

**SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY  
REGULAR MEETING**

May 27, 2009  
Seacoast Utility Authority Board Room  
**MINUTES**

CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Don Noel, Chair

ABSENT: Maria V. Davis, Vice Chair  
Ron Ferris, Member  
Robert Weisman, President Pro-Tem  
Joseph Lo Bello, Member

ALSO PRESENT: Nat Nason, General Counsel  
Rim Bishop, Executive Director  
Mary Ann Stiles, Authority Clerk

Chair Don Noel stated that since there is not a Board Member quorum for this meeting, Attorney Nat Nason has instructed him to adjourn this meeting and that this meeting will reconvene on Wednesday, June 10, 2009 at 3:00 PM in the Board Room and all matters on this agenda will be discussed.

Adjourned at 3:01 PM

**SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY  
REGULAR MEETING**

June 10, 2009  
Seacoast Utility Authority Board Room  
**MINUTES**

CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 PM

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Don Noel, Chair  
Maria V. Davis, Vice Chair  
Ron Ferris, Member  
Robert Weisman, President Pro-Tem

ABSENT: Joseph Lo Bello, Member

ALSO PRESENT: Nat Nason, General Counsel  
Rim Bishop, Executive Director  
Mary Ann Stiles, Authority Clerk

**\*\*\*THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE PLACED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA\*\*\***

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MEETING OF APRIL 22, 2009

Move to approve the minutes for meeting of April 22, 2009.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES

Move to approve invoices as follows: Howard C. Osterman, Inc. in the amount of \$540.00; Nason, Yeager, Gerson, White & Lioce in the amounts of \$11,121.15; \$712.50; \$79.94; \$193.50; and \$344.00; and Boyle Engineering Corporation in the amounts of \$705.00; \$17,360.00; \$1,625.00; \$4,157.50; and \$1,763.15; for a total of \$38,601.74.

MIRASOL CLUB MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

Move to execute Maintenance Agreement with Mirasol Club, Inc., as recommended by staff.

LILAC STREET REPUMP FACILITY 1.0 MILLION GALLON STORAGE TANK

Move to award bid for the Lilac Street Repump Facility 1.0 Million Gallon Ground Storage Tank, to The Crom Corporation, the lowest responsive bidder and whose bid will best serve the public interest in the amount of \$608,750.00, as recommended by staff.

PGA WWTP BAR SCREEN REPLACEMENT

Move to award bid for the purchase of PGA WWTP Mechanical Screens, to G & G Industries, Inc., the lowest responsive bidder and whose bid will best serve the public interest in the amount of \$410,840.00, as recommended by staff.

DECLARATION OF SURPLUS EQUIPMENT

Move to declare certain materials and equipment surplus, and to dispose of surplus material and equipment in accordance with established Seacoast policies and procedures, as recommended by staff.

RESOLUTION NO. 3-2009 – AMENDING SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY SERVICE CODE

Move to approve Resolution No. 3-2009, Amending Seacoast Utility Authority Service Code, as recommended by staff.

RESOLUTION NO. 4-2009 – AMENDING SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Move to approve Resolution No. 4-2009, Amending Seacoast Utility Authority Administrative Policies and Procedures, as recommended by staff.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Weisman/Ferris moved to adopt the Consent Agenda.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**\*\*\*\*\*END OF CONSENT AGENDA\*\*\*\*\***

LAWN MAINTENANCE SERVICES

Vice Chair Maria Davis stated that after reading this contract extension, she asked if the Board would be interested in seeing this project rebid. It is a \$100,000.00 annual contract and with the change in the economy over the years, she feels the Authority may get a better price.

Board Member Ron Ferris asked Executive Director Rim Bishop for his comments. Mr. Bishop stated that if the Board would approve the staff recommendation but shorten the term of renewal, it would give staff enough time to put this out to bid and award a contract.

