



DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
VIRTUAL MEETING

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2020 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

February 2020-January 2021

Attendance

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	2	0
Gerald Angeli	P	2	0
Shane Grabski	P	2	0
Charlie Ladd	P	1	1
Michael Marshall	P	2	0
Norm Ostrau	P	2	0
Peter Partington	P	2	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	2	0
Roosevelt Walters	P	2	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	2	0

As of this date, there are 10 appointed members to the Committee, which means 6 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

- Raj Verma, Director of Public Works
- Aneisha Daniel, Deputy Director of Public Works
- Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works – Sustainability
- Rick Johnson, Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager
- Miguel Arroyo, Water and Wastewater Treatment Manager
- Francisco Rios, Acting Senior Project Manager
- Omar Castellon, Chief Engineer
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- Talal Abi-Karam, Assistant Director of Public Works – Utilities
- Felicia Powell, Administrative Supervisor
- D’Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney

Communication to the City Commission

None.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

ii. Approval of Agenda

This Item was not addressed.

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes August 17, 2020

Motion made by Mr. Walters, and duly seconded, to approve the minutes with or without corrections.

Mr. Partington noted the following corrections:

- P. 9, paragraph 2: change “loading” to “locating”
- P. 10, paragraph 1: clarify amount cited under Public Comment

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

Ms. Scott addressed Public Comment, stating that she was in favor of permitting members of the public in attendance to speak on individual Agenda Items as they are called rather than waiting until the end of the meeting. The Committee agreed by consensus that members of the public will be invited to speak on each Agenda Item, including General Discussion, at the close of the Committee’s discussion of that Item.

Chair Mammano requested an update on breaks that have occurred since the Committee’s August 2020 meeting. Mr. Ostrau and Mr. Walters asked for an update on the City’s seawalls, and Mr. Walters requested an update on the City Commission’s discussion of stormwater issues at a recent meeting.

Raj Verma, Director of Public Works, stated there have been three sewer breaks since the Committee’s August meeting: one on Cordova Road, one at the Country Club golf course, and one in the vicinity of the Himmarshee Canal. The cause of the Cordova Road break has not yet been determined, as there are several intersecting pipes at that location which were cut into pieces in order to make repairs. He did not know if the age of pipes, effects of saltwater intrusion, or corrosive nature of soil was the reason for this break.

The break at the Country Club occurred at a peroxide injection nozzle on a force main. The break occurred near ongoing construction, and proximity to heavy equipment may have been a contributing factor. No faults were identified within the pipe itself. The Himmarshee Canal breakage over the previous weekend was similar to this and may have been due to the age of the nozzle.

In addition to sewer breaks, water main breaks have also occurred, including one on Bayview Drive where a force main and stormwater drainage were close to one another

within a small area. Staff was able to repair the water pipe with assistance from a contractor.

Chair Mammano asked if the City has calculated the amount of sewage released by the three most recent sewer breaks. Mr. Verma confirmed that amounts have been calculated for the Cordova Road and Country Club breaks, while the amount of the Himmarshee Canal spill is still being determined. These may affect the City's ongoing Consent Order with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) in the form of either a warning or an additional fine.

Mr. Partington recalled that some years ago the City maintained an in-house water main crew that replaced and repaired these mains. He asked if there has been consideration of bringing back a similar crew to address water main breaks. Mr. Verma replied that his instructions advise Staff to replace or repair pipe up to a certain size; above that size, the City will have a contractor address the issue, as a contractor is more likely to have the proper equipment at hand.

Mr. Walters noted that at the most recent City Commission meeting, as well as the last public budget hearing, there was lengthy discussion of stormwater rates and costs in neighborhoods slated for improvements. He asked what effect the cost overruns that have already occurred can be expected to have on the total stormwater budget.

It was clarified that a number of stormwater projects are already listed in the budget for the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP). As these projects go over budget, Staff goes through the budget transfer and amendment processes for them, which sometimes means other projects will be put on hold. Cost overruns will be addressed as they occur.

Mr. Partington suggested that stormwater expenditures be regularly provided to the Committee along with the water/sewer expenditure update. Mr. Verma confirmed this can be done.

Chair Mammano also addressed stormwater rates, pointing out that the City Commission accepted the Committee's recommendation for a hybrid system to reduce inequities between single-family homes, condominiums, commercial properties, and nonprofit properties. The Committee has recommended bringing some equity to the methodology used to determine properties' fees.

