

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #1</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Department RIF</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	\$1,940,686	\$1,967,857
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any): [RIF 13 and Inactive 6]</b>		<b>19</b>	

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

The Utility must provide core and essential services despite the present fiscally challenging environment. This efficiency represents one of several options that must be considered in order to contain costs. Thirteen positions have been identified for elimination which includes support, managerial, and senior level positions. These positions have been identified, many of which can be released during FY 09; however, this reduction-in-force will require that some recruitment, reclassification, and retirement actions be in play to facilitate the elimination of positions.

Positions	FY 10 Cost	FY 11 Cost
<b>13</b>	<b>1,173,039</b>	<b>1,189,462</b>
<b>Indirect @21%</b>	<b>246,338</b>	<b>249,787</b>
<b>RIF-Total</b>	<b>\$1,419,377</b>	<b>\$1,439,249</b>

Additionally, it is anticipated that the level of demand for utility services will be on the rise; however, predictively that is an unknown time frame. The below listed positions have been identified as critical for our organizations success; however, given the present state of work demand and support needed to maintain minimum service levels, these positions should be placed in an inactive status.

In anticipation that there will be an upturn in the economy, the utility must remain at a ready state of execution and the ability to immediately reactivate and recruit these positions to meet service demands and organizational support is imperative.

Positions	FY 10 Cost	FY 11 Cost
<b>6</b>	<b>430,834</b>	<b>436,866</b>
<b>Indirect @21%</b>	<b>90,475</b>	<b>91,472</b>
<b>Inactive-Total</b>	<b>\$521,309</b>	<b>\$528,608</b>
<b>Combined Total</b>	<b>\$1,940,686</b>	<b>\$1,967,857</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact [Both: RIF and Inactive]

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #2A</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Wastewater 24 hour Maintenance Support</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$193,959</b>	<b>\$196,412</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

This efficiency establishes 24 hour maintenance support within the wastewater section of the Plant Operations group. This will be accomplished by transitioning portions of the current day shift (7am to 3pm) maintenance personnel to the second (3pm to 11pm) and third (11pm to 7am) shifts. This proposed change will require verification by the union.

This efficiency eliminates the existing standby program within the wastewater section of the Plant Operations Group. Elimination of this program will save approximately \$85,367 per year in overtime pay and approximately \$75,315 per year in standby pay. In addition, WRS expects a reduction in vehicle costs of approximately \$18,720 per year. Creation of two new shifts will add offsetting shift differential pay costs of \$15,856 per year. These reductions in Character 10 will cause a related reduction of indirect costs of \$30,413. Total savings for this efficiency are approximately \$193,959 for FY 2010 and \$196,412 for FY 2011.

**Annual labor savings (calculated using actual data from 2008 pay periods 23 and 26):**

Wastewater				
Pay Period #23 (2008)			Pay Period #26 (2008)	
<b>Overtime worked while on standby</b>	60		<b>Overtime worked while on standby</b>	61
Allowance of 1.0 hour for take vehicle X 10 round trips X 4 employees	40		Allowance of 1.0 hour for take vehicle X 10 round trips X 4 employees	40
Hours paid	100		Hours paid	101
Avg overtime rate	\$ 27.00		Avg overtime rate	\$ 27.00
Overtime cost for pay period #23	\$ 2,700.00		Overtime cost for pay period #23	\$ 2,727.00
Pay periods per year	26		Pay periods per year	26
Annual overtime cost	\$ 70,200.00		Annual overtime cost	\$ 70,902.00
<b>Average annual cost of OT paid while on standby = \$70,551</b>				
<b>With Benefit Factor (21%) = \$85,367</b>				
<b>Standby hours</b>	141		<b>Standby hours</b>	125
Avg straight time rate	\$ 18.00		Avg straight time rate	\$ 18.00
Standby cost for pay period #23	\$ 2,538.00		Standby cost for pay period #23	\$ 2,250.00
Pay periods per year	26		Pay periods per year	26
Annual standby cost	\$ 65,988.00		Annual standby cost	\$ 58,500.00
<b>Average annual cost of standby = \$62,244</b>				
<b>With Benefit Factor (21%) = \$75,315</b>				

**Annual vehicle savings:**

	<b><u>Miles saved</u></b>
Elimination of take-home vehicles during standby (10 round trips x 4 employees x 20 miles)	800
Elimination of call-out mileage (2 round trips x 4 employees x 20 miles)	160
<b>Total</b>	<b>960</b>

Cost per mile	\$ 0.75
Savings per pay period	\$ 720.00
Pay periods per year	26
 Annual savings	 \$18,720.00

**Partial offset by shift differential costs:**

Average straight time rate	\$ 18.00
5% differential	\$ 0.90
Annual hours at differential	14560
 Annual cost of differential	 \$13,104.00
 With OT Benefit Factor (21%)	 \$15,855.84

<b>Summary</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Overtime costs avoided	\$ (85,367.00)	\$ (86,562.00)
Standby costs avoided	\$ (75,315.00)	\$ (76,369.00)
Additional shift differential costs	\$ 15,856.00	\$ 16,078.00
Character 10 Net	\$(144,826.00)	\$(146,853.00)
Related indirect costs reduction	\$ (30,413.00)	\$ (30,839.00)
Vehicle costs avoided	\$ (18,720.00)	\$ (18,720.00)
<b>Net effect</b>	<b>\$(193,959.00)</b>	<b>\$(196,412.00)</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring x / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact: Core maintenance staff for day time operations will be minimized.

FORM BF004 (Revised 10/08)

(Continue on separate page, if necessary.)

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #2B</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Water 24 hour Maintenance Support</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$267,561</b>	<b>\$274,045</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

This efficiency establishes 24 hour maintenance support within the water section of the Plant Operations group. This will be accomplished by transitioning portions of the current day shift (7am to 3pm) maintenance personnel to the second (3pm to 11pm) and third (11pm to 7am) shifts. This proposed change will require verification by the union.

This efficiency eliminates the existing standby program within the water section of the Plant Operations Group. Elimination of this program will save approximately \$127,885 per year in overtime pay and approximately \$91,863 per year in standby pay. In addition, WRS expects a reduction in vehicle costs of approximately \$18,720 per year. Creation of two new shifts will add offsetting shift differential pay costs of approximately \$14,094 per year. These reductions in Character 10 will cause a related reduction of indirect costs. Total savings for this efficiency are approximately \$267,561 for FY 2010 and \$274,045 for FY 2011.

