

INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Monday, May 02, 2022, 2:00pm to 5:00pm

City Hall – 8th Floor Conference Room

100 N. Andrews Ave, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

NOTE: Attendance in person is required to speak on an item.

To view the meeting, click [FLTV](#) or [YouTube](#).

AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Marilyn Mammano
Chair

Peter Partington
Vice Chair

Ralph Zeltman

Roosevelt Walters

Jacquelyn Scott

Gerald Angeli

Michael Marshall

Shane Grabski

Charlie Ladd

James LaBrie

1. CALL TO ORDER:
 - i. Roll Call
 - ii. Approval of Agenda
 - iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – April 4, 2022
2. OLD BUSINESS
 - i. Top Ten Capital Projects and FY 23 CIP Priorities
3. NEW BUSINESS
 - i. Asset Management Plan and Funding in FY23
 - ii. Consent Agreement – Mapping of the Water System
 - iii. Yearly Analysis of Water System Breaks from 2021
4. PUBLIC WORKS UPDATE
 - i. April Water and Wastewater Break Report
 - ii. Financial Report
5. GENERAL DISCUSSION AND COMMENTS
 - i. Committee Members
 - ii. Public Comments
6. ADJOURNMENT

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE: Monday, June 6, 2022, at 2:00 PM

Purpose: The purpose of the Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee is to review existing City infrastructure including, but not limited to: roads, sidewalks, airports, seawalls, water and wastewater distribution and collection systems, treatment plants, well fields, parks and all City facilities and structures and examine their current condition, review and identify the repair or replacement as well as funding sources and financing alternatives for those infrastructure, to receive input from members of the public interested in infrastructure, and to provide a report with recommendations to the City Commission as spelled out in Resolution 17-46.

NOTE: Two or more City Commissioners and/or Advisory Board may be present at this meeting. If any person decides to appeal any decision made with respect to any matter considered at this public meeting or hearing, he/she will need to ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. If you desire auxiliary services to assist in viewing or hearing the meetings, or reading meeting agendas and minutes, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 954-828-5002 at least two days prior to the meeting and arrangements will be made to provide those services for you.



DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2022 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

January-December 2022

Attendance

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	4	0
Gerald Angeli	A	3	1
Shane Grabski	P	3	1
James LaBrie	P	4	0
Charlie Ladd	A	1	3
Michael Marshall	P	2	2
Peter Partington	A	3	1
Jacquelyn Scott (dep 3:00)	P	4	0
Roosevelt Walters	A	2	2
Ralph Zeltman	P	4	0

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

Staff

Tracy Van Cott, Senior Administrative Assistant / Staff Liaison
Chris Bennett, Assistant Director of Public Works
Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
D'Wayne Spence, Assistant City Attorney
Sylejman Ujkani, Program Manager
Karen Warfel, Transportation Planning Manager
Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

ii. Approval of Agenda

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

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – March 7, 2022

Motion made by Mr. LaBrie, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve the minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

Ms. Scott suggested that in the future this Item be moved closer to the end of each meeting's Agenda, as there have been times when general discussion has taken a number of tangents.

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. LaBrie, to change our Agenda and process and put General Discussion and Comments by Committee members at the end of the Agenda. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

3. Public Comments (at Each Item)

4. Old Business

i. Sunshine Laws and Committee Communication – City Attorney's Office

Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence gave a PowerPoint presentation on Florida's Sunshine Law, explaining that the State Constitution provides that all meetings of any public body of the state, County, municipality, School Board, or special district, at which official actions are being taken and public business is transacted or discussed, shall be open and noticed to the public. This Law provides the general public with the right to be a part of the decision-making process by their presence. The Sunshine Law's language is incorporated into State Statutes.

The three basic requirements of the Sunshine Law are as follows:

- Meetings of the public or City Commission must be open to the public
- Reasonable notice of such meetings must be provided
- Minutes of the meeting must be taken and promptly recorded

Sunshine Law requirements apply to advisory board and committee members who are delegated decision-making authority and/or advisory bodies appointed by a single public official. They do not apply to strictly information-gathering or fact-finding meetings, or to Staff meetings regarding decision-making responsibilities.

