



**MEETING MINUTES  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2021 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.**

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**February 2021-January 2022**

**Attendance**

Marilyn Mammano, Chair (dep 3:28)	P	9	0
Gerald Angeli	P	9	0
Shane Grabski	P	9	0
Charlie Ladd	P	7	2
Michael Marshall	P	8	1
Peter Partington	P	9	0
Jacquelyn Scott	A	7	2
Roosevelt Walters	P	8	1
Ralph Zeltman	P	9	0

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

**Staff**

- Seemee Callier, Senior Administrative Assistant and Board Liaison
- Patricia Jolly, Senior Administrative Assistant and Board Liaison
- Alan Dodd, Director of Public Works
- Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works – Sustainability
- Vincent Morello, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Omar Castellon, Chief Engineer
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- Igor Vassiliev, Project Manager II
- Linda Short, Deputy Director of Finance
- Kymerly Holcombe, Business Operations Manager
- Jamie Opperlee, 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 2:00 p.m. and roll was called.

Chair Mammano requested that Mr. Partington serve as Acting Chair (A/Chair) of today's meeting, as she would need to leave the meeting early. The Committee agreed with this by unanimous consensus.

**ii. Approval of Agenda**

**Motion** made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Angeli, to approve as written. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes October 4, 2021**

Mr. Zeltman advised that he had sent an email to the full Committee, observing the requirements of the Sunshine Law, regarding a brief discussion of storm drains during the October 4, 2021 meeting. He asserted that this was a very important item, as he has encouraged the City for many years to convert this infrastructure to a system of exfiltration tanks for stormwater drainage, and he wished the discussion of his concerns with stormwater drainage to be included in the minutes.

A/Chair Partington suggested the inclusion of the following language on p.6: "Mr. Zeltman raised the issue of the stormwater drainage for [the] Imperial Point neighborhood, which is holding tanks, and informed the Committee that these should be retrofitted with slotted pipes for exfiltration. Mr. Castellon informed the Committee that slotted pipes were currently being installed in the Rio Vista neighborhood."

**Motion** made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to add that to the minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Motion** made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Grabski, to accept the minutes with the correction. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members**

Chair Mammano asked if the members had listened to the most recent City Commission meeting, where the Committee's communication from the October 4, 2021 minutes was discussed. The Commission's response to the communication had not been clear. Mr. Partington noted that the Commissioners had seemed to be in agreement to have the Infrastructure Task Force Committee (ITFC) continue, as they recognized the value of its work.

Chair Mammano suggested that the City Manager be invited to attend the Committee's December 2021 meeting to advise them on the progress of a new Ordinance that would allow the continuation of the Committee in some advisory capacity. If this is discussed at the December meeting, it would allow the City Manager sufficient time to place the proposed Ordinance on the City Commission's Agenda in January 2022, at which time it could be voted upon before the Committee's scheduled sunset date of February.

A/Chair Partington recommended asking the City Manager how he would like the Committee to continue beyond February 2022. Public Works Director Alan Dodd advised that a Resolution to extend the ITFAC is under development. There may be changes to the structure and/or time frame of the advisory body according to the wishes of the Commission.

**3. Public Comments (at Each Item)**

**4. Old Business**

**i. Continue Discussion about the Joint Workshop and Communication to the Commission**

A/Chair Partington noted that the Committee members had received, in their backup materials, documentation relating to the proposed development of a hotel on the Fort Lauderdale Beach. Chair Mammano explained that this documentation includes the most recent letter produced as part of the development review process, which she characterized as a significant improvement over the previous letter. The letter clearly reflects, however, that only infrastructure capacity is addressed, and its condition is not included.

Chair Mammano asked if Staff looks beyond the immediate impact of a development on the capacity of infrastructure, or if they follow the path of wastewater effluent all the way to its treatment plant to determine if any segments of this path and/or pump stations along the way are at high risk of failure or are struggling to maintain efficiency.