**Annual labor savings (calculated using actual data from 2008 pay periods 23 and 26):**

Water				
Pay Period #23 (2008)			Pay Period #26 (2008)	
<b>Overtime worked while on standby</b>	96		<b>Overtime worked while on standby</b>	95
Allowance of 1.0 hour for take vehicle X 10 round trips X 4 employees	40		Allowance of 1.0 hour for take vehicle X 10 round trips X 4 employees	40
Hours paid	136		Hours paid	135
Avg overtime rate	\$ 30.00		Avg overtime rate	\$ 30.00
Overtime cost for pay period #23	\$ 4,080.00		Overtime cost for pay period #23	\$ 4,050.00
Pay periods per year	26		Pay periods per year	26
Annual overtime cost	\$106,080.00		Annual overtime cost	\$105,300.00
<b>Average annual cost of OT paid while on standby = \$105,690</b>				
<b>With Benefit Factor (21%) = \$127,885</b>				
<b>Standby hours</b>	153		<b>Standby hours</b>	139
Avg straight time rate	\$ 20.00		Avg straight time rate	\$ 20.00
Standby cost for pay period #23	\$ 3,060.00		Standby cost for pay period #23	\$ 2,780.00
Pay periods per year	26		Pay periods per year	26
Annual standby cost	\$ 79,560.00		Annual standby cost	\$ 72,280.00
<b>Average annual cost of standby = \$75,920</b>				
<b>With Benefit Factor (21%) = \$91,863</b>				

**Annual vehicle savings:**

	<b><u>Miles saved</u></b>
Elimination of take-home vehicles during standby (10 round trips x 4 employees x 20 miles)	800
Elimination of call-out mileage (2 round trips x 4 employees x 20 miles)	160
<b>Total</b>	<b>960</b>

Cost per mile	\$ 0.75
Savings per pay period	\$ 720.00
Pay periods per year	26
 Annual savings	 \$18,720.00

**Partial offset by shift differential costs:**

Average straight time rate	\$ 20.00
5% differential	\$ 1.00
Annual hours at differential	11648
<b>Annual cost of differential</b>	<b>\$11,648.00</b>
 With OT Benefit Factor (21%)	 \$14,094.08

**Summary:**

	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Overtime costs avoided	\$(127,885.00)	\$(129,675.00)
Standby costs avoided	\$ (91,863.00)	\$ (93,149.00)
Additional shift differential costs	\$ 14,094.00	\$ 14,291.00
Character 10 Net	\$(205,654.00)	\$(208,533.00)
Related indirect costs reduction	\$ (43,187.00)	\$ (43,792.00)
Vehicle costs avoided	\$ (18,720.00)	\$ (18,720.00)
<b>Net effect</b>	<b>\$(267,561.00)</b>	<b>\$(271,045.00)</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact: Core maintenance staff for day time operations will be minimized.

FORM BF004 (Revised 10/08)

(Continue on separate page, if necessary.)

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resources Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #3</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Plant Operations Group – Modified Plant Supervisor Shift</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$47,183</b>	<b>\$47,842</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

This efficiency transitions the existing Plant Supervisor shift from 7am to 3:30pm to 1pm to 9:30pm. This will allow the Plant Supervisor to cover the 3pm to 11pm Plant Operator shift in the event the scheduled operator is absent. This efficiency generally eliminates 160 hours of overtime per year per water and wastewater plant. The 160 hours is based on 16 hours of floating holiday, 80 hours of vacation, 24 hours of sick leave and 40 hours of training. This proposal will require verification by the union.

Plant	Avg Plant Op Hourly Rate	Avg Plant Op OT Rate	FY10
Lake Park	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Fawn Ridge	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Lithia	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Central	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Dale Mabry	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
River Oaks	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Northwest	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Biosolids	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Falkenburg	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
Valrico	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
South County	\$ 17.58	\$ 26.37	\$ 4,219.20
<b>Total</b>			\$ 46,411.20
<b>With Benefit Factor (21%)</b>			\$ 56,157.55

This savings is partially offset by shift differential pay and possible overtime pay for the Plant Supervisor. It is assumed that the Plant Supervisor will have to cover 20 plant operator shifts each year (160 hours = 20 shifts).

**Additional costs resulting from transition to 1pm-9:30pm shift:**

- 2.5 hours of shift differential per day (7pm-9:30pm) x 5 shifts per week x 52 weeks = 650 hours

Average Plant Sup Rate	\$ 23.88
5% differential	\$ 1.19
Annual hours at differential	650
Annual cost of differential per plant	\$ 776.10
# of plants	11
<hr/>	
<b>Total</b>	\$ 8,537.10
<b>With Benefit Factor (21%)</b>	\$ 10,329.89

**Additional costs resulting from Plant Supervisor covering 3pm-11pm operator shift:**

- 2 hours of overtime pay per shift (9:30pm-11pm, ½ hour lunch eliminated) x 20 shifts = 40 hours

Average Plant Sup Rate	\$	23.88
Additional 50% rate	\$	11.94
Annual hours of OT		40
Annual cost of OT per plant	\$	477.60
# of plants		11
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>5,253.60</b>
With Benefit Factor (21%)	\$	6,356.86

- Additional 1.5 hours of shift differential pay per shift x 20 shifts = 30 hours

Average Plant Sup Rate	\$	23.88
5% differential	\$	1.19
Annual hours at differential		30
Annual cost of differential per plant	\$	35.82
# of plants		11
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>394.02</b>
With Benefit Factor (21%)	\$	476.76

<b>Summary</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Plant Operator OT Costs Avoided	\$ (56,158.00)	\$ (56,944.00)
Additional Plant Supervisor Shift Differential Costs	\$ 10,330.00	\$ 10,475.00
Additional Plant Supervisor OT Costs	\$ 6,357.00	\$ 6,446.00
Additional Plant Supervisor Shift Differential OT Costs	\$ 477.00	\$ 484.00
<b>Total Character 10 Savings</b>	<b>\$ (38,994.00)</b>	<b>\$ (39,539.00)</b>
Related indirect costs reduction	\$ (8,189.00)	\$ (8,303.00)
<b>Total Annual Savings</b>	<b>\$ (47,183.00)</b>	<b>\$ (47,842.00)</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring x / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact: Core Supervision staff for day time operations will be minimized.

FORM BF004 (Revised 10/08)

(Continue on separate page, if necessary.)