Attorney Nat Nason suggested a month to month extension so the Authority would be able to terminate it with a 30 day notice. Board Member Ron Ferris asked if the Board could authorize the Executive Director to do so without bringing it to the Board each month.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Davis/Ferris moved to extend competitively bid Lawn Maintenance Services contract with Luna Landscaping on a month to month basis, at the discretion of the Executive Director, until bids are received.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**GRIEVANCE APPEALS BOARD – SUA BOARD MEMBER REPRESENTATIVE**

Vice Chair Maria Davis volunteered to serve as the Board Member of the Employee Grievance Appeals Board.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Davis/Ferris moved to appoint Board Member Maria Davis to serve as the SUA Board appointee to the Employee Grievance Appeals Board.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**ORDINANCE NO. 1-2009, INVESTMENT POLICY**

Attorney Nat Nason asked Authority Clerk Mary Ann Stiles to read Ordinance No. 1-2009 by title only. Authority Clerk Stiles did so.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Weisman/Davis moved for second reading and adoption of Ordinance No. 1-2009, Providing for the Enactment of the Authority’s Investment Policy, Providing for the Repeal of any Inconsistent Provisions of Prior Investment Policies, as recommended by staff.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY HOOD ROAD MEMBRANE WATER TREATMENT PLANT CONCENTRATE INJECTION WELL SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION – WELL DRILLING CONTRACTOR**

Attorney Nat Nason stated that at this time there has been an appeal of the RFQ Selection Committee recommendation so the Board needs to take up the appeal.

Chair Don Noel stated that the SUA Contractor Prequalification Committee has recommended that of the three (3) firms submitting qualification packages only All Webbs Enterprises, Inc. and Youngquist Brothers, Inc. be deemed qualified bidders. An appeal of the Committee's findings has been filed by the third firm, Layne Christensen.

**Chair Don Noel then opened the Bid Protest Hearing.**

Attorney Nason told Chair Noel that all individuals who intend to give testimony at this proceeding need to stand and be sworn in at one time by the Authority Clerk. Chair Noel then asked individuals who intend to testify to please stand and Authority Clerk Mary Ann Stiles administered the oath.

Chair Don Noel then asked if any of the Board Members has had any ex-parte communications that they wish to disclose. All Board Members said no ex-parte communications took place.

Attorney Nat Nason stated for the record that all written communications by staff to the individual Board Members have been copied to any interested parties since the date of the appeal. Those documents will be made part of the record of this hearing. At this time, Attorney Nason read into the record what will become documentary evidence for this proceeding. These documents include: The Request for Qualifications for Well Drilling Contractor for Concentrate Injection Well System at the Hood Road Water Treatment Plant, Palm Beach Gardens, Florida; three documents, each of which were submitted as RFQ responses of the interested parties – one each from All Webb, Youngquist, and Layne Christensen; an email from Rim Bishop, Executive Director dated May 28, 2009 that contains the Committee recommendation. Also, attached to that email is a separate email dated May 28, 2009 providing notification of the Committee hearing results, a letter from Attorney Nat Nason dated May 28, 2009, to Mr. Stephen Crook at Layne Christensen, explaining the Committee's recommendation; Mr. Bishop's email to the SUA Board Members dated June 3, 2009 setting forth Committee position as opposed to the challenger's position and lastly, June 1, 2009 letter from Ms. Amy Rubin of Ruden McCloskey constituting the challenge to the Committee action.

Chair Noel told the Board that they are free to interrupt presenters for questions and clarifications during the presentations. First, Chair Noel called up Executive Director Rim Bishop to present the Committee recommendation.

Executive Director Rim Bishop stated that pursuant to Board's authorization on April 26, 2009, staff published a request for contractor qualifications (RFQ) for the Hood Road Concentrate Disposal Well. On May 18, 2009, SUA opened three (3) responses to the RFQ, one each from Layne Christensen, Youngquist Brothers and All Webb Enterprises. On May 28, the RFQ Committee met, determined that Youngquist Brothers and All Webb were qualified per the published standards. The Committee's findings were that Layne's experience, as submitted, was outdated and not demonstrated to be directly relevant to the SUA RFQ criteria. The same day, all respondents were notified of the Committee's findings and as Attorney Nason noted, on June 1, 2009, SUA received Layne's request for appeal. That brings us here today and he has described in writing and briefly here, what the Committee's findings and recommendations are. Chair Noel asked what he means when Mr. Bishop said "outdated". Mr. Bishop responded that

the most recent relevant experience that Layne submitted was from about 23 years ago, when they drilled a Class 1 Industrial Injection Well in this area. The Committee's finding was that experience probably could be described as stale; a little outdated and as such, was deemed not to be directly responsive to the intent of the RFQ. Chair Don Noel asked if there were any other reasons why Layne was not accepted. Mr. Bishop answered that it was hard to follow the qualifications, the relevance of the proposed project superintendent's qualifications to this particular type of work. Specifically, it wasn't clear whether the firm or the superintendent had experience with fiberglass casing pipe, pressurized annulus type injection well construction or other particular aspects of this job and on that basis, they were deemed not to be qualified. No further questions from the Board were forthcoming. Attorney Nason stated that Attorney Rubin should now have the opportunity to cross examine Mr. Bishop.

