

MEETING MINUTES  
Springs Coast Management Committee  
February 27, 2019

The Springs Coast Management Committee meeting convened at 1:30 p.m., February 27, 2019, at the Southwest Florida Water Management District, Building 4 Conference Room 112, 2379 Broad Street, Brooksville, Florida 34604-6899.

**Members Present**

Dave Burnell, City of Crystal River  
Ken Cheek, Citrus County  
Alys Brockway, Hernando County  
Bob Titterington, Marion County (via phone)  
Jason Mickel, Pasco County  
Jason Wagman, FWC (Via Phone)  
Yesenia Escribano, FDACS  
Michael Molligan, SWFWMD  
Rick Owen, State Parks (via phone)  
Charles Lee, Environmental  
Heather Young, Regional Planning Council  
Dr. Mauricio Arias, Academia (Via phone)

**Members Absent**

Richard Owen, Public Supply  
Terry Hansen, FDEP  
Curt Williams, Agriculture  
Dave Bruzek, Industry

**SWFWMD Staff**

Randy Smith  
Chris Anastasiou  
Danielle Rogers  
Sky Notestein  
Vivianna Bendixson  
Frank Gargano

**Recording Secretary**

Lauren Vossler

**Other**

Rick Kirby, Hernando Utilities  
Will Fontaine, FL Governmental Utility Authority  
Cara Keller, Kimley-Horn  
Gordon Onderdunk, Hernando Utilities

---

FDACS – Florida Department of Ag and Consumer Services  
FDEP – Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
SCMC – Springs Coast Management Committee

FWC – Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission  
SWFWMD – Southwest Florida Water Management District  
SCSC – Springs Coast Steering Committee

---

Approved summaries from previous meetings can be found on the District's website [WaterMatters.org](http://WaterMatters.org).

**1. Call to Order and Roll**

Mr. Michael Molligan, Employee and External Relations director, called the meeting to order. Roll was called and a quorum was noted.

**2. Action Item: Minutes Approval from January 9, 2019**

A motion was made for approval of January 9, 2019 minutes. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

**3. Public Input**

Mr. Molligan stated there were no blue cards present.

Mr. Molligan addressed the ranking system that was discussed and decided at the Springs Coast Steering Committee (SCSC) meeting on January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2019. The SCSC identified the criteria and parameters they wanted applied when judging the Springs Projects. The SCSC decided to use a tiered system, applying a high, medium or low ranking.

Mr. Molligan discussed that during this meeting the SCMC would be ranking and scoring of the projects along with further defining objective criteria to assess projects. The committee would also be voting on the weight given to each criterion.

Once the results are calculated the committee will see where the projects align based on the ranking and grades assigned each project. Mr. Molligan also discussed with committee members where to draw the lines between high, medium and low.

**4. Presentation: FY2020 Springs Funding Application Final Evaluations Changes- Danielle Rogers**

Ms. Danielle Rogers, Environmental Project Manager, provided an update on the Springs funding application final evaluation changes and provided a recap on the process that was approved by the Spring Coast Steering Committee. The draft final evaluations were presented and committee members recommendations were populated on each project. Ms. Rogers reminded members that \$40 million is being requested from the Florida Department of Environmental Protections for the projects and total project cost is around \$100 million. Ms. Rogers distributed a revised copy of the final evaluations and discussed revisions made to three of the projects.

Ms. Rogers provided a summary about the ranking and prioritizing that was decided on at the previous SCSC meeting. The committee wanted the title status changed to project readiness, the recommendation section was changed to the title overall ranking. The category of Local Match was added to the evaluation. Each category in the project information section needed a ranking of a high, medium or low, and objective criterion describing what makes it a high, medium or low.

Mr. Lee inquired about the effects of local governments decisions to require the hook up process to be paid for by the property owner versus the local governments.

Mr. Molligan replied that the committee would have the chance to go over the criteria and can move forward with a motion to change that option if it so chose.

Ms. Rogers then touched base on the proposed high, medium and low ranking for each category and creating a definition for each ranking. Based on criteria, the individual categories will receive a high, medium or low ranking.

**5. Action Item: FY2020 Springs Funding Project Recommendations and Prioritization**

Mr. Molligan began discussion on the Springs Information category. He provided a definition of what the objective criteria would entail.

Jason Mickle inquired about the committee being needed for the objective scoring. Mr. Molligan informed the committee that they would be identifying how they want to grade the high, medium or low and each of the criteria. Staff would then score the projects based on the criteria that that Committee has set. Once scored the committee will review the overall scores and determine the breaking point for each of the three tiers -- high, medium and low.