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #4</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Addition of Second Shift (Field Maintenance Services)</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$548,062</b>	<b>\$555,356</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):** This efficiency proposes creation of a second shift for the Field Maintenance Services group. The current hours of operation for this group are 7:00am-3:30pm. Emergency calls for service outside normal working hours are handled by on-call (standby) staff. Creation of a 12:00pm-8:30pm second shift will eliminate all standby pay and most overtime pay between the hours of 3:30pm and 8:30pm. Staffing the second shift will require no additional positions as a portion of current staff will simply be reassigned to the second shift. This proposed change will require verification by the union.

Implementation of this efficiency will save an estimated \$378,000 per year in overtime costs, \$59,000 per year in standby costs and \$27,000 per year in vehicle costs. Creation of the new shift will add offsetting shift differential costs of \$7,100. These reductions in Character 10 will cause a related reduction of indirect costs. Total annual savings for this efficiency are approximately \$548,000. There may be additional opportunities for savings after implementation as each group (North, South & Pump Stations) may be able to reduce the number of staff on standby between 8:30pm and 7:00am.

**Estimated annual labor savings:**

<b>OVERTIME PAY</b>						
	<b># of Employees on call between 3:30pm and 8:30pm</b>	<b>Avg OT hours paid between 3:30pm and 8:30pm (bi-weekly)</b>	<b>Avg OT Rate (time and a half)</b>	<b>Avg OT Rate w/benefit factor (21.81%)</b>	<b>Avg OT Cost 3:30 to 8:30pm / Bi-Weekly</b>	<b>Estimated Annual OT Savings</b>
<b>North</b>	3	140	\$ 26.72	\$ 32.55	\$ 4,556.67	<b>\$118,473.38</b>
<b>South</b>	6	160	\$ 27.81	\$ 33.88	\$ 5,420.06	<b>\$140,921.50</b>
<b>Pump Stations</b>	8	150	\$ 25.08	\$ 30.55	\$ 4,582.49	<b>\$119,144.80</b>
<b>Total Savings</b>						<b>\$378,539.68</b>

<b>STANDBY PAY</b>						
	<b># of Employees on call between 3:30pm and 8:30pm</b>	<b>Units Saved 3:30 to 8:30pm Bi Weekly</b>	<b>Hours Paid (8 units = 1 hr pay)</b>	<b>Avg Straight Rate</b>	<b>Avg Rate w/benefit factor (21.81%)</b>	<b>Annual Standby Savings</b>
<b>North</b>	3	150	18.75	\$ 17.81	\$ 21.69	<b>\$ 10,576.00</b>
<b>South</b>	6	300	37.5	\$ 18.82	\$ 22.92	<b>\$ 22,351.53</b>
<b>Pump Stations</b>	8	400	50	\$ 16.64	\$ 20.27	<b>\$ 26,349.94</b>
<b>Total Savings</b>						<b>\$ 59,277.47</b>

**Estimated annual vehicle savings:**

	Average # of call-outs per pay period	Average miles in County vehicle per call-out	Miles saved per pay period	Annual miles saved
North	19	20	380	9880
South	30	20	600	15600
Pump Stations	20	20	400	10400
<b>Total</b>			1380	35880

35,880 miles x 0.75 per mile cost = \$26,910 in estimated annual vehicle savings

**Partial offset by shift differential costs:**

	# of Employees on call between 3:30pm and 8:30pm	Avg Straight Rate	5% differential	Annual hours at differential	Annual differential cost
North	3	\$ 17.81	\$ 0.89	1170	\$ 1,041.89
South	6	\$ 18.82	\$ 0.94	2340	\$ 2,201.94
Pump Stations	8	\$ 16.64	\$ 0.83	3120	\$ 2,595.84
<b>Total Savings</b>					\$ 5,839.67
					With benefit factor (21.81%)
					\$ 7,113.30

<b>Summary</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Overtime costs avoided	(\$378,540.00)	(\$383,839.00)
Standby costs avoided	(\$59,277.00)	(\$60,107.00)
Additional shift differential costs	\$7,113.00	\$7,213.00
Character 10 Net	(\$430,703.00)	(\$436,733.00)
Related indirect costs reduction	(\$90,447.00)	(\$91,713.00)
Vehicle costs avoided	(\$26,910.00)	(\$26,910.00)
<b>Net effect</b>	<b>(\$548,061.00)</b>	<b>(\$548,061.66)</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time impact

Explain any service impact:

FORM BF004 (Revised 10/08)

(Continue on separate page, if necessary.)

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #5</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Alternate Power Falkenburg AWTP</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$325,000</b>	<b>\$390,000</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b> None			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):** This efficiency proposes construction of new underground power conduits, wiring, switches, meters and transformers to allow the Solid Waste Resource Recovery Facility to provide electric power to the Falkenburg AWTP and Woodberry MWPS in lieu of using electric power from Tampa Electric Company (TECO). Currently, the TECO power rate is approximately \$0.085/kWh with additional demand charges. Negotiations with the Solid Waste Department resulted in a flat rate of \$0.06/kWh with no demand charges.

TECO bills for the Falkenburg AWTP facility for FY 08 show an annual kWh usage of 7,303,632. The following will lead to increased usage in FY 10 & FY11:

- A. Increased flow of 1.275 MGD that is currently being diverted to City of Tampa because of the limited capacity of the plant prior to completion of the expansion [16% increase in kWh].
- B. Increased demand related to the current expansion from 9.0 MGD to 12.0 MGD [13% increase in kWh].
- C. Increased demand related to the Ultra Violet disinfection process [15% increase in kWh].

This results in a projected annual demand of 10,834,938 kWh/year for FY 10 & FY11.

For the purposes of a payback analysis, construction costs for the conduit, wiring and transformers, etc. are approximately \$605,000. The discount rate is assumed at 1% and is amortized over one year. TECO power charges are assumed at \$0.085 / kWh, not including demand charges which inflate the bill. Resource Recovery Facility charges are assumed at a flat rate of \$0.06 / kWh with no demand charges. The resulting analysis (attached) shows a payback of the original capital costs at around 27 months with a monthly power savings of around \$22,573 per month based on current conditions and with the plant operating at less than full capacity as described above. As plant flows increase and the resultant kWh demand increases, this monthly savings is projected to increase to over \$32,000 per month.

Should TECO rates increase, the agreement between Water Resource Services and Solid Waste allows for an optional escalation in rates proportionate to the TECO increase. The calculation of potential saving [below] assumes that the Solid Waste rate will escalate in proportion to the TECO rate.

