



**MEETING MINUTES  
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE  
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2022 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.**

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

<u>January-December 2022</u>		<u>Attendance</u>	
Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	2	0
Gerald Angeli	P	2	0
Shane Grabski	A	1	1
James LaBrie	P	2	0
Charlie Ladd	P	1	1
Michael Marshall	A	1	1
Peter Partington	P	2	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	2	0
Roosevelt Walters	A	1	1
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**

- Tracy Van Colt, Senior Administrative Assistant / Staff Liaison
- Seemee Callier, Senior Administrative Assistant
- Alan Dodd, Director of Public Works
- Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Chris Lagerbloom, City Manager
- Susan Grant, Finance Director
- Daphnee Sainvil, Government Affairs and Economic Development Manager
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- John Herbst, City Auditor
- Laura Reece, Director of the Office of Management and Budget
- Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to the City Commission**

**Motion** made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Chair Mammano, to recommend that we believe it is in the City’s best interests to create an RFP to design and build its own water treatment plant. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-1 (Mr. Partington dissenting).

1. **Call to Order**
  - i. **Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

**ii. Approval of Agenda**

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

**iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – January 6, 2022**

**Motion** made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Ms. Scott, to approve the minutes of January 6. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

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

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

Mr. LaBrie recalled that at the January 6, 2022 meeting, the Committee had discussed a proposed tunnel and communicated their support for it to the City Commission. Since that time, more documents have been made available by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and public meetings have been held to discuss this option. He recommended that the Committee further discuss the issue of a bridge versus a tunnel.

Chair Mammano stated that she had emailed the Committee's position to FDOT District Four Secretary Gerry O'Reilly, who replied that he would send FDOT representatives to the March 2022 Committee meeting to discuss the issue. She requested that Staff Liaison Tracy Van Colt send any link(s) to recent FDOT public meetings to the Committee members.

**2. Address from City Manager Chris Lagerbloom**

City Manager Chris Lagerbloom recalled that at a recent City Commission meeting, the Commission had asked that the unsolicited proposals for the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant be sent to the Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee (ITFAC) for a recommendation. He requested that the Committee provide their recommendation via communication to the City Commission no later than Tuesday, February 15, 2022.

Mr. Lagerbloom explained that the City had received an unsolicited proposal to build a new water treatment plant. While they were considering this proposal, a second unsolicited proposal was received, and two additional proposals were received during the period of competition between the first two. Consultant Ernst and Young has provided an analysis of these proposals, which they will present to the Committee.

Mr. Lagerbloom pointed out that there should ultimately be only one ranking, which will be done by the Commission itself. In lieu of ranking the proposals, he encouraged the

Committee to engage in healthy debate of the items before making their recommendation to the City Commission.

Mr. Partington requested clarification that the materials received by the Committee members for review, which include the analyses of each proposal by Ernst and Young, are no longer “in the shade” and can be openly discussed. Mr. Lagerbloom confirmed that this is the case, as any sensitive materials have been redacted.

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

**5. Old Business**

**i. Status of the RFP for the City’s “Business Representative” regarding the New Water Treatment Plant**

Chair Mammano recalled that in November 2019, the Committee has provided an opinion on public-private partnerships (P3s) to the City Commission, recommending that any such partnership retain the following for the City:

- Control of the water
- Control of the rates
- Control of water quality

On January 18, 2022, the Committee had asked the Commission for an opportunity to review the unsolicited P3s. The Commission has now asked the Committee to review these proposals and comment on the RFP alternative as well.

Chair Mammano continued that consultant Ernst and Young will provide the Committee with information regarding their own comparative analysis of the proposals. This will be followed by general discussion from the Committee to determine whether the proposals meet their stated criteria, as well as any other points of information the Committee members may wish to discuss with Staff or consultants. The Committee must then consider how their decision or resolution will be submitted to the City Commission.

Chair Mammano continued that in December 2019, the City received a report from consultant Carollo advising that they should construct a new water treatment plant at the Prospect Wellfield. The report provided two options:

- Build the new plant at the wellfield and use the existing Fiveash Plant for water distribution
- Relocate all operations to the wellfield without using the Fiveash facility

The proposed costs of these changes would range between approximately \$350 million and \$450 million to construct a new water treatment plant.