A/Chair Partington stated that it was clear to him that the City Attorney does not want discussion of condition to explicitly address any single development application. Chair Mammano also recalled that the City Attorney's Office has been adamant about this specific issue in the past; however, she emphasized that it is important to clarify to the City Commission that approving some developments may place additional stress on the system.

Project Manager II Igor Vassiliev explained that the capacity letters focus only on the capacity of infrastructure. While condition is taken into account, this is a separate issue from capacity, as any issues with the condition of infrastructure are internal and related to maintenance. Condition issues have nothing to do with a developer proposing a project, as that developer is not responsible for the infrastructure's condition. Staff instead focuses on items for which the developer would be responsible, which are related to capacity.

Mr. Vassiliev continued that transmission systems are analyzed up to and including pump stations. He further clarified that when a project adds to the wastewater flow, this does not place significant stress on pipes further down the line, as the addition of

effluent will only add a few minutes of pumping time to the station with no added pressure or increase in flow rate.

Mr. Zeltman expressed concern that the amount of flow coming into the George T. Lohmeyer Water Treatment Plant has increased by approximately 30%, which reflects a 30% increase in run time. This would have a significant and detrimental impact on the pipes, as sand remains in the system and continues to erode pipes from the inside. He asked if the City is continuing to be aggressive in the repair and replacement of sanitary sewer gravity mains, some of which still have breaks and allow groundwater and sand to intrude into the pipes. This intrusion would eventually be carried through force mains and into the treatment plant.

Mr. Vassiliev advised that for the particular project mentioned in the Committee's backup materials, roughly 24 minutes of pumping time per day would be added to the existing system. He characterized this as a relatively small increase.

Chair Mammano explained that the Committee has tried for some time to identify a methodology, absent any changes to the Ordinance, by which they may bring to the Commission's attention the potential impact of increased capacity on an area of infrastructure farther down the line that needs repair or replacement. Her intent was to determine whether Staff has looked at the potential impacts of additional effluent on its way to the treatment plant, where it may pass through at-risk areas of the wastewater system.

Mr. Vassiliev stated that Staff traces the path of wastewater from the proposed development through gravity pipes to the pump station, which pumps it to the treatment plant. He advised that they consider this entire path and address any issues along this path in the letters provided.

Mr. Ladd recalled that in an earlier discussion, it was stated that an increase in flow may actually improve the transmission of effluent, as this would reduce the abrasion of any sand in the system on the pipes. Mr. Dodd explained that the amount of flow is a product of the pressure and velocity inside the pipes. Pressure remains relatively constant coming from the pump station; however, the velocity is subject to change. As product moves faster through the pipes, there is less settling of sand particles on the bottom of the pipe, lessening abrasion from inside.

Mr. Dodd continued that in instances of heavy rainfall, the volume of product moving through pipes may peak due to increased velocity. The system is designed to absorb these short peak flows.

A/Chair Partington recalled that at the October 4 meeting, Mr. Ladd had proposed that Staff periodically generate a report of condition issues that have been identified. This would be an alternative means of keeping condition at the forefront of the Commission's attention, as it would include a regularly updated report of all work that has been done

and the most recent knowledge of infrastructure condition. Mr. Walters agreed that this could be a potential solution.

Mr. Ladd asked if it would be possible to compile a “top ten” list from the information provided in the Hazen and Sawyer consultant report as well as progress updates from various projects. This list could focus on the ten worst remaining areas in the system. Mr. Dodd advised that this information is captured in the Utilities Strategic Master Plan, which identifies the pipes at greatest risk within the force main system.

A/Chair Partington continued that the Committee is requesting regular updates on the current state of infrastructure condition. He felt a regular report of this nature to the City Commission would be useful, even if there have been no changes in the priority of concerns. He also felt this information must be kept at the forefront of the Commission’s attention in order to ensure that future Commissions are informed of the state of infrastructure. Mr. Ladd suggested that an abbreviated report could be provided on a quarterly basis to ensure the Commission is aware of the greatest problem areas.