Mr. Walters advised that many members of the public also feel a hybrid system would not be entirely equitable. There are also questions regarding equitable distinctions for senior citizens. Chair Mammano confirmed that she had heard similar concerns. She noted that the hybrid solution at least addresses major inequities between single-family homes and condominiums, and commercial properties are asked to provide a more equitable share.

Mr. Ostrau expressed concern with the City's seawalls as well. Mr. Verma stated that the Isle of Palms area of the City provides an example of what needs to be done: the City recently completed a project in this area with a seawall cap measured at an elevation of 5.0. There was no flooding in the area for which the City was responsible in this elevation area; however, private seawalls located to the south are at elevations lower than the king tides, which will continue to be overtopped until they are raised.

Another issue is that the water from high tides is actually higher in many areas than the roadway itself, and cannot be naturally pushed out. This, in combination with seawalls of insufficient height, contributes to overflows. If left unaddressed, flooding will continue on the City's roadways, particularly to the south.

Chair Mammano recalled that in previous discussions, it was acknowledged that raising some but not all seawalls within the City would be insufficient and would do little outside of individual locations. This means the City's investment in its seawalls may help the problem, but will not have a meaningful impact until all seawalls are raised. Mr. Ostrau stated that in some locations, such as Hendricks Isle, the opposite has occurred, as homeowners raised their seawalls but the City did not.

Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works (Sustainability), explained that a recent flooding on Hendricks Isle was due to the breach of a private seawall that lies south of the City-owned seawall. City-owned seawalls to the north of this area and at the terminus of the island must also be raised, and the City is pursuing grant funds to raise these seawalls ahead of their current schedule on the Stormwater Master Plan.

Dr. Gassman continued that the most recent king tide was 16 in. higher than predicted, which resulted in an extreme event similar to storm surge. No systems are currently at specifications that can address this type of high tide. As part of the City's Seawall Ordinance, the City is citing a variety of different private property owners for breaches of their seawalls and are pursuing enforcement actions. She estimated that 30 to 40 properties previously cited have come into compliance. All new seawalls must be built to the new standard.

At this time Chair Mammano opened public comment on the items addressed under General Discussion. As there were no individuals wishing to speak on these issues, the Chair brought the discussion back to the Committee.

Chair Mammano recommended that if the public is permitted to speak on each Agenda Item, they should be asked in advance which issues they wish to address.

3. Old Business

- i. Legal Requirement for Moratorium – D'Wayne Spence (City Attorney's Office)**

Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence explained that in February 2020, the City Commission adopted Resolution 2020-30, which expanded the duties of the Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee (ITF) to evaluate and provide recommendations on the feasibility and impact of implementing a moratorium on acceptance of applications for development or issuance of development permits within the City. The moratorium would be a temporary prohibition on activities.

Attorney Spence continued that a moratorium is considered a land use planning tool, as it is a means of ensuring a community's problems are not exacerbated while a regulatory scheme is formed to address issues at hand. This action is not intended to be arbitrary must have a rational relationship to the legitimate general welfare of the government. A moratorium must be a stopgap solution until a remedy has been devised.

Mr. Walters asked if the proposed moratorium would be City-wide or if it would affect only certain sections of the City. Attorney Spence advised that this determination is part of the Committee's task. He emphasized that a moratorium must be related to the overall problem at hand, which must be supported by expert testimony. If the problem is City-wide, the moratorium may not be disproportionately applied only to certain sectors of the City. The mechanism of a moratorium would be by Ordinance.

Chair Mammano pointed out that the Committee deals more closely with the provision of capital facilities than with regulatory solutions, and asked if it is appropriate for them to propose a moratorium until certain capital projects have been completed so they are online at the same time that new development also comes online. Attorney Spence replied that he did not know whether the completion of capital projects could be tied to a moratorium.

Mr. Zeltman felt a moratorium should be considered before more large high-density projects are constructed in areas lacking sufficient infrastructure to accommodate them. He asked if planned developments can be restricted from outpacing the City's water and sewer capabilities, pointing out that a significant portion of infrastructure in these areas is dedicated to fire protection and other safety measures. Attorney Spence reiterated that this is the task they have given to the Committee.

Attorney Spence continued that the City's Unified Land Development Regulations (ULDR) includes a review for adequacy, which addresses infrastructure on a project-by-project basis. A moratorium would not be implemented on this basis: for example, it would not stop the construction of one development while permitting another.