Public Works Director Alan Dodd advised that in June 2021, a contract was awarded to Hazen and Sawyer to act as the owner’s representative. While Hazen and Sawyer are

operating under a general contract to perform services, no task orders have been issued to them thus far.

Mr. Partington asked if any task orders would be issued to Hazen and Sawyer if the Commission determines to move forward with one of the unsolicited P3 proposals. Mr. Dodd replied that if this were the case, the City would still be able to engage Hazen and Sawyer as an owner's representative to deal with the chosen P3 entity. He explained that the City does not have sufficient technical expertise among its Staff to manage a project of this magnitude without an owner's representative.

Mr. Dodd further clarified that an owner's representative is asked to review any documents provided to the City for technical accuracy. They would also ensure that any specific types of equipment or connections meet the City's requirements. The overall responsibility of an owner's representative is to see that the City's needs are met within the project.

Mr. LaBrie asked if the City had originally considered retaining Hazen and Sawyer to help develop an RFP. Mr. Dodd stated that when the RFP was begun, the intent was for the City to design and build its own water treatment plant. Hazen and Sawyer would have acted as owner's representative in this case by helping prepare the necessary documents. Their contract also included the flexibility to allow them to act as the City's representative if the City chose to follow the P3 model.

Mr. Partington asked if the City might consider adding any other parties to act as owner's representative if they chose to proceed with a P3. Mr. Dodd replied that the City would need to make this decision: while Public Works Staff can address their needs with the help of Hazen and Sawyer as owner's representative, there may be other City Departments overseeing legal or financial areas that could require the assistance of additional consultants. Chair Mammano concluded that Hazen and Sawyer would be able to assist the City going forward, whether they opted to proceed with a P3 or with an RFP process.

## **6. New Business**

### **i. Ernst and Young Analysis of the Unsolicited Proposals for the new Water Treatment Plant**

Chair Mammano requested that Ernst and Young's comparative analysis of the four unsolicited proposals pay particular attention to the three criteria cited by the Committee as crucial to any P3.

Stephen Auton-Smith and Chris Dalgarno-Platt, representing City consultant Ernst and Young, provided an overview of the presentation shown to the City Commission in January 2022. Each of the four unsolicited proposals provided a technical and financial solution for the replacement of the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant. The Fort Lauderdale

Water consortium also provided a proposal that addressed the City's entire water system, including replacement of the Fiveash plant.

Mr. Auton-Smith advised that Aqualia would provide financing, construction, and operations of the proposed new plant. They are an internationally recognized entity that has developed water plants throughout the world. Construction work would be done with the assistance of locally provided design and construction services. Their proposal is for 50 million gallons per day using nanofiltration technology, which was suggested as an option by the Carollo report.

Another proposal was made by the Fort Lauderdale Water (FLW) consortium, which includes Suez Water and Environmental Services as a partner agency. Suez provides water to a number of U.S. municipalities, including construction and operation of new plants and management of existing operations. Other partners would provide the majority of the financing. Their proposed solutions include both nanofiltration and ion exchange. FLW would look after the entire system and invest in the development of piping as well as other processes.

The third proposal is from the IDE team. This team consists of IDE Technologies, which would oversee design and construction, with financing provided by Ridgewood Infrastructure and construction by DeWitt Corporation. These partners have experience in the United States as well as internationally. Their technical solutions are similar to those offered by Aqualia and the FLW team.

The fourth proposal is from NextSpring, for which U.S. Water would undertake operations and NextSpring Water Investments would address design and construction of the updated plant. This firm has assets in Florida and throughout the United States. The Ernst and Young team advised that their proposed technical solution is "broadly consistent with Carollo."

With respect to control of water, rates, and quality, a preferred P3 would retain ownership of the water treatment facility with the City of Fort Lauderdale. The P3 contract would be set up to allow the City to specify its water quality standards and retain control of authorization of rate settings under all proposals.