Chair Mammano recalled that there was also previous discussion of adapting the Asset Management Plan, which provides ongoing review of the condition of the City’s infrastructure, into a regular report format. Without ensuring that the Commission sees this information, she did not feel that the Committee would be fulfilling its responsibilities.

Mr. Dodd advised that many of the priorities to which the Committee was referring are captured in the City’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which identifies these priorities. It includes projects which are not yet fully funded but need to be. A/Chair Partington did not agree, stating that another level of reporting seemed to be necessary, as the CIP was not sufficient in and of itself in the past.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

**6. Public Works Update**

**ii. CIP Financial Report**

**1. Unfunded Balance Account**

Deputy Director of Finance Linda Short stated that Chair Mammano had contacted her to request information on the balance remaining in the CIP fund for projects that have been administratively closed. In the past, projects were closed out when their funding came online: if any balance remained, the Finance Department administratively returned those monies to the Fund Balance.

Approximately two years ago, this process was changed. Projects are no longer closed administratively: they are closed only through the budget process. If a project is closed

administratively, it involves an amount of less than \$1000. These are projects that are substantially complete with small amounts remaining.

In 2021, roughly 18 to 19 projects with very small amounts of funding left over were closed out administratively for a total of approximately \$1800. Every project funded through the CIP is closed out through the CIP process, which means the funds are de-appropriated and then re-appropriated to a current or future project.

Chair Mammano asked if this means there is no longer an “unfunded balance fund” in which leftover dollars are retained, as any remaining funds from closed-out projects are reallocated. Ms. Short explained that when a project is closed out through the budget process, this is a dollar-for-dollar allocation from the closed-out project to the project for which these funds are re-appropriated. Only the small remaining amounts are now returned to the Fund Balance.

A/Chair Partington asked if the budget amendments that often appear on City Commission Agendas are part of this reallocation process. Ms. Short confirmed this.

The Committee returned to its discussion of Item 4.i, with Mr. Dodd noting that a memorandum listing top infrastructure priorities could be easily compiled, focusing on force mains and other items that need to be replaced. The memorandum could also show the funding that is aligned with these priorities. He felt this could provide the Committee with greater clarity of what Staff is currently working on as well as what they see as future priorities in high-risk areas.

Chair Mammano suggested that this memorandum be accompanied by a report in narrative form, describing the priorities in the CIP. The narrative would also include a summary of the progress the City is making toward resolving some of the major issues.

Mr. Walters asked how items would be selected for the top 10 list. Mr. Dodd replied that much of this information comes from the Operations Division, which maintains the system on a regular basis. This Division knows where issues exist and monitors sensors to obtain information on problems such as leaking valves and other indicators. If a piece of infrastructure breaks and needs to be prioritized, there is a discussion with the Operations Division, as well as with other engineers and a number of advising consultants.

A/Chair Partington also referred to the approach proposed by the chair of the City's Budget Advisory Board (BAB). Chair Mammano stated that she had sent several communications to the chair of that board, requesting a more thorough explanation of the approach that board is taking to the future funding of infrastructure. They had requested a line item reflecting the ad valorem tax amount for infrastructure.

Mr. Marshall advised that he had attended the most recent BAB meeting, where that board's chair had informed its members that the City Attorney's Office had indicated

they would be unable to take this proposed approach. Chair Mammano added that this proposal had addressed the issue of whether or not a budget should specifically address infrastructure. She was disappointed that the BAB would not be permitted to explore this issue more aggressively.

Boyd Corbin, member of the public, asserted that the City pipes that failed, resulting in a major sewage spill, had done so due to sand abrasion on the bottoms of the pipes. This sand had intruded into the pipes through inflow and infiltration (I&I), which has not been properly addressed. This means sand remains in the force main and can damage the new pipes that have been recently installed. He continued that the new pipes are constructed from plastic, which will not hold up to the ongoing sand abrasion.

