

**RESTORE ACT ADVISORY COMMITTEE, PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA**

**ANNOTATED MINUTES**

**AUGUST 22, 2016**

**PREPARED IN THE OFFICE OF  
PAULA S. O'NEIL, CLERK & COMPTROLLER**

**THE MINUTES WERE PREPARED IN AGENDA ORDER  
AS PUBLISHED AND NOT IN THE ORDER  
IN WHICH THE ITEMS WERE HEARD**

**6:00 P.M.**

**WEST PASCO GOVERNMENT CENTER, BOARD ROOM  
8731 CITIZENS DRIVE, NEW PORT RICHEY, FLORIDA 34654**

---

Committee Members:

Jack Mariano, Board of County Commissioners  
Kathryn Starkey (Alternate), Board of County Commissioners – **Arrived at 6:15 p.m.**  
Cynthia Armstrong, School Board Representative  
Dr. Lisa Richardson, College/University Representative  
David Sumpter, Science or Fisheries Representative – **Arrived at 6:01 p.m.**  
Jeffrey Lowe, Job Creation Industry Representative  
Bill Cronin, Pasco Economic Development Council Rep – **ABSENT**  
Kristin Tonkin, Tourism Representative  
Bob Robertson, Citizen Representative  
Bruce Mills, West Pasco Chamber of Commerce Rep

Staff: Mr. Curtis Franklin, RESTORE Act Program Coordinator

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Mariano called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**INVOCATION  
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Ms. Katie McCormick, Deputy Clerk, gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

## ROLL CALL

All members were present except Mr. Bill Cronin. Mr. David Sumpter arrived to the meeting at 6:01 p.m. and Commissioner Starkey arrived to the meeting at 6:15 p.m.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

**Citizens are given an opportunity to comment on any proposition coming before the Committee during Public Comment. The Committee also takes Public Comment on items to be placed on a future RESTORE Act Advisory Committee agenda.**

Mr. Jeff Harris, Project Manager for the Crews Lake project and the Central Pasco project, spoke regarding Crews Lake having water in the lake, that last summer they had extraordinary rain fall, Tampa Bay Water had cut back production from the Cross Bar Wellfield, for the past 40 years Crews Lake had the minimum acceptable water level to support ecology five times, the Water Management District included Crews Lake on its list of stressed lakes since 1986, today Crews Lake did not meet its minimum level and was not expected to without some restoration project, and most months Crews Lake did not meet the definition of a lake.

Discussion followed between the Committee Members and Mr. Harris regarding possible clogging; the only surface water input was from jumping gully; in the last 25 years there had only been flow in 2015; whether it was feasible to turn it into a lake; the use of reclaimed water; the more treatment area they had the more recovery they could bring to the lake; the marsh creation project was a mitigation project for SunWest; that Pasco County Utilities did not have a surface water discharge permit; 4G Ranch and the possibility of shifting their pumping; the Trinity area flooding; and reducing pumping in areas.

Ms. Jessica Kelsh, National Wildlife Federation, said she liked the rankings and hoped they would accept them. She felt having fewer larger projects was a great approach. She understood the discussion that newer Committee Members had not seen the presentations. She wanted to be sure that everyone understood the September 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline was a starting point, not something that was “hard, fast and set in stone”. She felt they were asking for the project nominations to get a sense of where each County was in the process. She spoke regarding the infrastructure projects with the cap. She did not feel they needed a level of specificity in their submittal. She noted some counties were picking a single large project while some were identifying a waterbody and issues. She spoke regarding possible projects and recommended they not name specific stormwater projects for this first submittal. She felt there was nothing to preclude a project from receiving funds from different pots of funding.

## TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

## **1. Living Shorelines Pot 1 Project Results**

Mr. Franklin reviewed the scoring results for the project. The raw score was 24 and Staff added a timely score of 4 because of their ability to get the project based upon when funding would be received. The net grant score was 28.5.

## **MR. DAVID SUMPTER ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 6:01 P.M.**

## **2. Pot 3 Project Review and Regrade Results**

Chairman Mariano spoke regarding the project list and felt the projects should be broken down into smaller increments.

Ms. Armstrong felt based upon the money that they would need to pick smaller projects that ranked higher, instead of going straight with the ranking score. She spoke regarding effects on the surrounding area.

Ms. Michele Baker, County Administrator, referred to the August 16<sup>th</sup> memo which included a breakdown of all of the projects and included a spreadsheet showing the components of each project.

Ms. Kelly Boree, Parks, Recreation and Natural Resources Director, spoke regarding the revision of projects submitted. She noted some of the projects were being funded by other pots of money. She reviewed the list of the projects and noted the stormwater projects were broken out so they were not one large project and could be individual projects.