Mr. Ostrau noted that the City's water and wastewater systems, as well as its water treatment facilities, require evaluation to determine whether they have sufficient capacity to serve new development. Attorney Spence replied that an evaluation is provided by Staff to the City's Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) with regard to capacity.

This review is built into Code: if, in evaluation of the data, Staff finds there is insufficient capacity to accommodate development, they should make a negative recommendation to the PZB. Other experts may present information to the PZB as well, as part of that advisory body's quasi-judicial process. Thus far, developments that have gone before the PZB have been found to meet criteria for capacity.

Mr. Ostrau asked if the capacity criteria specifically include capacity for firefighting capability. Attorney Spence advised that he could not address the technical aspects reviewed by Staff, but noted that the PZB relies on evidence presented by Staff.

Mr. Ladd explained that as part of the development approval process, the City reviews sewer, water, and fire suppression adequacy through multiple departments, all of which must sign off on the application before it moves from the administrative process to the PZB and/or City Commission. If a deficiency is identified, a developer may be asked to upgrade nearby facilities as a condition of approval. He emphasized that fire safety review is an entirely separate review process: a project's fire-related water usage is typically very low.

Mr. Ostrau observed that the diameter of water mains plays a significant role in whether or not sufficient water pressure can be maintained when providing fire services. Mr. Ladd advised that developers are required to pay the City to perform flow tests and establish sufficient pressure and volume for fire usage.

Mr. Marshall advised that when projects meet concurrency standards but problems persist, a moratorium may be imposed in order to determine more appropriate review criteria. If projects continue to meet concurrency requirements, however, it becomes difficult to argue that a moratorium is needed unless the criteria are found to be insufficient.

Chair Mammano clarified that City Staff provides letters regarding infrastructure adequacy rather than concurrency. It may be that when a project was originally constructed, there was adequate capacity to serve it; however, cumulative impacts may affect capacity as more projects are built around it. Chair Mammano noted that there may be a public education component necessary in discussion of a moratorium, as individuals may not have a complete understanding of how the approval process works.

Mr. Partington asked if a framework might be applied to translate spare infrastructure capacity into a number of units that could be permitted in the future. Attorney Spence replied that a previous moratorium in the Central Beach area was imposed by Broward County: issuance of permits was tied to roadway level of service, and no more permits could be issued until this was addressed. The City and County entered into an inter-local agreement, including a regulation that ties development on the Central Beach to the number of trips. The City has recently approached this limit and will not be permitted to develop further on the beach after it has been reached.

Attorney Spence continued that it is possible to develop a scheme of this nature once more: however, it will require expert testimony and data showing a nexus between capacity and the number of development units or other form of measurement. He emphasized the need for data to support any plan of this type.

Mr. Ladd briefly reviewed the adequacy process necessary for the allocation of Downtown units as an example. He also stated that he would like to see the City's figures for sewage treatment and flow capacity, as well as reports from Staff so the public may be informed on these issues.

Mr. Angeli asserted that while he was confident in City Staff's ability to determine infrastructure capacity and adequacy, he would like to see more information on this adequacy on a City-wide basis. He expressed concern, however, that there should be a focus on conditional issues as well, including the age of the City's infrastructure.

ii. Water / Sewer Expenditure Update

Deputy Director of Public Works Aneisha Daniel recalled that the Committee had asked about the expenditure rate for projects funded through the City's \$200 million bond. Thus far the City has spent \$40 million. An additional 25% will be in the pipeline at a later stage, bringing this expenditure to 65%. This is based on both actual expenditures and encumbrances. A number of projects are already listed in the CIP for the second tranche of bond expenses, which is slated for fiscal year (FY) 2023.

Chair Mammano asked if it was possible for Staff to provide the Committee with a copy of the list of projects to be funded in the first tranche of the bond. These projects would match with the percentages provided. Ms. Daniel confirmed that this list would be forwarded to the Committee.

Chair Mammano also recalled that not all of the \$200 million was slated to go toward capital projects: some of these dollars would be used to replace monies borrowed from other CIP projects. She asked that these dollars be removed from the list. Ms. Daniel replied that the first \$200 million would be reconciled on a project-by-project basis, listing the stages of ongoing projects as well as projects that have been completed.

