd, Chief Science and Technical Officer provided a presentation on the 2018 Long-term Master Water Plan. Mr. Herd noted pursuant to the Interlocal Agreement, the Long-term Master Water Plan is updated every five years and provides a 20-year outlook in order to meet the needs of the region’s water supply. Mr. Herd provided information on the supply and demand noting that the region will be in need of an additional 10 million gallons per day (mgd) by 2028 and an additional 10 mgd by 2040. Mr. Herd explained the Master Water Plan assists in determining what to build and when to build in order for the agency to continue to meet the water demands of the region. Next, Mr. Herd noted that member government and public input assisted staff during the process of preparing the Master Water Plan update.

Mr. Herd introduced Andre Dieffenthaller, Hazen and Sawyer, to discuss components of the Master Water Plan. Mr. Dieffenthaller reviewed the unranked projects which were carried forward from the 2013 update. Mr. Dieffenthaller provided a brief summary of the planning process noting the process includes potable reuse. These concepts include: South Hillsborough Aquifer Recharge Program (SHARP); ground water treatment plant for water from SHARP; aquifer recharge and recovery with advanced treatment reclaimed water in south Hillsborough County; advanced treatment of reclaimed water with blending at the regional facilities site; Regional Surface Water expansion; Tampa Bay Seawater Desalination Plant expansion; regional Surface Water
Treatment Plant expansion with the Tampa aquifer recharge and withdrawal (Tampa Augmentation Project (TAP)). Mr. Dieffenhaller reviewed projects to address the supply needs in South Hillsborough County. Mr. Dieffenhaller reviewed the three top ranked projects recommended for additional study (Surface Water Treatment Plant expansion, Desalination Facility expansion, and new Groundwater Treatment Plant with South-Hillsborough Aquifer Recharge Project credits). He then provided a summary of project costs, impacts of the project timing and key recommendations for optimization of existing assets. Mr. Dieffenhaller turned the presentation back to Mr. Herd.

Chairman Murman asked that the pipeline along with SHARP with or without TAP be added to the list of options. Mr. Jordan stated that staff is looking at both options. Mr. Dieffenhaller agreed they are looking at both options. TAP does not impact the solutions of South Hillsborough County. Mr. Dieffenhaller recommended looking at both projects in parallel before a decision is made in February. Chairman Murman ask how this changes the recommendation. Mr. Dieffenhaller stated that it does not change the recommendation.

A copy of the full report can be found in the agency’s Records Department.

**Motion:** Mayor Marlowe moved to accept the recommendations of J1. Commissioner Oakley seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

**II. GENERAL COUNSEL**

1. Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Tampa Regarding the Tampa Augmentation Project – *Follow up discussion from workshop*

Barrie Buenaventura, General Counsel, explained that Agenda Item H1 is a companion item to the Workshop on the Tampa Augmentation Project (TAP) Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and is a carry-over from the October Board meeting. During the October meeting, the item was tabled and left pending. Ms. Buenaventura explained the procedure the Board would need to take in order to take action on the item. If the item is not taken from the table during this meeting, the item dies.

Chairman Murman asked for a motion to take Agenda Item H1 from the table.

**Motion:** Councilman Miranda moved to take Agenda Item H1 from the table. Mayor Marlowe seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

Chairman Murman opened Agenda Item H1 for discussion and recognized Councilman Miranda. Councilman Miranda moved to bring back the Agreement and MOU between the City of Tampa and
Tampa Bay Water for discussion at the February 18, 2019 Board meeting and request the Member Government attorneys meet and facilitate questions brought forth during the December 17th meeting. Commissioner Gerard seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

Council Member Rice moved for a substitute motion to bring back the Agreement and MOU for discussion at the February Board meeting and have the Board meet at the January Executive Committee meeting to discuss the policy implications. Commissioner Oakley seconded the motion. Commissioner Egger requested an amendment to the substitute motion asking the Member Government attorneys to meet prior to the January Executive Meeting to develop a new MOU adding language which would address not selling water inside or outside the region; the project producing a guaranteed 20 mgd, an opt-out provision, prohibit pursuing nutrient credits, ensure cooperative funding would not continue to increase, and an explanation of how the $7 million relates to the debt service. Commissioner Starkey seconded the amendment to the substitute motion.