A/Chair Partington requested that Mr. Corbin focus his comments on the issues of condition and funding of infrastructure, which had been the topic of discussion.

Mr. Corbin stated that the City needs to address the sewer pipes that allow sand and rainwater into the lines. He felt ceramic epoxy-lined iron pipes should have been used instead of plastic. He concluded that the City should address the I&I problem as soon as possible, even if this means taxes must be raised.

Mr. Walters requested clarification of the source of Mr. Corbin's information. Mr. Corbin replied that his information was based on fact but did not cite sources.

**ii. Update on proposed pilot study at Prospect Wellfield and Fiveash Water Plant**

A/Chair Partington noted that the Committee now has two reports from different consultants, including the Reiss report to which they have previously referred, on this topic. Chief Engineer Omar Castellon stated that the most recent wellfield report, from a different consultant, has three phases. The first phase includes historical data analysis of water in the aquifer, followed by phase 2, which examines each well and makes recommendations. The third phase will involve further action, such as cleaning or purging the wells.

A/Chair Partington commented that the conclusion he reached from this information was that none of the current wells provide a source of water without some discoloration. Mr. Castellon confirmed that some wells are better than others.

Mr. Castellon reiterated that the City is currently in the second phase of this report, which includes placing cameras in each well to investigate what is going on inside them. This is intended to determine whether or not a given well is contaminated with bacteria, which can contribute to discoloration. Mr. Zeltman added that this phase would also show whether or not the production area of each well has collapsed, or if there is intrusion that can affect color.

Mr. Castellon advised that all three phases have already been approved by the City Commission. A task order will be written once the second phase has concluded.

A/Chair Partington asked how information from these phases will be reported to the Commission. Mr. Castellon replied that the final findings will be reported.

Chair Mammano noted that unless issues that can be solved are identified in the wells, water quality is not likely to improve. Mr. Castellon stated that this can be answered once phase 2 has been completed. It is possible that conditions can be improved in some of the wells.

Chair Mammano requested an estimate of the cost of any recommendations that may result from the three phases of the study. Mr. Castellon again advised that this will not be known until the three phases are complete.

A/Chair Partington observed that the wellfield report concludes that source water from the wellfield is not available with the desired color. The Reiss report makes specific process recommendations for the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant and provides cost estimates for two options. Chair Mammano noted that the wellfield evaluation considers how the water coming from the wells may be improved; then, given the condition of that water, there are further suggestions of what can be done to remove some of the discoloration. Mr. Castellon confirmed this.

Chair Mammano continued that the Reiss report, also known as the pilot study, addresses what can be done at present regarding the water. This is what is intended to be discussed under the Agenda Item. She stated that the Reiss report includes a technical memorandum which makes a number of recommendations.

Mr. Castellon noted that it would cost \$171 million to retrofit the existing Fiveash facility to remove discoloration. This would be in addition to the existing \$22 million each year in operating costs. There is a second and more expensive option, nanofiltration, which would result in removal of even more color from the water. Chair Mammano asserted that the public would likely be shocked to learn of the cost of color removal from water, and that \$171 million would be a significant cost to improve a plant which may be replaced in the next few years.

Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works (Sustainability), clarified that the water is already clean: the difference made by these systems would result in less discoloration of the water. Mr. Castellon added that the estimated costs would apply to an output of roughly 45 million gallons per day: if this amount is increased over time, the cost of addressing discoloration would also increase.

A/Chair Partington asked if the proposed improvement would increase the useful life of the Fiveash plant. Mr. Castellon replied that it would not increase the life of any of the existing equipment and confirmed that Staff recognizes the need for a new facility.

Mr. Dodd stated that treatment of discoloration will need to be part of the larger discussion of replacing the Fiveash plant. This is part of the reason why discussion of a new plant versus rehabilitation of the existing plant is so significant.

Mr. Walters asked what the result would be if nothing is done. Mr. Castellon replied that the useful life of the Fiveash plant has been determined to be functionally complete, although improvements are being made to keep it operational. Mr. Dodd added that doing nothing is not an option, as the facility is likely to fail in that case. Additional funds will be necessary to maintain the existing plant until a new one comes online.