Attorney Spence continued that the Florida Supreme Court has determined that a committee serves as an alter ego of a town or city council or other elected body in making tentative decisions. For this reason, they are subject to the provisions of the Sunshine Law. Even though the Committee makes recommendations in an advisory

capacity, these recommendations are considered a part of the total decision-making process as a tentative decision, which makes them subject to the Sunshine Law.

Any gathering, either formal or casual, between two or more members of the same board or committee to discuss a matter on which foreseeable action could be taken by that advisory body is prohibited. Attorney Spence explained that “foreseeable” in this case refers to an issue upon which the entity may possibly take action.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of how it is determined that an item might come before the advisory body for action. Attorney Spence replied that this refers to anything that foreseeably falls within the purposes and duties outlined in the advisory body’s enabling legislation.

Attorney Spence further clarified that the prohibition of discussing an item does not apply only to advisory body meetings, but also to conversations between two (or more) members on an item that could foreseeably come before that body. This discussion is considered to be a meeting, which constitutes a violation of the Sunshine Law.

Mr. LaBrie asked if this restriction would still apply if the advisory body has already made its recommendation on a particular item and has concluded discussion of it. Attorney Spence stated that there is a risk that this item may come back to the advisory body for further discussion: if the item is within the scope of the advisory entity’s responsibilities, members should refrain from having any discussion of it outside noticed meetings. If more than one City Commissioner is in attendance at a given advisory body meeting, no discussion or debate may take place among those Commissioners on the issues raised at that meeting, per an opinion rendered by Florida’s Attorney General.

Chair Mammano recalled that the Mayor has attended Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee (ITFAC) meetings in the past to discuss infrastructure issues with the Committee. She asked if this meant the Mayor was in violation of the Sunshine Law. Attorney Spence explained that this is not the case, as only the Mayor was present from the City Commission. He read from the Florida Attorney General’s opinion on this issue, pointing out that if members of the City Commission in attendance at such meetings do not engage in discussion or debate among themselves on the issues raised, there is no violation.

Mr. LaBrie asked if one member of an advisory body may comment on an item at a Commission meeting. Attorney Spence confirmed this; however, he clarified that the second member of that same advisory body who comments on the same item would create a violation of the Sunshine Law, as it can be perceived as two or more members having a meeting “outside the sunshine.” Mr. LaBrie pointed out that in this case, the Commission meeting at which the members wish to speak has been publicly noticed and is being recorded. Attorney Spence explained that the meeting in question was not a noticed meeting of the ITFAC, and the general public was not provided notice that two or more ITFAC members were in the room together and commenting upon an issue.

Mr. Zeltman asked if this prohibition would also exist if both individual members identify themselves as members of the ITFAC but clarify that they are not present at the City Commission meeting in their capacity as ITFAC members. He pointed out that a member or members may be present to speak on behalf of a neighborhood association. Attorney Spence advised that there are many items on a City Commission Agenda on which ITFAC members may comment without identifying themselves as members of that Committee. A Sunshine Law violation occurs when more than one member addresses an item that involves the purpose and duties of the board.

Mr. LaBrie asserted that if the ITFAC has made a recommendation on an item and passed that recommendation on to the City Commission, the Committee will no longer discuss that issue and it will not come back before them. Attorney Spence reiterated that he was advising the members of the penalties that come with violation of the Sunshine Law: one member of the ITFAC, for example, may address an item at a City Commission meeting and there is no violation. The violation occurs if a second member addresses the same item.

Chair Mammano asked if all City Attorneys of all South Florida municipalities interpret the Sunshine Law in the same manner. Attorney Spence explained that all City Attorneys rely on the Florida Attorney General's opinions regarding the Sunshine Law.

Mr. Zeltman asked if he would be unable to address an issue as a member of a neighborhood association because he is a member of the ITFAC. Attorney Spence stated that he may still communicate with his City Commissioner outside of a public meeting, but may not address a specific issue if another member of the ITFAC has already addressed it at a City Commission meeting.

Chair Mammano noted that at community or civic meetings, she is sometimes asked to speak on items that have gone before the ITFAC. Attorney Spence confirmed that this is not an issue if she is the only ITFAC member speaking on that item. If a second ITFAC member attends that meeting, they may listen but may not address the same item.