Attorney Amy Rubin with the firm Ruden and McCloskey, stated that she is here on behalf of her client, Layne Christensen.

Attorney Rubin: Asked Mr. Bishop if he has had an opportunity to listen to the May 28, 2009 recording (a copy of which Authority Clerk Mary Ann Stiles had given to both Attorney Rubin and CH2M Hill Engineers) or review the transcript that Youngquist had produced for themselves only.

Mr. Bishop: He did not.

Attorney Rubin: During the course of the Committee discussion, there was discussion about a 2001 Class 1 Injection process that Layne had done in the panhandle of Florida, correct?

Mr. Bishop: He did not recall that discussion.

Attorney Rubin: Asked if Mr. Bishop recalled both Mr. Skehan as well as Mr. Rabideau talking with Mr. Bishop about injection well programs that had been done in the panhandle and that CH2M Hill was the engineer for that project.

Mr. Bishop: He does not have a specific recollection of that discussion.

President Pro-Tem Bob Weisman asked Mr. Bishop to please describe the conduct of how the hearing was held. Was Layne Christensen allowed to make a presentation at that hearing? Did they present evidence other than what was submitted in writing regarding their qualifications?

Mr. Bishop stated that his recollection of the Committee meeting was that there was no one from Layne Christensen that made a presentation. Sean Skehan and James Rabideau both from CH2M Hill, presented Layne Christensen's qualifications to the Committee.

Attorney Rubin: In fact, none of the three firms that are applicants to be qualified to bid on this project gave presentations or were advised that they were allowed to give presentations during that Committee deliberations or prior to.

Mr. Bishop: He did not remember anyone specifically inviting them to make a presentation at the meeting.

Attorney Rubin: And, if in fact the transcript of the proceeding indicates that no one gave any further testimony from any of the three bidders, is that correct?

Mr. Bishop: To the best of his recollection, that is correct.

Attorney Rubin: And, if in fact the transcript reflects that Mr. Skehan discussed at length with the Committee, the Committee being Mr. Rim Bishop and Mr. Vince Mollo, the last project Mr. Skehan was aware of, which was exactly similar in nature and scope being a Class I injection drilling well with packers, tubing and casing, if the transcripts reflect that, would he say that was accurate?

Mr. Bishop: He could not dispute it.

Attorney Rubin: And, if in fact Mr. Bishop said, year 2001 is close enough for experience, would you dispute saying that?

Mr. Bishop: He did not recall saying that, but he would not dispute it.

President Pro-Tem Bob Weisman asked which company this project of 2001 is being credited to, Layne Christensen or another company.

Attorney Rubin: Layne Christensen

President Pro-Tem Bob Weisman asked who the gentleman that made the presentation about those skills, he is with CH2M Hill?

Attorney Rubin: That is correct.

There was some discussion as to who CH2M Hill works for. Mr. Bishop clarified that CH2M Hill works for Seacoast and they are present for questions.

Attorney Rubin: CH2M Hill Engineers work for Seacoast and they did qualify her client, Layne Christensen, to bid on this project, but Layne was then rejected by the Committee. Attorney Rubin asked Mr. Bishop to explain CH2M Hill's involvement in this Hood Road project so that everyone understands.

Mr. Bishop: CH2M Hill has been engaged as Seacoast's engineering representative to design the membrane concentrate disposal well at the Hood Road Membrane Water Treatment Plant. CH2M Hill has also assisted Seacoast in review of the contractor's qualification submittals.

Attorney Rubin: CH2M Hill assisted Seacoast initially in creating the qualification package that would be submitted, correct?

Mr. Bishop: That is correct.

Attorney Rubin: When there was objection by Youngquist to the qualification requirements to bid on this Hood Road project, CH2M Hill responded on behalf of the Board in saying that the qualifications stand as written, correct?

Mr. Bishop: That is his recollection.

Attorney Rubin: Mr. Bishop as the Executive Director for Seacoast Utility Authority approved that letter, correct?

Mr. Bishop: He was aware of that letter going out.

Attorney Rubin: Is it correct that the Authority Board voted on what the qualifications would be for this project?

Mr. Bishop: The Authority Board did not vote on the qualifications.

Attorney Rubin: The decision on what the qualifications to bid on this project would be, was created by Mr. Bishop, working with the engineers of record, CH2M Hill, correct?

Mr. Bishop: CH2M Hill submitted the qualifications and Seacoast staff reviewed them and approved them.