Mr. Zeltman commented that it is unfortunate a new plant could not be built on some of the existing acreage of the Fiveash plant site, as the plant itself occupies only four to five acres of the full 23-acre parcel. If a new facility could be built there while the existing facility continues to operate, it might be simpler to transition from the old plant to the new one. Mr. Castellon pointed out that membranes on the existing site may not work for the requirements of a new plant.

Mr. Walters asked if everything recommended under the \$171 million improvement option is necessary. Mr. Castellon replied that this was the finding of the Reiss report. The same applies to the nanofiltration option.

Chair Mammano asked if it is guaranteed that the system used by the new plant will address discoloration of water. Mr. Castellon confirmed that the new plant will take care of this issue.

A/Chair Partington asked if it is known which system the new plant will use. Mr. Castellon explained that there are different options, which were recommended in the Carollo consultants' report. The proposed options include nanofiltration, remineralization of water, and ion exchange.

Chair Mammano commented that her understanding was that the public-private partnership (P3) option refers to an agreement with the entity that will design, build, and operate the new plant. Mr. Dodd added that the City has received four proposals from interested parties. The City Commission has approved the hiring of financial consultant Ernst and Young to evaluate these proposals and determine if any of the four were acceptable.

A/Chair Partington asked what input Staff has on the water treatment processes proposed by the various parties seeking a P3. Mr. Castellon advised that Staff is aware of the technologies being proposed and has received a recommendation from consultant Carollo. The Commission has reviewed the Carollo report but has not yet accepted its recommendation. When a full analysis is brought before the Commission, they will evaluate it and make a decision.

Chair Mammano expressed concern that, should the City not make a significant investment to upgrade the Fiveash plant before its replacement, residents will have no choice but to continue to tolerate discolored water. Mr. Castellon confirmed this.

A/Chair Partington asked when the public will be able to see the P3 proposals. Mr. Dodd replied that he did not know the timeline for the City Manager's and City Attorney's evaluations of these proposals. Both parties have expressed intent to complete their review of the proposals within "a few months."

Chair Mammano asked if Ernst and Young will review the P3 proposals before or after they have been made public. Mr. Dodd advised that this would be before the public has seen the proposals. He did not have the scope of work issued to these consultants on hand but noted that this scope will include everything the consultants will review. Chair Mammano requested that this scope be distributed to the Committee members so they may review and more clearly understand what Ernst and Young will be tasked with, noting that the Commission had asked for the Committee's input on the financial aspects of a P3.

A/Chair Partington recalled that the Committee has already indicated that they do not recommend private ownership of a water treatment facility. Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee's communication to this effect should be re-sent to the Commission, noting that it stated the City should investigate P3s but should not cede control of the asset, water, rates, or water quality.

Chair Mammano left the meeting at 3:38 p.m.

Boyd Corbin, member of the public, addressed the \$171 million cost associated with improvements to the existing Fiveash plant, stating that these funds would be used in lieu of building a new facility. He continued that there are discrepancies between the Carollo report and the Reiss report, including differences regarding bromide levels and bio-filters.

Mr. Corbin stated that the use of ozone would remove 90% of the discoloration from water. He also commented that "color is dirt," which means removal of discoloration lessens the need for disinfectant products.

Mr. Corbin continued that he did not feel the City could rely on the Carollo report without also considering the Reiss pilot study. He noted that the four P3 proposals were submitted prior to the release of the pilot study, and questioned the expense of hiring Ernst and Young to review these unsolicited bids in the absence of the Reiss study results. He also expressed concern with the testing and safety of City water.

A/Chair Partington asked if Staff is certain that the process for treating water has definitely been established at this point. Mr. Castellon noted that different proposals offer different treatment configurations, which must be analyzed. A/Chair Partington

noted that the City Commission has accepted the finding of the Carollo report, and appears to be inclined toward that recommended process, although no final decision has been made thus far.