Attorney Spence continued that the Sunshine Law equally binds all members of a governing body, whether that entity is an advisory committee or board, a member of that committee or board, or an elected official. All parties are held to the same standard.

The consequences of Sunshine Law violation include a criminal penalty for a knowing violation, which is a second-degree misdemeanor punishable by six days' imprisonment and/or fines up to \$500. Removal from elected office is also a possibility. Non-criminal violations are punishable by fines not to exceed \$500, attorneys' fees assessed against the advisory body members, and civil actions. The validity of an action taken in violation of the Sunshine Law can be revoked.

Mr. LaBrie asked for clarification of an instance in which a committee member has been asked to attend a City Commission meeting and speak on behalf of that advisory body. Attorney Spence advised that in this case, that member becomes “a committee of one,” and the advisory body’s Staff Liaison is asked to make sure this member’s representation as such is noted on the item. He reiterated that another member of the advisory body would not be permitted to speak on the same item at the same meeting.

Attorney Spence advised that Resolution 20-30, which governs the Committee, specifies the ITFAC’s responsibilities. These include review of existing City infrastructure, including but not limited to roads, sidewalks, airports, seawalls, water and wastewater distribution and collection systems, treatment plants, wellfields, and parks, and examine their current conditions

It was asked if the Committee’s responsibilities as listed in the Resolution are limited to fact-finding only. Attorney Spence replied that this depends upon how an item is approached: if the ITFAC is eliminating any options for the Commission, for example, this is considered to go beyond fact-finding or information-gathering. The Committee may also compile information and pass it on to the Commission in a fact-finding capacity.

Mr. Zeltman commented that prior to his membership on the ITFAC, he had performed inspections of City-owned properties, such as the Fort Lauderdale Police Department and the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant. Since he has become a member of this Committee, however, the City has advised him against making further visual observations at these types of facilities. He expressed concern with this advice, pointing out that these observations are within his area of expertise as an engineer. Attorney Spence stated that he did not have sufficient information on the specific circumstances of this concern to provide an opinion at this time.

Chair Mammano observed that there is some interaction between the Committee’s purview as a fact-finding entity and its responsibility to review and identify items. She pointed out that this refers to the need to review and identify information for another party. Attorney Spence explained that the determining factor of Sunshine Law application is whether or not the Committee is in discussion or deliberation related to the decision-making process.

Chair Mammano offered the example of discussion among members outside a formal meeting of a national trend as represented in news articles, requesting clarification of what would apply if the Committee is later asked to make a formal recommendation related to this trend. Attorney Spence advised that if the discussion outside the meeting included sharing opinions on opposition to or recommendation of a particular trend, this could present a problem, as this discussion would need to be held before the public with appropriate notice and other Sunshine Law requirements.

It was asked whether two members of the Committee, each representing their own civic or neighborhood association, could participate in a discussion at a separate meeting, such as the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations, if that discussion involved infrastructure issues within the Committee's purview. Attorney Spence reiterated that both members could be present at that meeting, but only one of them would be permitted to comment on that issue. It was further clarified that individual neighborhood or other associations, including the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations, are not subject to the Sunshine Law.

Chair Mammano also asked if she would be required to recuse herself from voting upon an item before the ITFAC if she had participated in discussion of that item at a civic or neighborhood advisory body that is not subject to the Sunshine Law. Attorney Spence replied that this would not be necessary, and added that a member may not legally recuse themselves from voting upon an item unless there is a legal conflict of interest as defined under Chapter 112 of Florida Statutes.

Attorney Spence concluded that if a Committee member has a question regarding a more specific circumstance and the Sunshine Law, they may reach out to him for an opinion.

ii. Update on the smart meter project (AMI)

Program Manager Sylejman Ujkani showed a PowerPoint presentation on the City's Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI), or "smart meter," project.

At present, manual reading of all water meters is required. The City has contracted with a vendor for this purpose at a cost of approximately \$500,000 per year. There are also inconsistencies in water billing and usage for which the cause is not easily identified. AMI technology reads the usage of water from a location and communicates it back to the Department, calculates this information, and creates the bill. This information updates every 15 minutes, which makes it easier to identify leaks and inform customers about them.