**Vote:** The motion on the Amendment to the Substitute Motion carried by a vote of 9-0.

Chairman Murman opened discussions on the Substitute Motion as amended. Seeing no discussion, Chairman Murman called for a vote.

**Vote:** The Substitute Motion as amended carried by vote of 9-0.

Council Member Rice informed the Board of her request of the Potable Reuse Commission to provide a presentation at the February Board meeting. Chairman Murman recognized Councilman Miranda. Councilman Miranda moved to sunset the Member Government Reuse Committee. Council Member Rice seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion carried by vote of 8-0. Commissioner Smith was not present during the vote.

**G. GENERAL MANAGER**

1. Executive Committee Report and Minutes – No meeting was held in November.

2. 2019 Grant Funding and Legislative Goals and Priorities – *Presentation and Approval*

   Peter Dunbar, Special Counsel, provided a presentation on the 2019 Grant Funding and Legislative Goals and Priorities. Mr. Dunbar noted that the recommendations are consistent with those in prior years and asked Matt Blair, Corcoran & Johnston, to speak on the legislative appropriations. Mr. Blair stated the federal budget is currently pending and will sunset at the end of the week. Discussions within the Legislature are to continue with the current budget with a slight increase for Homeland Security. On a state level, the House announced committee assignments on Friday, the Senate announced committee assignments the week prior. Mr. Blair stated they are working with agency staff on potential funding options with the State.
A copy of the full report can be found in the agency’s Records Department.

Chairman Murman asked for a motion to approve Agenda Item G2.

**Motion:** Council Member Rice moved to approve Agenda Item G2. Councilman Miranda seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion carried by a vote of 7-0. Commissioner Smith and Commissioner Oakley were not present during the vote.

3. 2019 Source Water Protection Mini-Grants – *Presentation of Awards and Board Photos* –

Chair Murman stated Agenda Item G3 will be heard at the February 18, 2019 Board Meeting.

**J. WATER PRODUCTION**

No items were presented to the Board.

**J. SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

2. Water Use Permit Renewal Application for the Brandon Urban Dispersed Wells – *Approve*

Warren Hogg, Water Use Permitting Manager, provided a brief presentation on the Water Use Permit Renewal Application for the Brandon Urban Dispersed Well. Mr. Hogg stated has staff developed a Water Use Permit Application to renew the permit for the Brandon Urban Dispersed Wells. The application has been provided to and reviewed by the host Member Government and Pinellas County staff. Tampa Bay Water staff recommends approval of the Water Use Permit Renewal Application.

A copy of the full report can be found in the agency’s Records Department.

**Motion:** Councilman Miranda moved for approval Agenda Item J2. Mayor Marlowe seconded the motion.

**Vote:** The motion carried by a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Starkey and Commissioner Oakley were not present during the vote.

**K. FINANCE**

No items were presented to the Board.

**L. OLD BUSINESS AND OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS**
No items were presented to the Board.

M. RECEIVE & FILE
1. Human Resources Activity Report for October and November 2018
2. General Counsel Activity Report
   a. Legal Services Activity Report for October and November 2018
   b. Legal Services Budget Report for October and November 2018
3. Public Affairs Activity Report for October and November 2018
4. Finance Activity Report:
   a. Finance and Administration Activity Report for October and November 2018
   b. Comprehensive Check List with Delegated Check Approval for September and October 2018
   c. Investment Schedule as of September and October 2018
   d. Financial Statements and Fund Analysis through October 2018
   e. Disposition of Assets through October 2018
   f. Vendor Status Report through October 2018
   g. Budget Amendments-Transfer Quarterly Report – 4th Quarter FY18
5. Water Production Activity Report for October and November 2018
6. Science and Technology Activity Report for October and November 2018

Chairman Murman asked for a motion to approve the Receive & File.

Motion: Councilman Miranda moved for approval of Receive & File. Mayor Marlowe seconded the motion.

Vote: The motion carried by a vote of 6-0. Commissioner Smith, Commissioner Starkey and Commissioner Oakley were not present during the vote.

IV. ADJOURNMENT
The Board adjourned at 1:37 p.m.

Attest: _______________
Matt Jordan, General Manager/Secretary

Date: 2/18/19