Annual savings are calculated as follows:

Proof of Savings - Falkenburg AWT			
Historical kWh			7,303,632
COT 1.275 MGD	16%		1,168,581
Expansion	13%		949,472
U.V. Factor	15%		1,413,253
<b>Projected kWh</b>			<b>10,834,938</b>
		<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Project kWh for FY 2010		10,834,938	10,834,938
Average TECO Rate		\$ 0.0850	\$ 0.1020
TECO Rate Increase	20%	0.0170	0.0204
TECO Rate for FY 2010		\$ 0.1020	
TECO Rate for FY 2011			\$ 0.1224
<b>Cost on TECO</b>		<b>\$ 1,105,164</b>	<b>\$1,326,196</b>
Contracted Rate		\$ 0.0600	\$ 0.0720
TECO Rate Increase	20%	0.0120	0.0144
<b>Solid Waste Rate</b>		<b>\$ 0.0720</b>	<b>\$ 0.0864</b>
<b>Cost form Solid Waste</b>		<b>\$ 780,116</b>	<b>\$ 936,139</b>
<b>Projected Annual Savings</b>		<b>\$ 325,048</b>	<b>\$ 390,058</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #6</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Alternate Power Falkenburg Customer Service Facility</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$113,000</b>	<b>\$136,000</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b> None			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):** This efficiency proposes construction of underground power conduits, wiring, switches, meters and transformers to allow the Solid Waste Resource Recovery Facility to provide electric power to the new Falkenburg Customer Service facility. This construction will allow Water Resource Services (WRS) to use electricity purchased from the Solid Waste Resource Recovery Facility in lieu of using electric power from Tampa Electric Company (TECO). Currently TECO power charges are about \$0.101 / kWh, with additional demand charges. Negotiations with the Solid Waste Department resulted in a flat rate of \$0.06 / kWh with no demand charges. Calculated savings are based on the connected loads for this facility and assumptions of usage during different times of the day as follows:

1. The connected load is approximately 1525 KVA (WRS is planning on installing a 1500 KVA transformer to serve the Falkenburg Warehouse and the adjacent Customer Service facility).
2. According to the architect, the calculated demand factor is approximately 0.71. This translates to a demand load of approximately 089 KVA or 1000 kW.
3. The Customer Service facility will use approximately 60% of the above load or 600 kW. The other 40% or 400 kW will be used by the adjacent Warehouse Facility.
4. To determine the utilization factor (uf), the following assumptions were made:
  - A. During normal working hours (7 am-6 pm, five days/week), the utilization factor will be highest in the summer months and slightly lower in the winter months. WRS assumes a utilization factor of .80 for these times.
  - B. During non-working hours and on weekends, the utilization factor should be somewhat less (i.e. - lights are turned off, HVAC is set at minimal levels and most operations in the warehouse are not taking place). WRS assumes a utilization factor of .30 for these hours.

Assuming the above is reasonable, the expected power consumption for the Customer Service facility is:

- A. Normal working hours: 5 days/week x 11 hours/day x 52 weeks/year x 600 kW x .80 uf = 1,372,800 kWh/year
- B. Non-working hours: 5 days/week x 13 hours/day x 52 week/year x 600 kW x .30 uf = 486,720 kWh/year
- C. Weekends: 2 days/week x 24 hours/day x 52 week/year x 600 kW x .30 uf = 449,280 kWh/year

**TOTAL kWh/year = 2,308,800 or 192,400 kWh/month average (note - summer months should be a little higher and winter months a little lower)**

For the purposes of a payback analysis, construction costs for the power conduits, wiring, switches, meters and transformers are approximately \$150,000. The discount rate is assumed at 1% and is amortized over one year. The resulting analysis (attached) shows a payback of the original capital costs in approximately 16 months based on an annual savings in excess of \$113,000.

Should TECo rates increase, the agreement between Water Resource Services and Solid Waste allows for escalating their rates a maximum of a similar amount although the increase is not mandatory. The calculation of potential saving [below] assumes that the Solid Waste rate will escalate in proportion to the TECO rate.

Annual savings are calculated as follows:

<b>Proof of Savings - Falkenburg Admin Bldg</b>			
		<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Estimated kWh		2,308,800	2,308,800
Average TECO Rate		\$ 0.1010	\$ 0.1212
TECO Rate Increase	20%	0.0202	0.0242
TECO Rate for FY 2010		\$ 0.1212	
TECO Rate for FY 2011			\$ 0.1454
<b>Cost from TECO</b>		<b>\$ 279,827</b>	<b>\$ 335,792</b>
Contracted Rate		\$ 0.0600	\$ 0.0720
TECO Rate Increase	20%	0.0120	0.0144
<b>Solid Waste Rate</b>		<b>\$ 0.0720</b>	<b>\$ 0.0864</b>
<b>Cost from Solid Waste</b>		<b>\$ 166,234</b>	<b>\$ 199,480</b>
<b>Projected Annual Savings</b>		<b>\$ 113,593</b>	<b>\$ 136,312</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #7</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Alternate Power Falkenburg Warehouse Facility</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$79,000</b>	<b>\$95,000</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>		<b>None</b>	

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):** This efficiency proposes construction of underground power conduits, wiring, switches, meters and transformers to allow the Solid Waste Resource Recovery Facility to provide electric power to the new Falkenburg Warehouse facility. This construction will allow Water Resource Services (WRS) to use electricity purchased from the Solid Waste Resource Recovery Facility in lieu of using electric power from Tampa Electric Company (TECO). Currently TECO power charges are about \$0.101 / kWh, with additional demand charges. Negotiations with the Solid Waste Department resulted in a flat rate of \$0.06 / kWh with no demand charges. Calculated savings are based on the connected loads for this facility and assumptions of usage during different times of the day as follows:

1. The connected load is approximately 1525 KVA (WRS is planning on installing a 1500 KVA transformer to serve the Falkenburg Warehouse and the adjacent Customer Service Facility).
2. According to the architect, the calculated demand factor is approximately 0.71. This translates to a demand load of approximately 089 KVA or 1000 kW.
3. The Falkenburg Warehouse will use approximately 40% of the above load or 400 kW. The other 60% or 600 kW will be used by the adjacent Customer Service Facility.
4. To determine the utilization factor (uf), the following assumptions were made:
  - A. During normal working hours (7 am-6 pm, five days/week), the utilization factor will be highest in the summer months and slightly lower in the winter months. WRS assumes a utilization factor of .80 for these times.
  - B. During non-working hours and on weekends, the utilization factor should be somewhat less (i.e. - lights are turned off, HVAC is set at minimal levels and most operations in the warehouse are not taking place). WRS assumes a utilization factor of .30 for these hours.