Mr. Walters requested clarification of the total cost of sewer projects within the first tranche of the \$200 million bond. Ms. Daniel replied that sewer force mains and basins are slightly over 50% of the total at \$103 million. Mr. Walters also asked for the estimated total cost of all repairs and improvements to the sewer system. Mr. Verma replied that Staff would use the Reiss report to extrapolate these costs and bring them back to the Committee at a subsequent meeting.

At this time Chair Mammano opened public comment on any of the items addressed under Agenda Item 3.

Paul Chettle, member of the public, recalled that the figures cited in the Reiss report were originally intended to represent the maximum figure that could be spent. He noted that the total cost of infrastructure improvements is now considered to be significantly higher than that original \$1.4 billion estimate. He also noted that his request from the August 2020 meeting regarding availability of backup documentation to the public has been addressed.

Mr. Chettle asserted that roughly 15 years' worth of documentation is available on the City's troubled infrastructure. He cited the 2007 and 2017 Master Plans as sources, in addition to independent third-party reports and presentations that have been made to the Budget Advisory Board (BAB). Additional reports have been commissioned in conjunction with the FDEP Consent Order.

Mr. Chettle continued that he felt a moratorium would be going too far: instead, he felt appropriate middle ground would be for the City to accurately present the state of its infrastructure as relates to various projects. This will provide developers with information they need and inform the public of the funding the City will ultimately need to improve its infrastructure.

As there were no other individuals wishing to speak on Item 3, the Chair brought the discussion back to the Committee.

4. New Business

i. Water Plant Construction

Chair Mammano noted that each Committee member should have received a memorandum from Mr. Zeltman regarding the prospective location of a new water treatment plant, as well as a memorandum from the Chair on the possibility of a public-private partnership (P3) as a methodology for the construction of this plant and a video of a City Commission discussion on the topic of P3s.

Ms. Daniel advised that little information on construction of a new water treatment facility has changed since the August meeting. Funds for the hiring of an owner's representative have been included in the FY 2020-2021 budget, and the City is still working through this process.

Mr. Zeltman advised that he had multiple concerns regarding construction of a new facility, including its potential link to the Prospect Wellfield over two miles away. He pointed out that moving a water treatment plant from the current Fiveash Water Treatment Plant location to a new location means greater distance from the water distribution area. This would require more pumps at the Prospect site, as well as larger pipes that tie into existing water transmission mains at Fiveash. He pointed out that the Fiveash plant also has existing security and administrative infrastructure, which makes it

a reasonable location for new and more efficient water treatment components to replace the current outdated processing equipment.

Mr. Zeltman also addressed yellow water, which could be treated at a new facility. This discoloration is primarily a result of existing cast-iron pipes with no interior lining. He concluded that his estimate of constructing a new facility at the Prospect Wellfield site was roughly \$200 to \$300 million more than the cost of building it at the existing Fiveash site.

Mr. Zeltman continued that in his opinion, a P3 is not appropriate for water or sewer treatment plants, as investors' priority is profit rather than the public interest. He also cautioned that a P3 would affect the rates charged to utility customers.

Ms. Daniel advised that the City Commission has evaluated the possibility of a P3 and has seen a presentation by the City's financial advisor at their most recent Conference Agenda meeting. The Commission plans to retain an owner's representative to evaluate the best way to proceed with this project.

Mr. Zeltman stated that a report submitted by previous consultant Carollo indicated that a pilot study and raw water analysis should be conducted to determine the most efficient and cost-effective treatment processes; however, this study has not been conducted. He recommended a thorough water analysis, as well as review of modern state-of-the-art treatment processes, before making any investment in a new treatment facility.

Mr. Partington commented that a P3 is simply one method of delivering a project. He asked if a City Commission decision to move forward using this method would preclude any proposals from prospective investors to replace the existing Fiveash plant instead of constructing a new facility. Chair Mammano advised that the City Commission's recent discussion of a P3 did not seem to consider revisiting new technology or the existing site: instead, they discussed possibilities ranging from a P3 to a design/build process to selling the entire system to a private company.

Mr. Verma stated that there are two primary components to a new water treatment plant: feasibility of construction and financing. The Reiss report made a number of recommendations regarding the overall condition of the City's existing infrastructure. Later came the Carollo report, which concluded that the City needed a new treatment plant and also included recommendations.