Attorney Rubin: Prior to the Selection Committee meeting, CH2M Hill provided Seacoast with a letter stating that they believed that all three bidders were qualified per the qualifications package and should be allowed to bid.

Mr. Bishop: CH2M Hill did state that they thought all three contractors were qualified and capable of constructing this project. He does not recall if he received a letter prior to the Committee meeting or not.

Attorney Rubin: She distributed a package of documents that might be helpful in this matter.

Attorney Nason: For the record, this document is made a part of the record for this proceeding.

Chair Noel: Can we now move from cross examination of Mr. Rim Bishop to Layne Christensen's presentation?

Attorney Nason stated that Attorney Rubin is allowed some leeway and can continue to cross examine Mr. Bishop.

Attorney Rubin: Included in the document she just distributed, there is a letter from James Rabideau regarding the qualifications of the proposed bidders. Does that refresh Mr. Bishop's recollection that Mr. Rabideau, on behalf of Seacoast's project manager for this project advised the Committee Members that all three; Youngquist, her client Layne Christensen and All Webb

were all qualified and that Mr. Rabideau made a recommendation that all three be allowed the opportunity to bid on this project?

Mr. Bishop: Yes

Attorney Rubin: Would you also agree with me that at the Committee meeting, these same engineers of Seacoast's selection also advised you that they believed that all three firms should be allowed to bid.

Mr. Bishop: Yes

Attorney Rubin: Although Mr. Bishop indicated in a recent email to the Authority Board, that the engineer's suggested that her client was "technically" qualified to bid. That is not, in fact, true, is it?

Mr. Bishop: That was his understanding at the Committee meeting.

Attorney Rubin: Once again, if the testimony at the Committee meeting reflect that CH2M Hill stated unequivocally that Layne was qualified to bid and should be allowed to bid, would you deny that?

Mr. Bishop: He described to Attorney Rubin his understanding of what CH2M Hill was telling him; Mr. Bishop's understanding was that Layne was a qualified contractor who is capable of constructing the project.

Attorney Rubin: Do you recall specifically that the presentation was, "they are currently working in the State of Florida on a project, that again, we are the engineers on. They are doing a monitoring well for Coral Springs Improvement District and thus far have performed satisfactory on the project. We believe that they will, we believe that they are qualified and will perform satisfactorily on this project and complete it to our satisfaction" – do you recall that?

Mr. Bishop: Yes, I do.

Attorney Rubin: Both Mr. Rabideau and Mr. Skehan spoke up on behalf of all three applicants and recommended all three, correct?

Mr. Bishop: I remember Mr. Skehan doing so.

Attorney Rubin: What I just read to you was stated by Mr. Rabideau so does that refresh your recollection that he too thought they were qualified.

Mr. Bishop: It does.

Attorney Rubin: Both of them work for CH2M Hill, correct.

Mr. Bishop: That is correct.

Attorney Rubin: Mr. Skehan advised Mr. Bishop that he had worked with Layne Christensen on a prior Class I injection drilling systems in the State of Florida, didn't he?

Mr. Bishop: That I do not recall.

Attorney Rubin: In fact, the documents that were submitted by her client reflect this, don't they?

Mr. Bishop: A matrix that was submitted did reflect that.

Attorney Rubin: Do you have any reason to believe that that was inaccurate?

Mr. Bishop: No

Attorney Rubin: Do you have any reason to believe that Seacoast's project engineers would recommend someone that they did not think was capable or qualified of doing the job?

Mr. Bishop: No

Attorney Rubin: In fact, these people are going to have to work together in tandem with whoever is selected, correct?

Mr. Bishop: Yes

Attorney Rubin: Asked if Mr. Bishop was the individual that asked CH2M Hill to assist in this project and give opinion as to who is qualified to bid.

Mr. Bishop: That was done by act of the Authority Board. It is part of CH2M Hill's contracted services and he (Mr. Bishop) is the Board's designated representative.

Attorney Rubin: I have nothing else at this time. She then thanked the Authority Board.

Chair Don Noel asked if Layne Christensen wished to make a presentation or did the cross examination serve that purpose. Attorney Rubin stated that her client has at least eight people from all over the country to establish their qualifications if necessary. This will not be necessary if the Board is inclined to believe that they have proved enough to allow them to bid. All she is asking for on behalf of her clients is to state that they are qualified and will be allowed to bid on this project. Attorney Rubin stated that she could give her opening statement and then based on that, the Board may make a decision. Layne Christensen is the largest well driller in the United States, and obviously they have the financial wherewithal to do the job.