Assuming the above is reasonable, the expected power consumption for the Falkenburg Warehouse is:

- A. Normal working hours: 5 days/week x 11 hours/day x 52 weeks/year x 400 kW x .80 uf = 915,200 kWh/year
- B. Non-working hours: 5 days/week x 13 hours/day x 52 week/year x 400 kW x .30 uf = 405,600 kWh/year
- C. Weekends: 2 days/week x 24 hours/day x 52 week/year x 400 kW x .30 uf = 299,520 kWh/year

**TOTAL kWh/year = 1,620,320 or 135,027 kWh/month average (note - summer months should be a little higher and winter months a little lower).**

For the purposes of a payback analysis, construction costs for the power conduits, wiring, switches, meters and transformers are approximately \$100,000. The discount rate is assumed at 1% and is amortized over one year. The resulting analysis (attached) shows a payback of the original capital costs in approximately 16 months based on annual savings in excess of \$80,000.

Should TECO rates increase, the agreement between Water Resource Services and Solid Waste allows for an optional escalation in rates proportionate to the TECO increase. The calculation of potential saving [below] assumes that the Solid Waste rate will escalate in proportion to the TECO rate.

Annual savings are calculated as follows:

<b>Proof of Savings - Falkenburg Warehouse</b>		
	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Estimated kWh	1,620,320	1,620,320
Average TECO Rate	\$ 0.1010	\$ 0.1212
TECO Rate Increase      20%	0.0202	0.0242
TECO Rate for FY 2010	\$ 0.1212	
TECO Rate for FY 2011		\$ 0.1454
<b>Cost from TECO</b>	<b>\$ 196,383</b>	<b>\$ 235,659</b>
Contracted Rate	\$ 0.0600	\$ 0.0720
TECO Rate Increase      20%	0.0120	0.0144
<b>Solid Waste Rate</b>	<b>\$ 0.0720</b>	<b>\$ 0.0864</b>
<b>Cost from Solid Waste</b>	<b>\$ 116,663</b>	<b>\$ 139,996</b>
<b>Projected Annual Savings</b>	<b>\$ 79,720</b>	<b>\$ 95,664</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #8</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Energy Alternatives</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>		<b>\$240,000</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

Water Resource Services currently bears monthly electrical bills in excess of \$1,000,000 (\$12 million annually).

It is the intention of Water Resource Services to contract with an energy efficiency advisor to identify opportunities to modify existing equipment, replace inefficient equipment and to implement electrical energy alternatives to reduce reliance on energy purchased from TECO and implement additional water conservation strategies.

Through a mixture of more energy efficient motors and equipment, and construction of energy production facilities (photo voltaic, etc), Water Resource Services aims at reducing its electrical bills from TECO by 2.0%. Through successful implementation, Water Resource Services will significantly reduce its carbon footprint and align the County with the Governor's energy initiatives, and can take advantage of available rebates, as outlined in the attached information.

The consultant will be funded from the Water Conservation Trust Fund 10-004-913 at \$120,000 annually for a limited duration based on the actual savings realized. Minimum performance measure for evaluation and continued contracting are set at 2% or \$240,000 in savings to be realized by the end of FY11. Funding is contingent upon revision of Water Conservation Ordinance, and savings are contingent upon an energy audit being completed by 12/31/09.

<b>Summary</b>	<b><u>FY 2010</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2011</u></b>
Annual Electric Cost		\$12,000,000
Savings Factor		<u>2.0%</u>
Savings		\$ (240,000)

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact: A positive service impact is anticipated. WRS will realize efficiency gains resulting from our ability to reduce energy costs associated with running its water, wastewater and reclaimed water systems. This in turn may manifest itself in moderating future rate increases for County utility customers.

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #9</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Facilities Maintenance</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$350,843</b>	<b>\$443,037</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>		<b>4</b>	

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary)**

In FY07, WRS made organizational adjustments that functionally moved five full-time maintenance positions from Field Maintenance Services to Operations and Management. While part of Field Maintenance Services, these positions supported sewer pump station maintenance. Field Maintenance Services has since used contract services to support a portion of pump station maintenance. Since moving to Operations and Management, the personnel have divided their time between pump station maintenance and maintenance and inspection of WRS buildings, facilities, and real estate assets. This efficiency proposes that facility/real estate maintenance and inspection activities that are currently performed by five full time WRS employees be provided by contract services on an as-needed basis. Doing so achieves a significant cost reduction over the next two fiscal years. Any funds in the Facilities Support index code (WAE01052) not eliminated by this efficiency will be moved into the Operations & Management index code (WAE01050). The resulting contract costs will be paid from these funds.

**Reduction in Force:**

<b>Positions</b>	<b>FY 10 Cost</b>	<b>FY 11 Cost</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>\$244,212</b>	<b>\$247,631</b>
<b>Indirect @21%</b>	<b>51,285</b>	<b>52,002</b>
<b>RIF-Total</b>	<b>\$295,497</b>	<b>\$299,633</b>

**Elimination of related operating costs:**

<b>Sub Object Code</b>	<b>FY10 Cost</b>	<b>FY11 Cost</b>
4002	112.50	112.50
4010	10,881.45	11,338.83
4299	300.00	0.00
4505	6,024.00	6,024.00
4601	800.00	800.00
4609	3,900.00	3,900.00
4699	700.00	700.00
5100	50.00	50.00
5200	8,500.00	8,500.00
5212	450.00	450.00
<b>Savings</b>	<b>31,717.95</b>	<b>31,876.33</b>

**Pinebrooke lease termination:**

The five full time personnel identified for force reduction are scheduled to occupy a large shop area within the new LB Foster Administration Building beginning in December 2009. The shop area not used by the personnel can be allocated for the full time personnel who would otherwise occupy the Pinebrooke lease facility. The cost reduction will be realized by eliminating the need for the Pinebrooke lease and corresponding electric costs.