Mr. Walters requested that Staff address the \$171 million cost of repairing the existing Fiveash plant. A/Chair Partington pointed out that some parts of the existing plant may only be useful for another few years: if the intent was to continue using that facility for a significantly longer time, the \$171 million would not be the total cost required to keep it running.

Mr. Walters observed that the City is currently accepting bids associated with construction of a new plant, and the \$171 million is the cost associated with upgrading the existing Fiveash plant to address discoloration until a new plant comes online. A/Chair Partington noted that while Mr. Corbin's assertion was that \$171 million would extend the life of the existing plant indefinitely, Staff did not agree.

Mr. Castellon advised that the entities submitting P3 proposals are considering water quality requirements. They may have chosen to suggest the water quality options included in the Carollo report, or instead may submit their own proposals.

Mr. Zeltman suggested that Staff review both the Carollo report and the Reiss pilot study and consider the options of upgrading the existing Fiveash or building a new plant on the Prospect Wellfield.

A/Chair Partington reiterated that the Committee's communication to the City Commission from several months ago, relating to their recommendations for P3s, be placed on the next Agenda.

### **iii. Unfunded Capital Projects – PW List**

A/Chair Partington recalled that the Committee had discussed a "wish list" of the City Commission, with estimated costs attached. There was no additional discussion on this Item.

### **iv. Bridge Master Plan**

#### **i. Funding for repairs versus replacement (updated chart)**

Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering), recalled that at the October Committee meeting, Staff presented its Bridge Infrastructure Plan and discussed the number of bridges being managed for repairs. There were questions regarding the prioritization of bridges, as well as requests to clarify terminology.

Mr. Carosi advised that if a bridge is structurally deficient, this means there are elements of the structure that, when examined by professionals, are found to be in need of treatment or repairs. It does not suggest that the bridge is in danger of imminent

collapse. There are six bridges with this designation in Fort Lauderdale. Different repairs are pending for these bridges over a number of years, as structural deficiency does not necessarily require immediate repairs.

Mr. Carosi continued that repairs are made on an as-needed basis to increase the bridges' useful lives or address immediate concerns. He also noted that if there are Code changes, what may have been previously acceptable for a structure now requires improvement.

A/Chair Partington commented that he would like to see Fort Lauderdale achieve a state in which there are zero bridges rated structurally deficient. Mr. Carosi stated that the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) has an inspection program that requires full examination of all bridges every two years. The City is provided with reports on their condition, which serve as the basis for any action they might take. He noted that they are moving quickly to make repairs to the Westlake Bridge and Castle Harbor Bridge due to areas of concern identified in these inspections.

A/Chair Partington asserted that he was concerned with a number of bridges that have been brought forward for repairs, such as the 1<sup>st</sup> Street Bridge. Mr. Carosi advised that repairs have already been made to this bridge and it is pending before FDOT for reevaluation of its structural rating. The SW 7<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge has been internally scheduled for repairs as part of the 2024-2028 CIP, as reports indicate these repairs can be pushed into the future.

Mr. Zeltman asked if any bridges have been determined to be structurally weakened to a point that requires limiting the weight that may cross them. Mr. Carosi replied that load ratings have been reduced on bridges based upon their conditions; in some instances, a lane may be closed on a bridge as a result of inspection. He emphasized that the Bridge Master Plan is very proactive.

#### **v. Sidewalk Master Plan**

Chief Engineer Jill Prizlee explained that the Sidewalk Master Plan includes City Commission priorities for making roads, sidewalks, and trails safer and more walkable. In 2014, the City hired a consultant to inspect all of its sidewalks and develop a matrix based on the severity of need and the total cost of funding repairs. A dedicated project manager, an engineering inspector, and an administrative employee are assigned to sidewalk infrastructure.

The 2014 report oversaw the inspection of 425 miles of sidewalk and identification of over 29,000 locations. The total cost of repairs was estimated at just over \$15 million in 2014 dollars, which has increased to approximately \$25 million in current dollar value.