President Pro-Tem Bob Weisman stated that the documentation that was submitted for the RFQ does seem to support the staff recommendation to not find Layne qualified. Some of it was very old experience. Was that all that was allowed to be submitted or was Layne allowed to submit more information after the initial submittal. Mr. Bishop stated that his recollection is that all of the written documentation that was received and considered by the Selection Committee was

delivered either before or at the Committee meeting. Mr. Weisman stated that the material he reviewed about their qualifications was very old and if he had just relied on that information, he would have reached the same conclusion of the Selection Committee, which is that Layne gave no evidence of their recent qualifications. Mr. Weisman then asked if Layne is allowed to supplement that evidence, whether through CH2M Hill or here before the Board to show that in fact they do have good qualifications.

Attorney Nason stated that it is within the Board's discretion to accept additional information submitted by the protester at this particular point in time. This is one of the reasons this type of proceeding exists. If someone takes an appeal of the Committee recommendation, they are allowed to present such evidence as they deem fit in order to establish their qualifications. Attorney Nason does believe that additional evidence can be considered by this Board at this time. He would also tell the Board that it is his understanding that they are dealing with a Committee recommendation which comes to you not with any presumption of correctness, it comes to the Board to either accept or make its own decision as they deem fit. He further believes that procedurally, if additional information is brought to the Board before the close of this hearing today, and perhaps it already has been, the Board is entitled to consider that when they determine whether or not this particular entity has met the qualifications standards or not for the RFQ.

President Pro-Tem Bob Weisman stated that it would seem a little unusual that with the recommendation of the engineer, that the Selection Committee voted contrary to their recommendation and asked Mr. Bishop to explain that decision. Mr. Bishop stated that the Selection Committee made a unanimous decision, but it was Committee of two as it turned out because the Board delegate was injured and could not attend. The Committee deliberations centered on the issue of the age of the experience that the Committee had before them at the time. The fact is that the wells that they were looking at were 20 years old plus and the Committee thought at some point, experience that is represented to a Committee for this purpose becomes stale. The Committee was faced with the question of how old experience must be before it becomes stale. The Committee's general feeling on the question of the "staleness" of the experience was anything that went back 20 years was probably too old. Mr. Weisman stated that it appeared that the engineer felt differently in that they thought that had more worthwhile short term experience. Mr. Bishop stated that his question to the engineer was "have they drilled a well exactly" like that which is being proposed, not necessarily the same size, but of the same materials and same design, recently. The answer was that they have drilled a lot of wells, most of which require the same techniques and the same type of work and that the work that they have done translates to the work that we are doing today. Accordingly, the engineer felt that Layne is qualified to do this work. The Committee then took that input and made its judgment. It wasn't so much a technical decision on the Committee's part as it was a qualitative one of what constitutes good experience.

Chair Don Noel stated that given Attorney Nason's advice, is there some specific reference to projects that are recent that the Board and staff can count on as experience relevant to this project and then forward with this item. If the Committee's only objection was that Layne did not have recent projects and they do have recent projects and can document that, then he would be inclined to move this along.

President Pro-Tem Bob Weisman stated that based on the engineer's recommendations and what he has heard today; he is prepared to make a motion to include Layne Christensen as a potential bidder. Frankly, he likes the idea of having three bidders, instead of just two. Mr. Weisman went on to say that the staff recommendation was not unfounded based on what was submitted, which was pathetic. Based on the engineer's recommendation and what has been heard today, they should be considered as a qualified bidder.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Weisman/Davis moved to include Layne Christensen as a potential bidder to construct the Seacoast Utility Authority Hood Road Membrane Water Treatment Plant Concentrate Injection Well.**

Attorney Nason stated that as a point of order, this motion can be made. If it fails, Attorney Rubin will have the opportunity then to present her case. Before the motion is taken, Chair Noel needs to ask if there is anyone else in the room that wishes to be heard on the specific motion that has been made and seconded here. Chair Noel did so.