<u>Sub Object Code</u>	<u>FY10 Cost</u>	<u>FY11 Cost</u>
4300	7,560	15,120
4400	<u>16,068</u>	<u>96,408</u>
Savings	23,628	111,528

<u>Summary</u>	<u>FY10</u>	<u>FY11</u>
RIF	\$(295,497)	\$(299,633)
Operating Expenses	(31,718)	(31,876)
Lease Termination	<u>(23,628)</u>	<u>(111,528)</u>
<b>Total Savings</b>	<b>\$(350,843)</b>	<b>\$(443,037)</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #10</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Operations &amp; Administrative Support</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$142,371</b>	<b>\$143,791</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>		<b>2</b>	

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

This efficiency focuses on downsizing WRS' telecommunications program, a reduction in force and contracting resources for mail distribution & courier service within the service area.

**Telecommunications Program**

<u>Item</u>	<u>Continuation Budget</u>	<u>Reduced Amt.</u>	<u>Savings</u>
Air Cards	93,876	46,646	47,230
Nextel	141,602	97,922	43,680
Savings			<b>90,910</b>

Savings in the telecommunications budget will be accomplished in two separate actions as follows:

First, the department currently uses cell phones as its primary means of communication with field and plant operations personnel. The department possesses more than two hundred 800mhz radios. This efficiency will utilize our 800mhz radios to replace 182 push-to-talk cell phones.

**Estimated annual savings - \$43,680**

Secondly, the department currently employs 161 data air cards as a means for field staff to transmit data to and from CAMS asset management software. This efficiency relies on the approval of a desired automation hardware and software initiative that will bring a "smart pen" technology to the department. Over time, the smart pen technology will become a replacement for the air card/laptop computer model for data transfer. The air cards are slow and unreliable when entering data into CAMS. WRS plans to eliminate 81 air cards in this efficiency and will replace the air card function with data entry at desktop computer work stations. WRS will employ the new smart pen technology as it becomes available.

**Estimated annual savings - \$47,230**

**Reduction in Force (from Admin Support)**

<b>Positions</b>	<b>FY 10 Cost</b>	<b>FY 11 Cost</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>\$83,852</b>	<b>\$85,026</b>
<b>Indirect @21%</b>	<b>17,609</b>	<b>17,855</b>
<b>RIF-Total</b>	<b>\$101,461</b>	<b>\$102,881</b>

**Addition of Contract Courier Services**

WRS runs a daily route to deliver and pick up department mail from 18 utility-owned locations throughout the county, as well as the County Center and East Street. Using a current PGM courier service contract for reference, WRS can contract to achieve the same service currently provided by utility staff for a cost of approximately 10 dollars per stop. Our route consists of approximately 20 stops per day. WRS estimates that a contract for services that will meet our needs will cost \$50,000 annually.

<b>Summary</b>	<b>FY 2010</b>	<b>FY 2011</b>
Telecommunications	<b>\$(90,910)</b>	<b>\$(90,910)</b>
RIF – Admin Support	<b>(101,461)</b>	<b>(102,881)</b>
Contracted Courier Services	<u><b>50,000</b></u>	<u><b>50,000</b></u>
Net effect	<b>\$(142,371)</b>	<b>\$(143,791)</b>

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

FORM BF004 (Revised 10/08)

(Continue on separate page, if necessary.)

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #11 [Revised]</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Expansion of After-Hours Call Coverage</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$344,815</b>	<b>\$346,101</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any): Cut: 7 FTE's from CAC [Indirects]</b>		<b>5 vacant positions to be used by WRS [no new positions]</b>	

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

The Water Resource Services intends to take all after-hour and emergency calls. This includes calls now answered by Citizens Action Center (CAC) from 3:30 p.m. - 11:00 p.m. (M-F) and on weekends and Holiday from 7 a.m. - 11 p.m. WRS pays CAC approximately \$142,223 in indirect costs to staff three (3) FTE's. WRS will extend after-hour coverage to 24/7/365 to unify the points of contact for citizens, create operational efficiencies and reduce response times by leveraging the existing call center location, computers and systems.

WRS evaluated two options based on cost, operational efficiency, communication limitations, response time and contract consolidation opportunities.

Option #1:

CAC expands coverage times from 11:01 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. (365 days a year). Based on figures provided by the CAC Executive Manager, this would require an additional four (4) FTE's and additional equipment.

- \$189,631.38 = (4 FTE's @ \$45,150.33 including benefits + 5% shift differential)
- \$3,360 = Computers and Monitors (4 x \$620 computers + 4 x \$220 monitors)
- Indirect costs for three (3) FTE's = \$142,223 annually
- \$335,214 = the total annual cost for the CAC to provide after hours coverage for WRS
- This option is not the most cost or operationally effective method and does not provide a unified point of contact for emergency or after-hour calls

Option #2:

WRS now handles emergency calls from 7:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. and will expand the existing call center staff to answer all WRS after-hour and emergency calls. This effort would expand coverage levels to 24/7/365 for WRS related emergency calls.

- \$211,855 = (5 FTE's @ \$ 42,371 which includes benefits and 5% shift differential)
- \$9,600 savings annually from elimination of FMS lift station emergency dialer third party answering service
- \$202,255 = the net annual cost for WRS to operate the after hours emergency response center
- No additional facility, phone, computer or system costs are anticipated. WRS will leverage the existing call center facility, systems and equipment
- WRS would realize several operational efficiencies resulting from direct entry of work orders and field activities into the CAMS and AIMS systems
- WRS would decrease overall response times to emergencies and line breaks due to system familiarity and a streamlined communication path
- Increased ability to capture event types, response times and trend data within CAMS system.
- WRS would use night staff to process mail and web contacts from customers. This will allow the call center to reduce wait times and the number of abandoned calls
- Nightly staff will monitor the billing batch runs to minimize down time in the billing system
- This savings is contingent on the reduction of the existing CAC indirect costs

WRS' recommendation is to implement Option #2, which would decrease costs by \$344,815, enhance operational efficiency by 5%-8%, and improve response times by 5%-8%.

Summary	FY 2010	FY 2011
Current CAC – 3 FTE	\$ (142,224)	\$ (144,215)
CAC expanded after hours – 4 FTE	\$ (189,631)	\$ (192,286)
CAC equipment	\$ (3,360)	\$ 0
Eliminate FMS answering service	\$ (9,600)	\$ (9,600)
Net effect	\$ (344,815)	\$ (346,101)

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact: A positive service impact is anticipated. WRS will realize efficiency gains resulting from our ability to leverage the CAMS and AIMS systems in real time, create fiscal savings and streamline communication paths to improve response times.