Mr. Molligan then asked the committee if there were any changes or suggestions for the Springs Information section. The committee agreed to keep everything for this criteria.

Ms. Rogers provided a brief recap of the proposed Project Benefit category. The category reflects how many pounds of nitrogen will be removed each year by the project.

Discussion then ensued about possibly combining Project Benefit and Cost Effectiveness together. Mr. Molligan stated that there appeared to be no recommended changes to the Project Benefit criteria. All committee members unanimously agreed.

Ms. Rogers gave a brief description of the proposed Cost Effectiveness criteria. Cost Effectiveness is the estimated cost of the project per pound of nitrogen removed. Projects that are less than \$100 per pound of nitrogen removed will receive a high ranking, \$100-176 dollars per pound of nitrogen removed will receive a medium ranking, and greater than \$176 dollars a low ranking.

Committee members discussed potentially breaking criteria into three categories and having them in descending order. A motion was taken to use a criterion similar to the Project Benefit where the cost effectiveness is ranked, top five, middle five and bottom five; rather than using a numerical dollar amount. The motion was seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Rogers discussed the proposed Related Strategies. This category identifies three criteria: 1) Project is listed in the BMAP list of projects or anticipated to be added in the next update, 2) Benefiting spring has an existing MFL, and 3) Project is part of a specific water quality or water quantity improvement plan.

Committee members discussed hook up from septic to sewer being mandatory from FDEP.

The committee unanimously agreed that a project would receive a high ranking in this category if it meets at least one of the criteria and would get a low ranking if it does not meet any of the criteria OR the applicant does not require connection to available sewer.

Ms. Rogers provided a proposed definition of the Local Match criteria. This category explains that if a local match is present the project will receive a high ranking; if a local match is not present then the project will receive a low ranking.

Mr. Charles Lee proposed to split the Local Match category into 3 rankings of high, medium and low, and consider if a local match was present and if the sewer customers were paying the connection fees (if required).

Committee members discussed potentially requiring local governments to pay for hook ups and connections fee by using that as an incentive to get property owners to connect to sewer systems. A motion was made to use two criteria: 1) local match as part of the funding request and 2) Customer paying 100% of the connection costs. Meeting both criteria would result in a high, one would be a medium, and neither would be a low. The motion was seconded and carried seven in favor and three against.

Ms. Rogers gave a brief recap of the proposed Project Readiness category. The definitions that are being proposed for consideration are based on the project time frame. The project would receive a high ranking if the project is in construction or anticipated to start within the funding calendar year. If project construction is not anticipated to begin in 2020 but the project design is ongoing then it would receive a medium ranking. If the project is dependent on the completion of another development before it can begin then the project would receive a low ranking

Mr. Molligan stated that there appeared to be no recommended changes to the Project Readiness criteria. All committee members unanimously agreed.

Mr. Molligan addressed the committee with approving the criteria, the chart and the changes made during the meeting. The motion was approved and second.

Ms. Rogers discussed the weighting of the projects and the finalization of the criteria. Each category receives a high, medium or low ranking. The committee decides how much value or weighting each category has. The proposal was to assign a value of 10 points each for the Project Benefit and Cost Effectiveness categories, 7 points for the Spring Information category, 5 points each for the Related Strategies and Project Readiness categories, and 3 points for the Local Match.

Discussion was ensued by committee members about changes in weighting the categories, and where the projects fall in order of importance.

A motion was made to implement weighting score shown on FY2020 Springs Funding Spreadsheet. The motion was seconded and carried 10 in favor and 1 against.

Committee members discussed possible options of tiering the Springs projects.

A motion was made by Mr. Lee to tier the top five projects in segments of five, five, & five. This would split the score between a 94 and 85 between the high and the medium and then 80 and 75 on the medium to the low. The motion died to the lack of a second.

With the maximum points available being 120 and the minimum 40, a difference of 80 points separates the maximum and minimum values. A motion was made to assign the overall rankings dividing 80 evenly into three levels: 40-66 would be a low, 67-94 would be a medium, and 95-120 would be a high. The motion was seconded. The motion carried 9 in favor and 2 against.

## **6. Open Discussion**

Ms. Rogers reminded committee members that the approved finale evaluations and rankings will be provided to the Springs Coast Steering Committee.

Mr. Molligan gave committee members a final chance to ask any questions or voice concerns relating to the changes Ms. Rogers mentioned earlier. No additional questions or concerns were brought forward.

## **7. Adjournment**

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.