For the next step, the City hopes to hire an owner's representative, which Mr. Verma characterized as an extension of City Staff. This representative would have greater expertise than Staff and would consider the two previous consultants' reports, including constructability, feasibility, and technology. The intent of hiring an owner's representative is to bring in a person with greater expertise in these areas. The scope for the owner's representative is currently in development.

The second consideration is financing of a new treatment plant, whether through a P3, a traditional design/build contract, or another method. The recent presentation to the City Commission went into detail regarding the pros and cons of various options. Mr. Verma advised that an owner's representative will focus on both the construction and financing aspects of the project. He emphasized that while the City Commission may be discussing options for a new treatment plant, no final decision has been made.

Mr. Walters asked if Staff felt the new treatment facility would be built at the Fiveash or Prospect site. Mr. Verma advised that it would be extremely challenging to keep operations going from the Fiveash site during construction of a new facility at that same location. Because of this difficulty, the City is looking at other locations, such as the Prospect Wellfield; however, for the reasons cited by Mr. Zeltman, that site may also not be feasible. He concluded that Staff cannot answer this question at this time.

Chair Mammano requested feedback from the Committee members regarding how deeply they wished to reach into the details of technology and location of a new water treatment plant. The members agreed by consensus that more education on this issue, including what the owner's representative is tasked with doing, is necessary to make a fully informed decision.

Mr. Marshall left the meeting at 4:11 p.m.

At this time Chair Mammano opened public comment on Item 4.

Boyd Corbin, member of the public, stated that the pilot study recommended by the Reiss report would include raw water analysis to determine what system would be best to filter it. The Carollo report, however, discouraged use of some types of filters and instead recommended using ion exchange and constructing a new plant.

Mr. Corbin continued that the Carollo report did not suggest that a new plant could not be built at Fiveash while the current facility continues to operate, although it did point out that there is insufficient room at Fiveash for the infrastructure necessary for ion exchange. He stated that a pilot study would examine different technologies and their estimated costs, and recommended that this study precede any action to be taken, irrespective of the location of a new plant.

As there were no other individuals wishing to speak on Item 4, the Chair brought the discussion back to the Committee.

5. Public Works Update

i. Valve Exercising

Ms. Daniel recalled that the executed Consent Order includes a written valve maintenance plan, which involves exercising 100% of the City's source water valves

within its first year and 20% per year thereafter. The Consent Order also requires that the City complete a map of the water distribution network within 36 months. The City has executed a contract to prepare plans for these tasks, both of which will be submitted to FDEP.

Rick Johnson, Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager, explained that 35% of source water valves have already been exercised within the first year of the Consent Order. The City plans to exercise 100% of these valves each year due to the critical nature of source water infrastructure.

ii. Wastewater Flow Report

Talal Abi-Karam, Assistant Director of Public Works (Utilities), advised that over the past three years, the City averages 37 million gallons per day (MGD) of wastewater each year. This volume is affected by rainwater. Miguel Arroyo, Water and Wastewater Treatment Manager, further explained that months with high levels of precipitation, such as April 2020, contribute to spikes in MGD.

Chair Mammano asked if the COVID-19 virus has had any discernible impact on the flow of wastewater through pipes. Mr. Abi-Karam replied that there was no significant effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on the consumption of water from late March through May 2020. Staff has noticed, however, that while there are decreases in water consumption from high-rise hotels, offices, Downtown businesses, and the cruise industry within the City's service area, there was an increase in residential use.

Regarding the financial impact of the pandemic, Mr. Abi-Karam continued that the City decided against turning off utility services for nonpayment, resulting in a slight decrease in revenues. The City has, however, realized an additional \$4.5 million in revenue as a result of a program that replaced large consumption meters within the City and other distribution areas.

Mr. Partington noted that the permitted capacity by Broward County DEP for the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant is 48 MGD, while the Reiss report suggests that an additional injection well would be needed. Mr. Abi-Karam replied that the Fiveash plant is rated for a certain capacity in terms of treatment. A large percentage of the City's wastewater flow is related to inflow and infiltration (I&I). The City has made a \$30 million investment to reduce I&I since the Reiss report was issued and may increase this investment over time to include an injection well. There will also need to be consideration of whether or not sufficient space exists at the Fiveash plant to implement a new injection well. Rain and king tide events also affect the capacity of injection wells.