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resources Service ( FMS Pump Stations Maintenance)</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #12</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Odor Control Chemical Cost Reduction</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$207,485</b>	<b>\$207,485</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

WRS has identified 10 pump stations that are eligible for conversion from Bioxide to Peroxide (PRI-SC). These chemicals are used for odor and corrosion control. Siemens Water Technology currently provides Dioxide to these 10 pump stations. Siemens has indicated that WRS can expect a 30% reduction in cost as a result of a conversion from Bioxide to Peroxide (PRI-SC). The annual cost of Bioxide for these 10 pump stations is \$691,617. The conversion will reduce the annual cost to \$484,132. The resulting annual savings will be \$207,485.

	<u>Bioxide Cost</u>	<u>Peroxide Cost</u>	<u>Savings</u>
Duncan Booster	\$202,729.00	\$141,910.30	\$60,818.70
Mitchell Master	\$65,582.50	\$45,907.75	\$19,674.75
Mount Carmel #2	\$42,790.00	\$29,953.00	\$12,837.00
South Valrico	\$47,510.50	\$33,257.35	\$14,253.15
Lumsden #2	\$36,410.00	\$25,487.00	\$10,923.00
Providence #1	\$10,406.25	\$7,284.38	\$3,121.88
Eagle Palm	\$58,178.20	\$40,724.74	\$17,453.46
Chelsea	\$31,958.75	\$22,371.13	\$9,587.63
Bloomingtondale #2	\$51,566.75	\$36,096.73	\$15,470.03
Fish Hawk	\$144,485.00	\$101,139.50	\$43,345.50
Total	\$691,616.95	\$484,131.87	\$207,485.09

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes No X Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes No X How much?

Recurring X / One-time

Explain any service impact: None

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>		<b>Water Resource Services</b>	
		<b>Efficiency #13</b>	
<b>Program:</b>		<b>Reduce Interest Paid on Deposits</b>	
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$192,700</b>	<b>\$194,600</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any): 0</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

The Water Resource Services billing system is currently configured to pay 3% interest on the \$9.6 million in customer deposits on hand. Based on the current deposit amounts on hand, the annual interest disbursed will be \$288,700 for FY10 and \$291,600 for FY11.

The average yield WRS is earning on deposits is 1%. Projected interest income on the customer deposits on hand is \$96,000 in FY10 and \$97,000 in FY11. Modifications to the billing system's interest calculation for deposits on hand would save WRS \$192,700 in FY 10 and \$194,600 in FY 11.

Staff review and analysis of utilities throughout Florida reveals that cities and counties are losing money due to declining interest rates. WRS has three options to minimize or eliminate this risk:

**Option #1:**

Change the current system configuration to pay 1% on all deposits on hand and all future deposits required by WRS.

- This option would be the most cost effective and require no Resolution or Board Policy revisions.

**Option #2:**

Change the current system configuration to pay 1% for all deposits on hand and place all future deposits from customers (starting in FY 10) in a non-interest bearing account.

- This option would reduce any recurring interest income for future deposits. Future deposits are projected to be \$600,000 to \$800,000 annually. Placing these deposits in a non-interest bearing account would result in an interest income loss of \$6,000 to \$10,000 annually based on a 1% rate of return.
- This option will require a revision to the Rate Resolution R05-106.

**Option #3:**

Sweep all existing and future deposits into a non-interest bearing account.

- This option would yield the greatest savings for WRS (FY 10= \$288,700 and FY 11= \$ 291,600.00)
- This would require a BOCC Policy revision and changes to the Rate Resolution R05-106 language.

Staff recommends application of Option1. Annual savings are estimated at \$192,700 for FY10 and \$194,600 for FY11.

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
	<b>Efficiency #14</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>Water Resource Team – Reduce Number of Public Hearings</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$2,250</b>	<b>\$2,250</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any): None</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

**Proposed Modifications to Improve Efficiency of Existing BOCC Policy: GUIDELINES FOR ENSURING CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN TAMPA BAY WATER PROJECTS PROPOSED IN HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY**

Under existing BOCC policy established in 1998, all Primary Environmental Permit Applications prepared by Tampa Bay Water (TBW) for projects located in Hillsborough County are scheduled for a Public Hearing to allow the BOCC to take public comment prior to voting on whether or not to seek arbitration under the TBW Interlocal Agreement. This policy was established at a time when TBW was pursuing several controversial permits for large-scale water supply production facilities that have since been constructed and are now in operation. In more recent years however, TBW has pursued numerous construction related permit applications that are of rather negligible concern from an environmental impact perspective. Unfortunately, under existing policy these permits must be presented to the BOCC, which results in allocating scarce resources for non-critical matters. The legal advertisements alone can cost over \$1,125 per Public Meeting. Staff costs have not been quantified but are assumed to be significant considering the activities required to plan and conduct the Public Hearing.

Staff suggests that the existing policy be modified to allow those permits of negligible concern to be placed under the Consent section of the BOCC agenda for approval of staff recommendation, subject to being pulled for discussion by the Board. The public would be notified via the routine agenda process in lieu of a legal advertisement, and would have the opportunity to provide comment to the BOCC at the appropriate time on the agenda. More complex/controversial permits warranting a Public Hearing (i.e., Water Use Permits, Individual ERPs, and Wellfield Operations Plans), and applications recommended for arbitration, would continue to be scheduled for a Public Hearing.

In both FY2007 and FY2008, the Water Resource Team presented five arbitration recommendations per year to the BOCC. It is currently projected that similar demands will occur during FY2010 and FY2011. Adopting the proposed efficiency would likely eliminate the requirement for two of the five public hearings resulting in an estimated annual savings of \$2,250.

A draft of the current policy with proposed modifications is attached for consideration.

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring  / One-time  impact

Explain any service impact:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS  
HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY  
TAMPA, FLORIDA 33601

Draft 1/24/08

**BOARD POLICY – SECTION NUMBER: [INSERT NUMBER]**

**SUBJECT: GUIDELINES FOR ENSURING CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN TAMPA BAY WATER PROJECTS PROPOSED IN HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY**

**EFFECTIVE DATE: [INSERT NEW DATE]**

**SUPERSEDES: June 24, 1998**

**PURPOSE:**

On June 10, 1998, the Member Governments of the West Coast Regional Water Supply Authority (“Authority”) executed the Amended and Restated Interlocal Agreement (“Interlocal Agreement”) and various agreements which reorganize the Authority. Upon reorganization, the Authority’s name ~~will be~~ was changed to Tampa Bay Water (“TBW”). Under the approved Interlocal Agreement, Hillsborough County foregoes its Florida Statutes Chapter 120 legal rights in matters pertaining to ~~Water User Permitting~~ TBW Primary Environmental Permit applications as defined in the Interlocal Agreement (including, but not limited to, applications by TBW for Water Use Permits and Environmental Resource Permits), and agrees to utilize the binding arbitration process outlined in the Interlocal Agreement. The arbitration process requires Hillsborough County to express its concerns and disagreements to a proposed TBW Primary Environmental Permit ~~water use permit~~ very early in the process.