Extensive discussion followed between the Committee Members regarding the replacement of septic systems along the coast; possible leveraging with some of the projects; the use of matching monies; a recommendation that the projects be graded so that Staff had a priority listing that would go to the Board of County Commissioners; the state expenditure plan that would move forward would be stormwater and not so much project specific; the committee may rank a specific project, but when it was submitted to the State it may not be that project name but stated as stormwater improvements; the scoring and impacts to the surrounding area; and the Madison project had a direct connection to the river which made it score higher.

Mr. Franklin said they were required to grade all of the projects when they were submitted. If they were going to go back and do project presentations, Staff would not be able to present it to the Board tomorrow. They would need to determine if they could extend the date for the initial plan past September 2<sup>nd</sup>. He explained the RESTORE Act specified a 25 percent infrastructure limit and working with the limit based upon water quality. The 25 percent expenditure was statewide, not County specific.

## **COMMISSIONER STARKEY ARRIVED TO THE MEETING AT 6:15 P.M.**

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of grouping the projects; the grading criteria; should the committee designate which stormwater projects they preferred; the ranking criteria that was developed to determine the highest priorities for the County; ultimately the Board of County Commissioners could pick the path they wanted to take, but would weigh heavily on the Committee's recommendation; they may need to have the presentations again; the Ranch Road project; there were 87 million dollars' worth of projects with 24 million available; the September 2<sup>nd</sup> deadline; a feeling that the more information a project had, the better the project would look; that Staff could rank the stormwater projects better than the Committee; the Madison project was fresh in their minds, with specific details and ranked higher; a suggestion to have the presentations again; the newer members may feel hampered from not seeing the presentations; that the Committee needed to develop a recommendation; the state expenditure plan was their 15 year plan; and the selection process to be followed.

Chairman Mariano suggested a large binder with all the presentations be given to the committee members for their review, then have the presentations and grade the projects.

Mr. Franklin clarified the Committee wanted him to get binders with the presentations from the 25 different projects, with a 10 minutes presentation scheduled for each of the projects.

Ms. Baker stated all of the County's stormwater projects had already been scored against Capital Improvement Plan criteria. She explained Staff could score the stormwater projects against the Pot 3 criteria.

Mr. Paul Deen, Public Works Program Administrator, explained there were environmental benefits from each of the projects. He explained they could go through the project list with the engineers to provide a recommendation.

Chairman Mariano felt they should hit the high points to the criteria. He felt the rankings would come down to the Committee.

**SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER ARMSTRONG MOVED** to reject the scores based upon the limited information the new members had regarding the projects, that information be sent out, and the projects be rescored with short 5-10 minute presentations of all projects; **MR. SUMPTER SECONDED.**

Chairman Mariano called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

Discussion followed regarding the next meeting which was scheduled for September 1, 2016, at 5:30 p.m.; using electronic documents; scheduled consortium meetings; and funding projects from both pot 1 and pot 3 funds.

Chairman Mariano noted he did not see the Port Richey project listed and he felt it would be a good pot 3 project. The project should be included in the presentations.

### **3. Discussion on the State Expenditure Plan**

Chairman Mariano spoke regarding the septic tank projects and felt they should be added back into the list. The dredge project also needed to be included.

Mr. Franklin explained the information for the dredge project would be from the task order going before the Board of County Commissioners meeting. He spoke regarding the timeline. This project was a non-binding entry into the State Expenditure Plan.

Ms. Boree explained at the last meeting they did discuss the county-wide dredge project and the Committee had indicated they did not want it included in the pot money.

Mr. Mills stated there were already 87 million dollars worth of projects on the list. He felt they needed to cut down on the projects, not add to the list.

Mr. Franklin said they could also prepare the dredge project for pot 2 consideration.

Mr. Lowe asked if they would add septic to pot 3.

Chairman Mariano explained the waterfront park in Port Richey had already been funded from pot 1 and included all the dredging in the city canals. The septic was separate from that project.

Ms. Baker said Staff could include a presentation regarding a septic project that had already been scoped.

**MR. SUMPTER MOVED** approval to have a summary on the septic project and add it to the list for consideration; **SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER ARMSTRONG SECONDED.**

Chairman Mariano called on the motion; the vote was unanimous and the motion carried.

**ADJOURN**

The committee adjourned at 7:17 p.m.

RESTORE ACT COMMITTEE  
REGULAR MEETING  
AUGUST 22, 2016



*Office of Paula S. O'Neil, Clerk & Comptroller*

Prepared by: Donalee Schmidt  
Donalee Schmidt, Operations Lead  
Board Records Division