In the past, smart metering relied heavily on investment in cell towers; at present, however, the system piggybacks on existing cell towers, which is simpler and less expensive. There is no restriction on the depth that can be read by AMI technology, which works in real time in a similar manner to how Florida Power and Light (FPL) meters read electrical use.

Assistant Director of Public Works Chris Bennett advised that AMI technology reads electronic meters using a cellular system that reports to a home base. Another option is for meter readers to collect information while driving through a neighborhood, which serves as a backup method in case there are any dead spots in the cell network or other reporting issues. This prevents meter readers from having to visit every meter each month. It also allows them to identify any problems in reporting data.

Mr. Ujkani continued that operational savings to the City will begin with the \$500,000 saved from the previous contracted meter reading program. There will also be increased accuracy of water usage and real-time alerts for leaks.

Concerns include the cost of implementation, which is currently estimated at \$30 million. This amount has been approved in fiscal year (FY) 2022 and the City will issue debt to cover this cost. Another challenge can be the increase in water bills, as the new system will read usage more accurately. While billing will be available online, customers will still have the option to receive a paper bill in the mail. The City is planning an educational campaign to explain AMI to customers.

Ms. Scott left the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Ujkani reviewed a timeline for the project, noting that at present, the City is soliciting a consultant to help them develop the criteria for a request for proposal (RFP). Once this is complete, they will solicit vendors to install and operate this technology. This is estimated to complete the RFP development in November 2022, after which it will be advertised in December. The implementation period is estimated to take 24 months. The anticipated completion date for the project is July 2025.

Mr. Zeltman expressed concern with water that may be unaccounted for when the City flushes its fire hydrants, and suggested attachment of a meter to these lines in order to help account for this wasted water.

Mr. Grabski asked if smart meters can be shut down remotely if necessary. Mr. Ujkani confirmed this, stating that the RFP will specify the criteria the City will need to operate this system.

Chair Mammano asked if evaluation of the City's water rates include the additional amount that would be received as a result of smart metering. This could offset some of the other costs. Mr. Ujkani replied that a performance-based study has been conducted on these rates, which estimated how much savings the City could realize over the long term. Mr. Bennett noted, however, that this amount may not factor significantly into a rate study.

5. New Business

i. Penny Surtax Annual Report

Transportation Planning Manager Karen Warfel showed a PowerPoint presentation on the City's Mobility Advancement Program (MAP). She briefly recalled the history of the Broward County penny surtax program, which was passed on referendum. Since that time, an amendment has passed at the state level which further narrows the interpretation of how surtax dollars may be used.

The two main types of projects on which surtax dollars may be spent are traffic calming and roadway widening. The County will no longer fund multimodal development for its own sake. This means some projects, such as sidewalk improvements planned by the City, are no longer eligible for surtax funding use, although sidewalk projects that are part of larger roadway or traffic calming projects may proceed.

As a result of the amendment, the City has reviewed and reworded a number of its projects and plan to submit them again for surtax funding. Ms. Warfel noted, however, that there is not a great deal of surtax funding available: roughly \$30 million is raised each year and shared by all Broward County municipalities.

Chair Mammano commented that the surtax program funds community buses. Ms. Warfel confirmed this, stating that surtax funding pays 100% of community bus service costs, including new vehicles. The costs of these programs come from the 10% of surtax funding the County provides to its municipalities each year. Most projects funded by the County surtax are on County roads and will be limited to traffic calming or roadway widening in the future due to the restrictions of state law.

Chair Mammano expressed concern that surtax funding cannot be used toward repair or maintenance of the City's bridges in the future. Chief Engineer Jill Prizlee advised that the City has eligible bridges they would like to be considered for funding and will submit applications seeking these monies in the future.

Ms. Warfel continued that the County surtax funding is administered using a five-year plan. This application process for the current five-year cycle will end later this month. Significant federal funding is also expected to be available in the future.

Chair Mammano recalled that this was also discussed at a previous meeting, including the fact that state guidelines for the use of these federal dollars have not yet been determined. Ms. Warfel noted that a range of allocations will be available, some of which will come through the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). These will include new programs for which funding guidelines have not yet been established.