Ernst and Young was asked by the City to review specific areas of the proposals, including the firms' capacity and experience as well as the general compliance of the proposals with Florida regulations. Once these were reviewed, the team then looked at a number of evaluation criteria for the purposes of comparing the proposals:

- Transfer of commercial value
- Risk to the proposers
- Technical aspects of the proposals
- Pricing and financial terms

The technical aspects were reviewed by Ernst and Young in conjunction with the City's operations team.

Mr. Auton-Smith continued that each of the teams has international experience in the development and operations of water plants, although some have less experience in the U.S. FLW partner Suez operates several systems in municipalities of similar size to Fort Lauderdale, while IDE has both domestic and international experience in developing municipal water treatment plants. NextSpring has experience in developing water treatment plants in the U.S. and in Florida in particular, although these facilities tend to be of a smaller nature.

Chair Mammano asked which team has the best capacity and financial experience. Mr. Dalgarno-Platt replied that all four teams have varying experience. He stated that the FLW team has the most substantive and directly relevant experience, determined on the basis of technology, scale of assets, and U.S. experience. Aqualia has equivalent experience, although most of this comes from outside the United States, while IDE and NextSpring have operated plants "of equivalent complexity and scale" with a greater focus on desalination.

Mr. LaBrie noted that three of the companies listed assets worth billions of dollars, while one, IDE, did not. Mr. Auton-Smith confirmed that IDE is a smaller entity than the others. He explained that Ernst and Young's evaluation looked at the scale and financial standing of the entities in the context of their roles and the financial structures they have proposed. The intent is to determine whether the proposed project has a reasonable chance of being financed and deliverable. While IDE is a smaller entity from the perspective of their operating responsibilities, including the performance, guarantee structure and level of equity contribution, Ernst and Young did not feel they were so small as to preclude them from being a credible operating partner.

Mr. Dalgarno-Platt reiterated that all four proposals meet the Committee's stated criteria for a P3. He noted that all proposers offer a similar risk profile, although there are some areas of difference between them with respect to demand, power consumption, labor costs, and performance. Regarding these last two, which focus on the willingness of proposers to stand behind the performance of staff that is employed by the City but managed by the proposers themselves, IDE was less willing to stand behind this performance, although they were willing to negotiate around this. With regard to the transfer of Staff from the City, it was proposed that this occur after a period of time, subject to further discussion.

Another consideration was price inflation, for which there were more substantial differences between the teams. Aqualia and FLW have proposed that payments made by the City would increase according to the consumer price index (CPI) and would not be capped. Aqualia would apply the CPI to the entire payment from the City, while FLW would apply it only to operating costs, reducing the City's exposure to inflation. IDE and NextSpring offered fixed annual payments with increases of 1% and 1.5% per annum

across the entire payment schedule. In terms of the pricing schedule, IDE's proposal states it would guarantee the costs and schedule included in that document, while the other three teams have not guaranteed their proposed amounts.

The presentation also referred to the City's assessment of each of the proposals from a technical perspective, including experience in constructing and operating water treatment plants, management of City employees, water quality goals, and resiliency. With respect to the financial terms, Ernst and Young looked at a basic comparison of the proposals regarding annual costs under each proposal, as well as City comparisons based on the Carollo report and rate-setting models.

Mr. Dalgorno-Platt noted that the risks associated with financial structuring depend upon the percentage of debt to equity that would be included in each of the proposers' financial solutions. These range from 100% debt, in which the City would finance all the work with no equity component, to the FLW and IDE proposals which both assume a more substantial equity commitment in comparison to debt. The equity would be provided by an entity other than a bank or other lending source and represents an element of risk on the part of the entity delivering the project.

By considering the level of design work proposed by each team, Ernst and Young was able to determine the margin of error, based on construction costs in particular, that would be incurred by each of the four teams. The lower the level of design development, the higher the potential margin of error that may occur and the greater the potential exposure to the City through increased costs compared to the baseline proposed costs.