Board Member Ron Ferris stated that the RFQ Selection Committee's findings and eye to detail is to be commended. He feels that staff has done their job in a very, very detailed manner, just as the Board pays them to do, to be technically correct in all they do. Mr. Ferris reiterated that the Committee made a good decision and the right decision, but the Board sees things from a different perspective sometimes and this is not meant to be an affront to the Committee's decision. Mr. Ferris stated that he would support the motion and he too, would like to see three bidders instead of just two. Chair Noel also agreed with Mr. Ferris' comments.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**MOTION**

**Board Members Weisman/Ferris moved to include Youngquist Brothers and All Webb Enterprises for a total of three bidders to construct the Seacoast Utility Authority Hood Road Membrane Water Treatment Plant Concentrate Injection Well.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Chair Don Noel then closed the hearing.**

**SEACOAST UTILITY AUTHORITY HOOD ROAD MEMBRANE WATER TREATMENT PLANT – INDUSTRIAL CONSTRUCTION GENERAL CONTRACTOR**

Chair Don Noel asked if this was another appeal. Executive Director Rim Bishop stated that John J. Kirlin, Inc., has withdrawn its objection.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Davis/Weisman moved to designate the following firms qualified to construct the Seacoast Utility Authority Hood Road Membrane Water Treatment Plant and to restrict consideration of award to only these firms:**

**Archer Western Contractors  
Brasfield and Gorrie, LLC  
Cardinal Contractors, Inc.  
ENCORE Construction Company  
Garney Companies  
Kiewit Southern Co.**

**PCL Civil Constructors, Inc.  
Poole and Kent  
Reynolds, Inc.  
Skanska USA Civil Southeast, Inc.  
Wharton Smith, Inc.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS – GENERAL ENGINEERING SERVICES AND HYDROGEOLOGIC CONSULTING SERVICES**

Board Member Ron Ferris recommended Bob Weisman as the Board Member Representative for this Committee as he has the most experience with this type of work. He is the best man for the job. Mr. Weisman accepted.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Davis/Weisman moved to authorize staff to publish Requests for Proposals for General Engineering Services and Hydrogeologic Consulting Services and to appoint Bob Weisman as Board Member Representative to serve on the RFP Review Committee.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**MEMBRANE CONVERSION PROJECT – BOND ISSUE UNDERWRITER SELECTION**

Vice Chair Maria Davis recommended Joe Lo Bello as Board Member Representative for this Committee.

**MOTION**

**Board Members Davis/Ferris moved to appoint Joe Lo Bello, Board Member, Daniela’ Russell, Finance Department Manager and Rim Bishop, Executive Director as the Request for Bond Underwriter Qualifications Review Committee for the Seacoast Utility Authority Series 2009 Bond Issue and to authorize publication of Requests for Underwriter Qualifications, as recommended by staff.**

**The motion carried unanimously.**

OTHER BUSINESS  
COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS

None

ENGINEERING REPORT

Engineer's Report included in Board package. Bruce Mowry was present for questions. None were asked at this time.

STAFF REPORT  
MONTHLY REPORTS

Executive Director Rim Bishop stated that the monthly reports are in the Board package.

HOOD ROAD MEMBRANE CONVERSION PROJECT SCHEDULE

Executive Director Rim Bishop gave the schedule of events for this project.

SFWMD WATER USE PERMIT

Executive Director Rim Bishop stated there was no activity on the SUA water use permit since the last Board meeting.

SFWMD PROPOSED YEAR ROUND IRRIGATION RULE

Executive Director Rim Bishop stated that SFWMD staff tells Seacoast staff that there will be a new draft rule sometime between now and the end of this month. Seacoast staff will review it, report back to the Board on its content and request direction as to whether to proceed with the administrative objection to it or whether to let it go.

ANCHORAGE PARK DEDICATION

Executive Director Rim Bishop stated that the Anchorage Park dedication took place on Saturday morning. Mr. Bishop reminded the Board that what is now Anchorage Park was once the Anchorage Drive Wastewater Treatment Plant. As he mentioned in his note to North Palm Beach Village Manager Jimmy Knight, Seacoast liked the Anchorage Drive site like it was; but we like it better like it is today. The Village has done a beautiful job with the park. The Mayor, Village Manager and all North Palm Beach officials that spoke on Saturday morning were very gracious toward Seacoast and they wanted Mr. Bishop to express their appreciation to the Authority Board for its involvement with conveying the property to them.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

Chair Don Noel stated that the bill that was before the legislature regarding regulation of the Authority by the Public Service Commission did not pass. It died in committee.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Authority, Chair Don Noel adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:43 PM.

**APPROVAL:**

---

DON NOEL, CHAIR

---

MARIA V. DAVIS, VICE CHAIR

---

ROBERT WEISMAN, PRESIDENT PRO-TEM

---

RON FERRIS, MEMBER

---

JOSEPH LO BELLO, MEMBER

**ATTEST:**

---

MARY ANN STILES, AUTHORITY CLERK