Chair Mammano asked if there has been any discernible reduction in I&I based upon the investments made thus far. Mr. Abi-Karam stated that there is a lower run time at pump stations where significant efforts have been made. This data will continue to be analyzed by Staff. Mr. Verma observed that while improvements have been observed

as a result of investment, the City still has a long way to go, with miles of gravity mains and other infrastructure yet to be addressed.

iii. CMOM & Force Main Assessment Report

Chair Mammano noted that this report was included in the Committee's backup materials. She requested additional information from the Capacity Management, Operations, and Maintenance (CMOM) report with regard to planning studies required by the Consent Order.

Francisco Rios, Acting Senior Project Manager, stated that the Asset Management (AM) report determines how to evaluate assets in relation to the system, as well as how to prioritize and fund them. The City has met most of the requirements of the Consent Order; however, the implementation of the CMOM and AM programs remains to be completed.

Chair Mammano asked if this means specific components of CMOM have yet to be implemented. Mr. Rios replied that there is a procedure to incorporate information from capacity letters from developers into management of resources. Chair Mammano asserted that the Committee needs this information in order to move forward with discussion of a moratorium. She asked if there is data within these programs, such as the System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Program, that the Committee might see to help them with this decision.

Mr. Verma emphasized that all of the City's force mains need to be addressed and improved, irrespective of their level of risk as determined by the Condition Assessment Report. He asserted that this infrastructure needs to be repaired to minimize the risk to the City's waterways. Staff is moving forward with projects in the Condition Assessment Report to address these issues before they become more critical.

With regard to the incorporation of information on coming developments, Mr. Verma explained that the CMOM includes programs to analyze current and future development. The consultant preparing the report has been asked to inform the City if their modeling suggests whether or not capacity may "max out" in various areas of the City. Data from the planning documents must be fully implemented to provide more successful modeling to be managed by the City.

Chair Mammano asked if the adequacy analyses performed by Staff for developments are the same information that have gone into the planning documents. Mr. Verma confirmed this, stating that when capacity letters are issued at present, the City uses older models to calculate information. The information provided by the consultant comes from a more advanced and accurate version of these models, which Staff is seeking to fully implement.

Chair Mammano asked if the application of new models might affect the conclusions regarding capacity, and therefore affect the capacity letters issued for developments. Mr. Verma replied that while this is possible, significant variation is unlikely unless something was missed.

Mr. Partington observed that the reports required as part of the Consent Order are more technical and difficult to understand than previous documents provided to the Committee, such as the Reiss report. He expressed concern that while the reports addressing capacity were compiled by consultants, the capacity evaluations for individual developments were done by City Staff. He noted that these evaluations should also consider the condition of the infrastructure on which new development will depend.

Mr. Verma advised that the data necessary for the Committee to make a recommendation on a moratorium is not yet available. He added, however, that he would work with the consultant to provide the most recent information so the Committee can begin working toward a recommendation. Once a capacity recommendation has been made, it is followed up on by Operations Staff, which studies the performances of pump stations, lift stations, and other infrastructure to determine if there are any specific concerns. He concluded that this process may take some time before the Committee can be provided with all the information it needs.

Mr. Partington reiterated that capacity and other analyses should take the condition of infrastructure into consideration. Mr. Verma confirmed this, but pointed out that Staff does not have the forensic ability to determine the condition of all infrastructure at this time. He stated again that his goal is to address all force mains and related infrastructure, regardless of their condition or the conclusions of planning documents.

Motion made by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Mr. Walters, to extend [the meeting beyond 5 p.m.]. [The **motion** was approved by consent.]

Chair Mammano asked if Mr. Ladd could provide more information regarding what is involved with the allocation of additional units to Downtown Fort Lauderdale. She suggested that the Committee may be able to use this information as a model toward consideration of a moratorium. Mr. Ladd noted that other concerns include the percentage of pipes that have been replaced or relined, as well as the capacity of the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant on both peak and normal days.

Chair Mammano requested that Staff reissue some of the materials provided to the previous iteration of the Task Force to its current membership, including maps of all basins addressed in the first round of I&I as well as an estimate of how much progress has been made thus far.

6. Information

i. Previous P3 Letter to Commission

This Item was not discussed.

ii. Wastewater – Consent Order

This Item was previously discussed.

7. Public Comments

It was noted that individual members of the public provided comment on individual Agenda Items.

Mr. Ostrau requested an update on the status of the new Fort Lauderdale Police Station at the October meeting.

8. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting October 19, 2020

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, ProtoType, Inc.]