Ernst and Young also examined the differential rates of inflation in terms of the annual payments to be made by the City to each proposer, applying each proposer's approach to inflation using a CPI index of 3%, which is the percentage applied in the City's rate model.

Regarding rate impacts, the City assumes a long lead time for the development of the replacement plant to occur. This enables rate increases agreed upon by the Commission to date to build up a cash fund over time, which means when the replacement project begins, funds have built up to help smooth rate increases at a later time.

Mr. LaBrie requested clarification of a slide which referred to "compliance with consumptive use permit." Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering), explained that this means there is a maximum amount the City is permitted to draw from the aquifer.

Mr. LaBrie continued that the City is only permitted to draw from the Biscayne aquifer through the year 2035, and all of the proposals exceed this time frame by several years. He also noted that this time limit was not addressed in any of the proposals. Mr. Castellon replied that the City has been allocated use of the C-51 canal as another source of water, as listed in the Carollo report, to account for more water at that point in the future.

Mr. Dodd further clarified that while water will still be flowing through the aquifer, the C-51 canal would offer increased capacity for water going into the aquifer. In 2035, the City's consumptive use permit would be adjusted by making additional purchases from the C-51 canal or other sources. The water from this reservoir would then flow through the aquifer.

Mr. Dodd continued that if the City's water use increases to the point where this becomes a necessity, they will need a plant that can be expanded. All of the four proposals offer this option.

Mr. Partington observed that each of the proposals offers a number of caveats concerning water quality. He asked what would happen if this water quality deteriorates. Mr. Castellon replied that the nanofiltration process would address this need if quality becomes a concern.

Chair Mammano asked if the P3 proposers would be in charge of the wells and the pumps that draw water from these wells. It was confirmed that this would be the case. Chair Mammano asked who would then be responsible for distribution of the water from the Fiveash plant. Mr. Castellon stated that the City would take ownership of the water at a specific valve outside the Fiveash plant: the proposer would be responsible for everything before that point, from the infrastructure leading up to this valve all the way to the aquifer.

Ms. Scott asked how long a proposer would be responsible for the water treatment plant. It was clarified that this time frame would be from 33 to 50 years. At the end of this term, the City would receive ownership of the plant and can hire another entity to operate it, or operate it themselves, from that time on.

Ms. Scott expressed concern that this would mean the City would take ownership of a plant with 35-year-old equipment. Mr. Castellon pointed out that over the 35-year time frame, some of the equipment may have already been replaced. He added that any contract would include a stipulation that the plant must be in good operating condition when it is turned over to the City.

Mr. Ladd asked if the City expects the proposers to pick up capital costs, noting that these costs are typically lower for the City than what is quoted in the various proposals due to its financing and bond ratings. Chair Mammano stated that none of the proposals offer to take over billing, with the exception of the proposal from FLW, which would assume control of the entire water system. Mr. Castellon advised that the City would approve all the equipment that would go into the new plant, regardless of whether it is the result of a P3 or the RFP process.

Finance Director Susan Grant advised that the City would continue to operate billing for the water system. With regard to financing, she agreed that the City can access better financing than the private sector, with a difference of 100 to 150 basis points in the City's

favor. She added that the P3 options would most likely be able to deliver the plant sooner than the City could, as the RFP process could add up to two years to the process.

Ms. Scott also asked if it would be safe to continue using the existing water treatment plant until the RFP process is complete, should the Committee decide to recommend that process. Mr. Castellon reiterated that the RFP process could add another two years to the timeline, and pointed out that the Carollo report characterizes the existing plant as “at the end of its life.” Mr. Angeli noted that there would also be additional time in crafting a P3 agreement well, which could mean no significant difference in time frames for an RFP or a P3.

Brian Donaldson, chair of the City’s Budget Advisory Board, stated that due to the timing of Budget Advisory Board meetings, that advisory body has not been able to weigh in on the proposals. He expressed concern with the concept of moving forward with a P3 as opposed to an RFP.

Mr. Donaldson continued that the Budget Advisory Board had approved the appointment of an owner’s representative, Hazen and Sawyer, in the City’s budget. He added that the Commission acknowledged in summer 2021 that they would need to move forward to construct a new water treatment plant, and chose to budget for this through the City’s water bills in order to prevent the possibility of a spike in this utility bill in the event a bond must be issued.

Mr. Donaldson advised that there were a number of questions to be asked regarding the difference between a P3 and an RFP. He felt a P3 would be preferable for a project that the City might otherwise be unable to fund; however, the City has known that it would need to build a new water treatment plant and has the funding to do so. He cautioned against allowing a private entity to make a profit on a City utility. He also noted that the City is spending roughly \$5 to \$6 million each year to make sure they are repairing and maintaining the water treatment facility, while a private entity may not keep up the same type of maintenance over a 30-year period. He concluded that he also felt the decision-making process is being rushed.

Chair Mammano asked how much money is set aside every year for the water treatment plant. Ms. Grant replied that an additional 5% was added to water rates during the past year, and rates will continue to increase by 5% each year. The differential is placed into a capital reserve. This money will be available for a water treatment plant project whether the City chooses to proceed with a P3 or with an RFP.

Chair Mammano observed that one proposer, IDE, states they can build a new water treatment plant for \$385 million, while the Carollo report states that this estimate was closer to \$450 million two years ago. She expressed concern with the possibility that these assumptions are inflated or otherwise inaccurate. Ms. Grant stated that the estimates are “a range” of costs, and the true number will not be known until the City

either enters into an agreement with one of the proposed providers or sends the project out for RFP.

Mr. Partington reminded all present that the proposals were unsolicited and would require negotiation. He characterized the decision as being “about transference of risk:” if the City manages all operations in-house, they carry the majority of the risk for construction issues, cost overruns, and other concerns, while in a P3, the agreement would offer some profit margin to the provider in return for their assumption of a substantial amount of the risk. Chair Mammano pointed out that the amount of risk a private partner is taking on can be determined by the amount of equity they would put into the project. Mr. Partington reiterated that this amount remains negotiable.

Mr. Zeltman asked if the City’s water rates are being increased over the next three years in order to generate more revenue for the expected purchase of a new water treatment plant. Ms. Grant confirmed this, stating again that the gradual increase in water rates is intended to build up cash and support the City’s debt service, regardless of whether or not the City chooses to proceed with a P3 or an RFP.

Mr. LaBrie commented that the Carollo report concludes that nanofiltration and ion exchange are preferred technologies for a water treatment plant, and also states there is room on the Fiveash site to construct a new water treatment plant; however, the report then recommends that a new plant be built on the Prospect Wellfield instead. Mr. Castellon explained that the footprint of a new plant would not fit on the existing site without the purchase of additional land.

Chair Mammano recalled that there are additional reasons why a new plant would be constructed on the wellfield rather than at the existing site, including the size of the wellfield. She added that Staff has been very clear that it is too complicated and potentially dangerous to build a new plant on the existing Fiveash site.

Mr. Zeltman stated that if a new treatment plant is to be built on the Prospect Wellfield, it would need to be built further west due to height restrictions associated with the nearby Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport (FXE). He felt the planes coming into this site already represent a threat to the wellfield, and expressed concern that this threat would only increase if a new water treatment plant is built there.

Mr. Castellon advised that if the intent is to expand the size of the plant, there is more room for expansion at the wellfield, while there is less room at the existing Fiveash facility. If demand increases, there is no room at the current site for the placement of more water tanks or to otherwise expand the facility 20 or 30 years in the future.

Chair Mammano noted that the only certainty available through the Ernst and Young report is that they have vetted the proposing companies and their financial and technical capabilities. She asserted that practically all other information included in the report is an assumption, including most costs of construction and operation.

Ms. Scott commented that should the City choose to go out for RFP, there is a great deal of information provided by the four proposing companies, who will be permitted to bid on that RFP. She added that an RFP is more likely to allow the City to get what they want from an agreement.

Mr. Partington stated that even if the City chooses to send out an RFP, they will still have to decide which process will be used to acquire the new plant, such as design/build or construction management, which offer different levels of risk. Another option could be an RFP that lists the City's specifications up front, which also carries some risk.

Mr. Ladd asked what would happen to the Fiveash facility if a new plant is built at the Prospect Wellfield. Mr. Castellon replied that Fiveash would serve as a water distribution facility for the network, although the building where treatment currently occurs would eventually be demolished.

Mr. Angeli stated that while there are some differences between the unsolicited proposals, they are generally very similar. He did not see any referrals from customers of the four teams regarding how well the providers met their expectations or how close they came to meeting their estimates. He concluded that none of the supporting materials provided offered confidence in any particular option or the business aspects related to them, including negotiations. He concluded that he did not feel the City should make any choice that "adds more time" to the replacement process, with the possible exception of NextSpring, which already operates in Florida.

Mr. Ladd did not feel the Committee was in a position or was sufficiently knowledgeable to discuss the differences between the four proposers. He also noted that NextSpring has an affiliation with Florida Power and Light (FPL), which has not demonstrated good service to its customers. He concluded that from a development background, he felt the better decision would be for the City to determine exactly what it wants and send out an RFP in order to get the best possible price.

Mr. LaBrie commented that the City has a contract with Hazen and Sawyer to provide technical support, as well as an experienced and knowledgeable City Staff. He suggested that another company could be identified to draft an RFP or serve in the capacity of project manager to ensure that the proposed project stays on schedule. He concluded that he was also more comfortable with an RFP than with a P3.

Ms. Scott expressed concern with the possibility of any further delay that could occur if the City opted for a P3 rather than an RFP. She stated that she would like to see the City move forward with its own RFP so they can specify what they want and control it.

Mr. Partington felt the private sector has proven itself able to deliver major projects, provided that the right agreement can be negotiated. He also felt the private sector has the advantage of speed. In addition, he pointed out that the four proposers may be the

parties who are most interested in bidding on the project, and concluded that he felt there were advantages regarding price certainty and risk transfer as well.

Mr. Zeltman stated that while P3s can be used for some types of work, he did not believe they were the best option for water or wastewater treatment plants. He pointed out that the history of these facilities has demonstrated major difficulties with P3s in multiple municipalities throughout the nation as well as the world. While he felt the City's examination of the costs and risks associated with P3s was "a good exercise," he concluded that an RFP would be the better choice.

Chair Mammano stated that although she was not certain that the City could realize a project of this magnitude, she understood that a reputable South Florida engineering firm is already under contract to the City, which made her more comfortable with the option of an RFP. She was concerned that a P3 partner must make a profit as part of the agreement, and that the City must pay them this profit.

Mr. Zeltman recommended looking at a comparative analysis of projects that have been funded through P3s, which he asserted have resulted in "major problems." Mr. Partington stated that he attributed many of these issues to the way the P3 agreements were negotiated, and felt the City's negotiating team would ensure that any such agreement is watertight.

The Committee members discussed the possibility of including or excluding the projected costs of operations from a P3. Chair Mammano commented that the attractiveness of a P3 to some companies is the operation and revenue of a plant. Ms. Scott also noted that with a P3, the City would not be making the same level of profit that they are currently accustomed to: if the cities to which Fort Lauderdale supplies water decide to use another source, this revenue could be lost, whereas an RFP from the City was more likely than a P3 to retain these existing clients.

**Motion** made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Chair Mammano, to recommend that we believe it is in the City's best interests to create an RFP to design and build its own water treatment plant. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-1 (Mr. Partington dissenting).

Eva Arnaiz, representing Aqualia, read a statement in relation to Aqualia's P3 proposal, briefly describing the firm's experience and qualifications, as well as those of its partner agencies, to deliver the proposed project.

## **7. Public Works Update**

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

### **ii. CIP Financial Report**

#### **1. Unfunded Balance Account**

**iii. Impact Fees – Usage**

**8. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

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

**9. To be Discussed at the March 7 Meeting**

- i. Top 10 unfunded priority projects list**
- ii. Status update on the \$200 million stormwater bond**
- iii. New member training from Dept. Director and Staff**
- iv. Update on the smart meter project (AMI)**

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