Section 25-26 of Code includes the Sidewalk Ordinance, which was updated in 2020. Until that time, it was the duty of the property owner adjacent to the sidewalk to maintain

that section of sidewalk if so directed by the City Commission. The update modified this so the property owner is asked to notify the City of their damaged sidewalk. An engineering inspector visits that site to determine if repairs are the City's responsibility, which is the case roughly 99% of the time unless the property owner is responsible for some of the damage.

Depending upon the side of the sidewalk in which a tree is located, the City may or may not be responsible for repairs. If a tree is in the swale, for example, the City must make repairs; if the homeowner plants a tree on their property beside the sidewalk, however, repairs may be their responsibility depending upon its proximity.

Ms. Prizlee continued that the City has a sidewalk program and procedure, which includes three ways through which an individual may initiate a sidewalk damage complaint:

- A phone number advertised throughout City resources: (954) 828-8000
- A Lauderdale app through which a damaged location may be reported
- Email to the City at Customer Service

Complaints are routed to Public Works/Engineering, which assigns the complaint to an individual for further research. The site is inspected to determine responsibility. Once the complaint has been addressed, it is closed out and the results are reported to the customer.

For every \$1 million annually appropriated to the City's sidewalk budget, they can repair three miles of sidewalk. In 2020, with significantly reduced funding due to the COVID-19 shortfall, they were able to repair only 0.05 mile, which was determined by City Commission priorities, including heavily trafficked areas, City-owned properties, and the Downtown and Fort Lauderdale Beach areas. Over five years, the City has appropriated over \$3.1 million and repaired 9.4 miles of sidewalk.

A/Chair Partington commented that this related to the Committee's earlier discussion of a dedicated funding source for infrastructure in the budget. Without such a source, a financial crisis, such as the one caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, will likely result in reduced funding for programs such as sidewalk repairs.

Mr. Grabski asked if the City is considering the implementation of ramps and other means of compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements. Ms. Prizlee replied that ramp locations have been identified. The City relies on community input to inform them of any features that may constitute a hazard. When the City is paving roadways, they also upgrade nearby sidewalk infrastructure in the subject area.

At present, 60% of repairs remain on the City's list. An inspection team visits these sites between projects and provides updates to Staff, as it is very costly to have a consultant revisit these sites. The City will need to budget for another comprehensive report over the next few years, as there have been more issues identified than can be fixed.

## **5. New Business**

### **i. Improvements on 40-year inspection process**

This Item was deferred. A/Chair Partington recalled that the City Commission had recently received a report from Broward County's working group on this topic and requested that this report be included in the Committee's backup materials for the next meeting.

## **6. Public Works Update**

### **vi. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping**

It was noted that only one break occurred in October 2021, which affected a force main on N Federal Highway.

### **iii. Impact Fees – Usage**

A/Chair Partington commented that the funds collected through impact fees have been budgeted for various purposes, including a new pump station and the projected C-51 reservoir, among other items. He noted that the impact fee amounts are not very large sums of money, although it is useful to see the amounts collected and how they will be used.

Mr. Walters asked where the collected impact fees are listed. Kymberly Holcombe, Business Operations Manager, explained that as these fees are collected, they are replaced into specific accounts for water or sewer expansion fees, which address expansion projects.

A/Chair Partington requested clarification of the party responsible for appropriating these monies. Ms. Holcombe advised that funds from the water expansion account have been allocated to and budgeted for the C-51 reservoir project, while funds from the sewer expansion account have been budgeted to a new pump station in Flagler Village. These allocations are determined by the Director and his executive team, who examine the eligible projects in need of expansion and decide if the budgeted amount is sufficient for one project or more. These monies may only be used for projects that expand the system. As the CIP is requested each year, dollars from these funds are allocated to specific eligible projects.

## **7. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee

November 1, 2021

Page 15

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.]