The following policy establishes the guidelines and outlines the procedure to be utilized by the County to maximize the opportunities for citizens to be informed and to be heard by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) prior to the County’s decision of whether to arbitrate. It is the intent of the BOCC that all final decisions regarding whether or not to arbitrate a TBW Primary Environmental Permit application shall be made by the BOCC. However, it is also recognized that many TBW Primary Environmental Permit applications involve negligible impacts and do not justify the additional costs associated with a public hearing.

**POLICY:**

1. It is the intent of the BOCC that potentially affected citizens within Hillsborough County be provided all reasonable access to technical information regarding a proposed TBW project within Hillsborough County.
2. It is further the intent that potentially affected citizens within Hillsborough County be provided this information in a time frame sufficient to allow their review and comment prior to the BOCC’s decision of whether to initiate binding arbitration pursuant to Sections 3.13 and 3.16 of the Interlocal Agreement.
3. The BOCC will hold a public hearing on every proposed TBW ~~project to be~~ Water Use Permit application, Individual Environmental Resource Permit application, Wellfield Operations Plan or other Water Production Optimization Plan which is for facilities located in Hillsborough County and which meets the definition of a Primary Environmental Permit, prior to the deadline by which the BOCC must decide whether to initiate binding arbitration. ~~The BOCC will make every effort to schedule such public hearing prior to the date the TBW Board of Director’s vote to approve the submission of a water use permit application for a water supply project located within Hillsborough County.~~ In addition, any TBW Primary Environmental Permit application which includes a recommendation by County staff to initiate arbitration shall be set for public hearing.
4. At said public hearing, the public will be presented with a project overview by the County Administrator’s Office, a summary of the legal issues by the County Attorney’s Office, a summary of the technical and financial issues by the appropriate County Department(s), and a summary of the environmental issues by the appropriate County Department(s) and/or EPC.
5. All other recommendations by County staff regarding TBW Primary Environmental Permit applications shall be presented on the BOCC’s Consent Agenda, except that a public hearing may be set for any other TBW Primary Environmental Permit application which involves significant environmental or other impacts or may otherwise be of wide public interest, in the discretion of the County Administrator.

**RESPONSIBILITY:**

It is the responsibility of the County Administrator’s Office to implement this policy.

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	<b>Water Resource Services</b>		
<b>DU #60</b>	<b>Efficiency #16</b>		
<b>Program:</b>	<b>FMS-Suspend TV/Cleaning of Lines FY 2010 &amp; FY 2011</b>		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$262,500</b>	<b>\$262,500</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

In May, 2006, InfraMetrix LLC began a county-wide inventory, inspection and condition assessment of the gravity sewer system. In order to maximize value of information received per dollar spent, all assets were inspected with a zoom camera. This method greatly reduced time and cost compared to traditional closed circuit television (CCTV). A similar review of the gravity sewer system using CCTV would have increased costs by \$11 million. If deficiencies were found with the zoom camera inspection, then the assets were inspected using in-line CCTV and a plan of remediation was developed. As a result, all pipelines blockages identified by this project have been mitigated.

Suspension of the in-line CCTV inspection program and the related cleaning is possible because of the findings from the InfraMetrix project. Grease blockages were determined to be the primary cause of pipe blockage. By reference to the work product of InfraMetrix, WRS is able to identify future cleaning needs. This knowledge will allow WRS staff to focus efforts on pipelines more likely to experience blockages. With limited in-house staff and equipment, WRS should be able to identify those pipelines which may need service in the near future, resulting in significant reductions in the need for CCTV and cleaning in the short term.

It is estimated that the suspension of this program will save \$262,500 in FY10 and \$262,500 in FY11.

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring / One-time  impact Suspend during FY 2010 & FR 2011

Explain any service impact:

**IDENTIFICATION OF OPPORTUNITIES FOR EFFICIENCIES IN THE BUDGET  
FY 10 AND FY 11 BUDGET  
(BF004)**

<b>Department:</b>	Water Resource Services		
<b>DU #59; #61</b>	Efficiency #17		
<b>Program:</b>	FMS-Suspend Maintenance FY 2010 & FY 2011		
<b>Identified Savings from FY 10 and FY 11 Continuation Level Budget</b>		<b>FY10</b>	<b>FY11</b>
<b>Fund: 40-040 Water &amp; Wastewater Utility Enterprise Fund</b>	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$190,539</b>	<b>\$190,539</b>
<b>Number of Positions to be Cut (if any):</b>			

**DESCRIPTION (use additional pages, as necessary):**

**A) Hydrant Paining:**

WRS is required to maintain (per NFPA 25 and AWWA standard M-17) and perform upkeep to all the fire hydrants (FH) in the designated Urban Service Area. Maintenance and Inspections will be completed by County Staff. However, the painting of fire hydrants is best performed by a contractor with the proper equipment and licensing. A new contract will be let in FY10-11 with an increase in the number of hydrants to be painted each year due to residential and business growth in the County Service Areas. This increase will allow us to paint every hydrant every third year. Costs = \$175,539 in FY10 & FY11

**B) Groundskeeping:**

Provides for groundskeeping and landscape maintenance at multiple Water and Sewer Line Maintenance Yards through out Hillsborough County. This Maintenance has been determined to be a core activity that is most cost-effectively performed by specialized contractors. By contracting this service Water Resource Services saves personnel costs, exposure to on-the-job injuries/liability, and also reduces the necessity to invest in capital equipment with associated depreciation/equipment maintenance costs. Cost = \$15,000 in FY10 & FY11

**Recommendation:**

Suspend the above programs during FY 2010 & FY 2011 and utilize WRS staff to perform minimum maintenance to reduce risk of asset failure.

Shifts costs to another department/agency: Yes  No  Explain:

Revenue impact: Yes  No  How much?

Recurring / One-time  impact Suspend during FY 2010 & FR 2011

Explain any service impact: