



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

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2021 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

<u>February 2021-January 2022</u>		<u>Attendance</u>	
Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	3	0
Gerald Angeli	P	3	0
Shane Grabski	P	3	0
Charlie Ladd (dep. 3:32)	P	2	1
Michael Marshall	A	2	1
Peter Partington	P	3	0
Jacquelyn Scott (dep. 3:32)	P	3	0
Roosevelt Walters	P	3	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	3	0

As of this date, there are 9 appointed members to the Committee, which means 5 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

- Aneisha Daniel, Deputy Director of Public Works
- Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works – Sustainability
- Rick Johnson, Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager
- Omar Castellon, Chief Engineer
- Pauline Ricketts, Senior Administrative Assistant
- D’Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
- Dronix Suarez, Project Manager II
- Gabriel Garcia, Project Engineer II
- Crysta Parkinson, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m. and roll was called.

ii. Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve. The **motion** passed by unanimous consent.

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes February 1, 2021 and March 1, 2021

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve the minutes of the February 1 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve the minutes of the March meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

Ms. Ricketts advised that the communication to the City Commission sent by the Committee at their March 1, 2021 meeting will be on the April 6 City Commission Agenda. Chair Mammano stated that she would try to attend the meeting, and urged other members to do so as well.

Chair Mammano continued that at the request of Director of Public Works Raj Verma and Deputy Director of Public Works Aneisha Daniel, she had reviewed a federal grant application filed by the City, and has written a letter to Congresswoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz in support of the requested \$1.2 million project, which addresses tidal valves and other stormwater infrastructure.

Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works (Sustainability), explained that the project is part of the City's current Community Investment Plan (CIP) and would install up to 100 tidal valves in Downtown catch basins. This would reduce tidal flooding in the Sailboat Bend and Downtown areas. If the City receives these funds, it would free up other dollars for use on other needs.

Chair Mammano asked if the Committee members wished to formally support the City's application for these additional funds. Their support would be added to her letter to the Congresswoman.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Ms. Scott, in approval of sending the letter as drafted. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Mammano also requested clarification of a project mentioned in the Committee's backup materials. Ms. Daniel advised that this is a joint agreement between the cities of Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park, and Wilton Manors for federal appropriations for the Middle River Water Quality Improvement Project, which would mitigate the effects of climate change. The cities hope to receive \$9 million for this project.

Dr. Gassman further clarified that the intent of this project is to examine innovative ways to reduce storm surge impacts throughout the Middle River basin. It would involve placement of a mechanical structure to be activated in the event of a high tide or storm surge, which would block flows from coming into the basin and reduce inland flooding in

all three cities. The structure may be opened or closed to provide a barrier to significant high water during extreme events. The funding request would permit the Army Corps of Engineers to study the feasibility of this type of project and determine its potential benefits.

Chair Mammano briefly left the meeting at 2:18 p.m.

Dr. Gassman continued that the three cities are working with Congressman Ted Deutch's office to advocate for the project. She characterized the approach as an attempt to install infrastructure to make the area more resilient.

Mr. Partington recalled that at a previous meeting, the Committee had requested a list of developments that have paid impact fees. Ms. Daniel confirmed that this list has been requested from the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD), but has not yet been received. Chief Engineer Omar Castellon advised that he would work with Ms. Ricketts to secure this list.

Chair Mammano rejoined the meeting at 2:22 p.m.

Chair Mammano noted that there is a proposed State Bill that would affect municipalities' ability to collect impact fees. It would also require municipalities to credit developments for any site-specific improvements they may make to public infrastructure against potential impact fees: for example, if a developer must install a piece of pipe from the development to a pump station, the cost of this installation must be credited against the impact fee the developer must pay.

Ms. Daniel advised that she would provide the Committee with more information on this proposed bill prior to the next meeting. Chair Mammano requested further discussion of this issue at that time, as well as a review of any other bills that could affect the City's ability to fund and build infrastructure.

It was determined that stormwater funding would be discussed further under Item 5.i, New Funding Opportunities.

Mr. Ladd addressed impact fees, noting that the County's traffic impact fees, which are charged to every Fort Lauderdale project, are substantial. When inquiries were made a number of years ago regarding how these fees are spent, the County responded that much of this money is used to support its bus system rather than traditional infrastructure only. Chair Mammano noted that the bill to which she had referred earlier includes a provision that would require municipalities, special taxation districts, and counties to provide an accounting of where impact fee dollars are spent.

3. Public Comments (At Each Item)

There were no public comments at this time.

4. Old Business

i. Continued Discussion on Developing Moratorium

Resolution Statement – *To evaluate and provide a recommendation on the feasibility and impact of implementing a moratorium on the acceptance of an application for or issuance of a development permit within the City.*

Chair Mammano addressed Code Section 47-25.2, which describes the analysis done by the City prior to the issuance of a development permit. She recalled that when the Committee previously discussed the possibility and implications of a moratorium, the Assistant City Attorney had noted there is a connection between any proposed moratorium and the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Mammano reviewed Section 47-25.2, which lists the items analyzed for adequacy before a development permit is issued. These include:

- Fire protection
- Parks and open space
- Police protection
- Potable water
- Sanitary sewer system
- Schools
- Solid waste
- Stormwater
- Transportation facilities

Chair Mammano noted that the Committee is not involved in review of some of these items, such as parks and open space, Police protection, schools, and solid waste. They have not previously addressed transportation infrastructure, such as roadway capacity, levels of service, and public transit, in depth.

The Chair continued that while she was aware that Staff examines adequacy for potable water, stormwater, sewage, and traffic, she has not seen how these components are analyzed to determine adequacy. She asserted that these questions should be answered prior to any recommendation the Committee may make to the City Commission.

Ms. Scott pointed out that the criteria for traffic analysis include the number of trips expected to be generated by a development. Chair Mammano noted that this brings up the issue of level of service (LOS), for which there are standards that a development must not exceed. She requested that the Assistant City Attorney opine on the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan, which establishes LOS, and the development review process, as well as what would happen if a project is expected to affect the LOS.

Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence advised that Florida's Community Planning Act requires each municipality and county adopt a Comprehensive Plan, which must include

elements to help guide future development and growth. These include capital improvement elements, the location of which must be considered by the municipality for efficient use of public facilities. The municipalities are also required to establish parameters for the levels of service for these services.

State Statutes also limit the ability of municipal governments to issue development permits that are inconsistent with the municipality's Comprehensive Plan. The elements listed under Section 47-25.2 help the City maintain this consistency.

Attorney Spence recalled that when he had first discussed the criteria for a moratorium, he had noted that any moratorium Ordinance must be appropriate to the development of the Comprehensive Plan. This meant it must relate to specific planning studies, as well as enactment of an appropriate Ordinance to implement remedies. The Comprehensive Plan is the City's primary planning tool and must be evaluated every seven years to determine if amendments must be made, including amendments to the way in which development permits are issued.

Mr. Partington commented that transportation concurrency in particular is a major subject in itself, and that addressing this issue would likely require several meetings. He noted that when LOS in many areas of the City are already at D or lower, developers who conducted the studies were required only to make their best efforts to maintain this LOS in its current state.

Chair Mammano referred to Section 47-25.2, which states that traffic shall be evaluated on the basis of generalized daily LOS maximum volume. The LOS on several Fort Lauderdale streets is currently at F. She asked if this affects the way Staff reviews prospective development permits, pointing out that the Comprehensive Plan states LOS should not fall below a certain level for roadways.

Mr. Ladd advised that any project going through the Development Review Committee (DRC) process must submit a traffic statement prepared by a traffic engineer. If the development generates fewer than 1000 trips per day, the statement is sufficient. If more than 1000 trips per day are generated, a full traffic study must be conducted to identify and address any deficient areas.

Another concept mentioned in Code is the compact deferral area, which deals with areas where the LOS is already below D. In this case, the project must maintain the LOS of D, often by making improvements to the surrounding area. These may include upgrades such as turn lanes, median modifications, elimination of cuts, and other changes. If a project is located on a state roadway, the developer must get approval from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Mr. Ladd concluded that there is significant analysis involved in the approval of any project of considerable size.

Mr. Ladd also addressed stormwater, stating that this is governed primarily by the County, which issues a surface water management permit. A civil engineer submits a permit

application to the County, detailing the project and the amount of stormwater it is expected to generate, as well as calculations showing that all this stormwater can be kept on the development's property. Most commercial projects install a French drain, which draws in the first one to two inches of water on the property for absorption into the ground. Any remaining overflow is addressed through a deep injection well, which injects water directly into the aquifer.

Mr. Ladd noted that the City has become more aggressive regarding stormwater runoff on smaller projects as well, including single-family homes, which may now also feature French drains. The intent is to prevent the pumping of stormwater into street systems connected to the Intracoastal Waterway.

Mr. Zeltman added that another storm drainage system, known as positive drainage, collects stormwater in a similar manner to the French drain or exfiltration system and connects it to a piping system that leads to an outfall structure. After 10 to 15 years, debris can collect in exfiltration systems and clog their ability to filter the water, making the system less effective unless steps are taken to maintain it. He felt there should be an overview of the storm drain system to identify and address maintenance issues, as well as to deal with the challenges posed by 50-year or greater storms, for which today's design standards are often inadequate.

Mr. Partington commented that the only issue with private development seems to be that the current standard has not kept up with the increased intensity of storms. Mr. Ladd clarified that this standard has been raised repeatedly to address the need for stormwater systems, pointing out that the takeaway capacity of deep injection wells greatly exceeds the standard cited in Section 47-25.2.

Chair Mammano asked if the Committee members felt they should advise the City Commission that they have addressed stormwater issues in depth, identified issues, and wish to continue review of this aspect. Mr. Angeli observed that the question with respect to the moratorium is whether or not the City adequately assesses factors such as stormwater, sewer, and water when deciding to build or renovate a project that will add demand on the infrastructure. He felt there was more than enough evidence that these issues are already being addressed.

Mr. Angeli asked if there is evidence showing that the City takes action following their analysis. Mr. Ladd replied that the DRC reviews this analysis and will not sign off on development until these items have been addressed. The Engineering Department will determine whether or not these issues have been dealt with, or will be, before a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) can be issued. Mr. Ladd concluded that in his opinion, the greater issue was of capacity and impact on the City's sewers, which he felt were the City's weakest point.

Chair Mammano recalled that the Committee has discussed water in terms of replacing the treatment plant, although they have done a less comprehensive analysis of the water

pipe system than of the sewer pipe system. An analysis of the water pipe system is currently underway by the City. Ms. Daniel recalled that as part of the City's Consent Order, Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager Rick Johnson is currently working to map the City's water system. Staff is also preparing a plan to bring this system into compliance with American Water Works Association (AWWA) standards. This plan is expected to hold the City to more robust standards than AWWA by requiring review of pipes and exercise of valves every two years.

Chair Mammano asked if it is possible to prepare a narrative of what is currently being done to ensure this infrastructure is adequate for new development. Ms. Daniel confirmed that this can be provided as part of the Public Works Update beginning at the next meeting.

Mr. Partington noted that the Committee would benefit from the same type of comprehensive knowledge of the condition of water transmission pipes as they have for the condition of sewer transmission pipes and force mains. Ms. Daniel confirmed that the Committee has seen a significant amount of material on the sewer system, and Staff has nearly completed the mapping of this system and determination of its likelihood and consequence of failure. They are working to allocate more funding toward analysis of the water system in the next tranche of bond funds.

Mr. Zeltman commented that the City has done a good job preparing comprehensive data on force mains and water mains, identifying the age of the pipe, type of material, and characteristics related to eventual replacement. With regard to the moratorium, he noted that he had believed it to be the Health Department's responsibility to invoke a moratorium if a municipality could not provide sufficient water to meet demand.

Chair Mammano asked how Staff can account for the quality as well as the quantity of water, noting that the spreadsheets reviewed by the Board include columns for the capacity of the sewage treatment plant as well as the capacity of the water system. She requested clarification of what is being done to ensure that the City meets appropriate water quality standards.

Mr. Partington advised that a major issue with both the water transmission and sewage treatment systems is that standards and review methods are based on the capacity of these systems rather than their condition.

Chair Mammano requested Attorney Spence's opinion regarding the LOS in the City's Comprehensive Plan, asking if a moratorium could be recommended based on the likelihood of continued deterioration of already stressed levels of service. Attorney Spence replied that a moratorium is intended to be an extraordinary remedy applied under emergency circumstances, which would pause the continued damage caused by these circumstances until the Comprehensive Plan and other planning documents have been amended to create a remedy. The Comprehensive Plan and ULDR have remedies or systems built into them that are supposed to address these issues; a moratorium is

appropriate only when these mechanisms are insufficient to address the issues. He characterized it as an emergency measure to address an immediate and serious problem.

Chair Mammano observed that the more appropriate question before the Committee is whether or not a sufficiently serious problem exists, due to the issuance of development permits and ongoing difficulties with infrastructure, to warrant a moratorium. Attorney Spence confirmed that this is one way the Committee can evaluate the issue.

Mr. Partington asked if it would be considered grounds for a moratorium if the Committee concluded that the current analysis of development does not adequately consider the condition of certain infrastructure, and that the development review process should be redone so more explicit consideration can be given to this issue. Attorney Spence replied that the Committee would need to hear expert testimony stating that a moratorium is warranted under current circumstances in order to correct the deficiencies that have been identified. He did not know if this could be accomplished without halting the issuance of development permits, or if Staff would be able to make these changes without affecting the issuance of these permits.

Chair Mammano noted that there is currently a process by which Staff reviews sewer systems, including both pipes and pump stations, according to their capacity for flow; however, documentation does not show that an explicit review of condition is performed, nor does it establish standards for acceptable condition. She asked if the analysis of condition brought forward in the Hazen and Sawyer report could be added to the development review process, with a moratorium to be recommended until this analysis could be added. Attorney Spence stated again that the Committee would have to elicit expert testimony showing that there is a demonstrated need to impose a moratorium before there is damage to the City as a result.

Chair Mammano asked if the Committee can recommend that the City impose a moratorium due to the need for greater professional analysis of whether or not the condition of the pipes should be part of the review process. Attorney Spence replied that the Committee can say that they have identified this particular issue, which they believe warrants a moratorium; however, based upon the guidance of counsel, they can indicate that they feel there should be additional expert evaluation to determine whether or not there is a demonstrated need for a moratorium.

Chair Mammano asked if it might be possible for the Committee to identify an issue with the recognition that they cannot provide professional analysis to determine the scope of the issue, and recommend that the City seek this professional analysis. Attorney Spence confirmed this.

Mr. Ladd and Ms. Scott left the meeting at 3:32 p.m.

At this time Chair Mammano opened public comment.

Paul Chettle, member of the public, stated that he was not in favor of this action, but recalled that the Committee had previously discussed the incorporation of infrastructure condition into the DRC process. This addition would be supported by a number of resources, including the Hazen and Sawyer report. He noted that the original capacity letter provided by Staff was not intended to be the final document on analysis of adequacy, but was considered to be a first step to which additional analysis could be added over time. He was in favor of including condition analysis as part of the Committee's final recommendation to the City Commission, or as a communication to the City Commission in advance of their final report.

Mr. Partington asked how Mr. Chettle would view capacity relative to condition. Mr. Chettle replied that he felt these two aspects are combined: Staff can deduce the capacity of infrastructure, but without understanding its condition, the knowledge of capacity is insufficient. He cited recent sewer line breakages as an example of infrastructure with sufficient capacity but in insufficient condition to continue to transmit effluent through the pipes.

Mr. Chettle continued that while he is not in favor of a moratorium, he felt the history of Public Works reports to the City's Budget Advisory Board, inclusion of projects in the CIP, two 10-year Master Plans, the Reiss report, and the more recent Hazen and Sawyer report can be incorporated into an informed decision by the Committee to recommend that steps be taken to address the City's infrastructure needs.

Chair Mammano noted that the Committee had asked Hazen and Sawyer if the pipes identified in their report as at risk of breakage were already being addressed through either the CIP or the Consent Order. She advised that these did not seem to constitute an immediate and/or emergency need that could be used to justify a moratorium. Mr. Chettle pointed out that some CIP projects are de-funded every year.

With no other individuals wishing to speak at this time, Chair Mammano closed public comment.

ii. Recap of information related to current procedures for adequacy of public infrastructure

Chair Mammano requested that the analysis of pump stations and condition of pipes, which were included in the members' backup materials, be addressed next. She asked for additional explanation of the analysis, noting that some pump stations are currently running for more than eight hours per day, which can be problematic.

Mr. Zeltman stated that when pump stations work for longer hours than they are intended to, the result is that they exceed design flow capability. He continued that these stations may be running for longer hours than recommended for a number of reasons: their collection systems may have experienced too much inflow of groundwater and/or sand, which can damage sanitary sewer basins. Another possibility is that the surrounding area

may be overbuilt and more flow is coming into the pump stations than they were designed to accommodate.

Dr. Gassman observed that to improve the resiliency and sustainability of pump stations, Staff has installed variable speed pumps, which can run for longer periods of time at a lower pumping rate. These may be part of the reason that certain pumps are running longer. She further clarified that some of the affected systems may not be overtaxed, but may instead be operating in this different manner.

Mr. Partington commented that the Committee does not see this type of information, which would inform them that stations are running longer because of a different type of pump. He added that the Committee has requested more explicit analysis of how new development affects at-risk infrastructure, but has not yet seen this information.

Dronix Suarez, Project Manager II, provided a brief analysis of how figures are analyzed for capacity letters. This process includes determination of the amount of time that pumps are running, as well as whether or not they are working with variable speed drives that allow them to run longer at less volume. He noted that in some cases, a new basin has been added to accommodate new flows in the area.

Mr. Zeltman observed that stations operating at variable speed can be an energy-saving measure; however, he recommended that these stations be identified in the backup materials in order to prevent a misunderstanding, as they could be misidentified as problematic if it is not known that they operate at variable speed.

Mr. Partington asked for additional clarification of the process by which development proposals arrive at the Department of Sustainable Development and are analyzed for their projected impact on the City's sewer system. Mr. Suarez explained that when the DRC determines that capacity analysis is required for a prospective development, a representative of the developer's team fills out a water and sewer availability form, which is found on the City's website. Once this is filled out, an automatic email is generated to send the form to Staff with a description of the project and an analysis of its perceived amount of water and sewer use.

Mr. Partington asked how Staff would then determine the adequacy of pump stations to be affected by the project, noting that if they do not know that variable speed pumps are in use at specific locations, it would not be possible to determine whether or not there is sufficient capacity for the new project. He asked how all that is known about the condition of an area's infrastructure can be included in the analysis for development.

Mr. Suarez advised that the analysis is based on a mathematical model. He added that the condition of the pipe is not something of which Staff may always be aware. Mr. Partington asserted that a good deal is known about the condition of the pipes due to the reports that have been submitted and reviewed, including the Hazen and Sawyer report, and can be incorporated into the analysis of condition. He reiterated that the issue is that

the Committee does not see how the incorporation of this material is used as part of the process.

Mr. Castellon stated that Staff looks at the documentation each year before making decisions on what will be included in the CIP: for example, an area getting a new pump station is likely to be able to accommodate increased flow. Staff uses the list to determine which pump stations, pipes, and other infrastructure require upgrades or other refurbishment.

Mr. Suarez continued that when information is provided by the developer, Staff reviews the plans for the project and determines whether or not the proposed connections are viable based on its water and sewer atlas. This includes checking to see what type of pipes are used in the area, as well as what development already exists and what other development is proposed.

Chair Mammano asked which entity looks at the information to determine if the existing system has adequate capacity and condition to address more flow. Mr. Suarez confirmed that this is Public Works' responsibility. The capacity analysis provides information on the ability of a new project to connect, as well as whether or not existing infrastructure can handle more demand. This information is outlined in the capacity analysis letter that is provided once the process is complete. If the increase in demand necessitates larger pipe size or other upgrades, this will be stated in the letter as well.

Mr. Partington felt this could put more demand on infrastructure that might have been identified as high-risk. He noted that the analysis of individual developments does not identify whether or not demand is or is not placed on high-risk infrastructure.

Chair Mammano asked if Mr. Suarez has ever received and analyzed information from a developer and recommended against permitting that development to go forward. Mr. Suarez confirmed this, citing the recent example of a property that wished to connect to two different pump stations, one of which cannot accept any additional load. The developer was asked to redesign these plans to omit the connection to this pump station. The project was able to divert this connection to another station. He concluded that if the numbers available support a project's ability to connect, Staff will move forward with approval of that project.

Chair Mammano observed that this is an issue of capacity rather than condition. Mr. Suarez clarified that capacity refers to the ability of a system to accept the load placed upon it, while condition refers to whether or not the infrastructure, such as pump stations, can accommodate this load without too much extra effort.

Chair Mammano briefly left the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Mr. Zeltman reiterated his concern that the materials should indicate which pump stations are equipped with variable speed. Mr. Partington added that he would like to see

clarification of when committed flow becomes actual flow, which would be reflected at treatment facilities, as well as when developments drop off the spreadsheet and how the list of developments is maintained.

Ms. Daniel explained that the spreadsheet is used by Public Works Staff members who work from the Department of Sustainable Development. Gabriel Garcia, Project Engineer II, replied that projects are removed from the list as soon as they have received a Certificate of Occupancy (CO). The list is reviewed every three to six months.

Mr. Partington noted that the spreadsheet includes a number of projects that date back several years. Mr. Garcia provided an example of one such project, which has taken significant time to go through the DRC process and for which construction is still not complete. Mr. Castellon added that at times a project will drop off because it was not completed; that project may reapply later on, but must rejoin the process at the end of the line. He reiterated that the spreadsheet is reviewed for “cleanup” on a quarterly to six-month basis.

Chair Mammano rejoined the meeting at 4:24 p.m.

Chair Mammano noted that the spreadsheet provided to the Committee members is not intended to reflect analysis, but simply to present information. She asserted that she would like to discuss the analysis that went into including information on the spreadsheet, pointing out that thus far, the only analysis that has been shown is the calculation of capacity.

Mr. Grabski also addressed the spreadsheet, noting that several individual lines reflect the dates on which COs were issued and demand is moved from committed flow to actual flow. It was clarified that the spreadsheet was separated into two documents because the amount of information in the system could not fit on a single document.

Mr. Zeltman observed that another aspect of the moratorium discussion is the ability of a water distribution system to meet fire flow requirements, clarifying that this concern referred to the demands of dynamic rather than static testing. Mr. Suarez replied that current analysis requires a minimum residual pressure of 30 psi in water sources used for firefighting. He emphasized that it is not within Staff’s purview to recommend a moratorium, but only to provide analysis that can be used to make decisions of this nature.

Chair Mammano asked if the standard for every City fire hydrant is 30 psi. Mr. Suarez replied that this is the standard, and Staff seeks to ensure that this standard can be met when calculating their analysis of new development. This is part of the water model. Staff also keeps a map of current fire hydrants, their inspection schedules, and their historical flow.

Rick Johnson, Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager, advised that an engineer of record or developer may order a dynamic flow test in order to determine if a

particular water main will provide the required capacity. The work order for this test comes through DSD and eventually to Utilities Staff. Large or multi-story projects typically have this test done. He could not speak to whether or not the DRC requires evidence of this test before approving a project.

Mr. Johnson continued that after a developer orders this test, it may still be several months or up to two years before the design phase of the project is complete and construction can begin. In that time, other developments may have been built, which would affect the final capacity of the water main.

Mr. Grabski clarified that additional checks are performed after the initial dynamic flow test: for example, a building must conduct fire flow tests through its sprinkler system, which acts as a safeguard in the event of a water pressure issue. Staff also has a general idea of the normal operating pressure in the City's water mains at any given moment.

Mr. Johnson explained that the mapping presented earlier in the discussion is only intended to note the location of assets, not to assess their condition. When a break occurs, a condition assessment is made in that area. This documentation is used to develop CIP projects. The City is also exploring non-invasive assessments of the water system to determine conditions, including tuberculation and other concerns.

Chair Mammano noted that between this map and the Water and Sewer Breaks Report 2021, the City also has a good idea of where its vulnerable areas are located. Mr. Johnson confirmed that the three major factors in assessing vulnerability are age of the pipes, breaks, and pipe material. She requested that this be discussed in greater depth at the next scheduled meeting.

Ms. Daniel advised that next month the Committee will be able to discuss the progress of mapping in conjunction with consultant WGI. Staff is trying to use more CIP funding toward the condition assessment of water infrastructure, but has not yet begun this assessment process.

Ms. Daniel recalled that with regard to fire suppression, the Committee discussed this system at the December 2020 meeting, and a dashboard report of three years' worth of fire hydrant inspections was presented to the members. The City's Fire Chief also spoke individually with Mr. Zeltman to share information on the City's processes to ensure fire suppression adequacy. She concluded that the City has a reasonable grasp on the workings of this system, including which hydrants are not working as well as regularly scheduled inspections.

5. New Business

i. New Funding Opportunities

Chair Mammano recalled that the Committee had briefly addressed this issue under General Discussion. Ms. Daniel reiterated that the Middle River water quality improvement project and the tidal valve installation project are both eligible for federal funds and are before the U.S. Congress. The water quality project is a joint project that requires agreements between Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park, and Wilton Manors.

Chair Mammano recalled that the Committee had voted to support funding of the tidal valve installation project, and asked if they wished to take another vote in support of the water quality improvement project. Ms. Daniel clarified that both of these projects are related to the Middle River water quality improvement project: one will go to Congressman Alcee Hastings' office, while the other will go to Congresswoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz's office.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, that the ITF supports the application for the grant for \$9 million for the Middle River water quality project. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (6-0).

Mr. Partington commented that as part of the Biden administration's first COVID-19 relief bill, the Governor of Florida proposes to dedicate \$1 billion of this funding toward resiliency projects. This would be in addition to the \$1 billion already proposed for the fiscal year (FY) 2022 budget. He continued that if the City Commission wishes to pursue transportation projects, Broward County transportation surtax funds could be used toward this project. He noted that experienced lobbyists have the best chance of securing these funds.

Mr. Partington continued that the Biden administration also proposes an infrastructure bill that has been estimated at \$3 trillion. He reiterated that good lobbyists will also have the best chance of securing a portion of these funds for Fort Lauderdale.

Dr. Gassman advised that the City has retained a dedicated individual to focus on securing state and federal funds. That individual is working with the City's lobbyists to address these issues and take advantage of funding opportunities.

Chair Mammano asked that Government and External Affairs Manager Daphnee Sainvil be invited to address the Committee at their next meeting. Ms. Daniel confirmed that she would extend this invitation.

6. Public Works Update

i. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping

This Item was not discussed.

ii. CIP Financial Report

This Item was not discussed.

7. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting TBA

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:59 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.]