Mr. Marshall asked if the Broward County Attorney has issued an opinion on the State Statute restricting the use of surtax funds to traffic calming or roadway widening projects. Ms. Warfel replied that this is a written opinion by the County Attorney. Mr. Marshall recalled that the County oversight board dedicated to the surtax had initially identified four priorities, one of which was an increase in multimodal capacity. Ms. Warfel advised that this has been a challenging process for City Staff, as the rules of the program have changed many times.

Chair Mammano asked if other Florida counties have issued different interpretations of the State Statute. Ms. Warfel explained that other counties with preexisting surtaxes may have spent money on other types of projects: however, state law has not changed.

Chair Mammano characterized this as an interpretation by the Broward County Attorney, while other counties' attorneys may have taken different positions on the state legislation. She felt the Committee may have a role to play in this process by suggesting to the City Commission that they urge the County to take a stronger position in favor of multimodal improvements.

Mr. Marshall pointed out that it is not possible to widen roads in many areas of Fort Lauderdale. Ms. Warfel confirmed this, stating that this meant the City will instead focus on traffic calming, possibly including larger projects which include traffic calming elements. She added that there is a significant need to have sidewalk gaps filled in the City, many of which are the result of requests from the community; however, this need cannot be met as part of traffic calming measures.

Mr. Marshall requested clarification of what constitutes traffic calming. Ms. Warfel replied that the intent of traffic calming is to slow vehicles to a more appropriate speed in order to lessen the number of crashes. Sidewalks or tabletop crosswalks may be included in some traffic calming projects as an ancillary improvement, although they themselves do not constitute traffic calming measures.

Chair Mammano commented that this would mean any sidewalk improvements would fall within the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), and asked if they should be moved to a higher priority on the unfunded priorities list. Ms. Prizlee recalled that a number of sidewalk gaps were discussed in last month's presentation on the City's top 10 unfunded priority projects. At present, the City only repairs damaged sidewalks or makes Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) -related improvements: they do not build new sidewalks.

Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee may wish to take a position on the inclusion of funding for new sidewalks in the CIP as part of the City's upcoming budget. It was noted that the City pays approximately \$300,000 to \$500,000 each year in claims related to sidewalks. Chair Mammano proposed including an item on the next Agenda to further discuss the top 10 unfunded priority list, including recommendations the Committee may make to the City Commission on the FY 2023 budget.

Chair Mammano advised that there is an item on the City Commission's April 5, 2022 Agenda which addresses the appointment of special counsel to represent the City in connection with the unsolicited proposal and project submitted by IDE Technology for design and construction of a new water treatment plant. The firm will work with the City to put together the comprehensive agreement with IDE Technology. Consultant Hazen and Sawyer will assist with the technical aspects of this agreement. She asked if the Committee wished to provide the Commission with any input or support related to the agreement. It was determined that the Committee would not address this issue further at this time.

6. Public Works Update

i. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping

The Committee reviewed the list of sewer breaks provided in their backup materials. Mr. Bennett advised that the list provides detail of leaks, breaks, and other issues addressed in previous months, along with the locations and estimated amounts lost. The sewer issues reported in February and part of March 2022 were relatively minor, including gravity pipe blockage and stoppage of flow due to a break.

Chair Mammano requested that a list of water system breaks from 2021 be placed on the Committee's next Agenda.

Mr. Zeltman stated that he would like to see information on the percentage of water use that is unaccounted for from breaks, flushing of hydrants, or other incidents. He noted that this amount has an impact on utility customers.

Mr. Bennett advised that there are a number of issues to be considered, including the water use unaccounted for due to planned flushing as well as the unaccounted-for use due to breakages or other issues. Inflow and infiltration (I&I) coming into the sewer system is another consideration. Costs include the amount of water treated as well as the electricity used in treating water at plants. This cost is borne by taxes and income brought into the City through utility rates: if more breakages and flushing occur, this cost will be higher. This is one reason the City is working to comply with Consent Orders as well as to continuously improve the efficiency of its plants.

Mr. Zeltman observed that water costs are expected to double within five fiscal years. This will have a significant impact on sewer costs, which are based on domestic water consumption as well as the return of some water to the sewers, where it is then moved to the appropriate facility for treatment. He concluded that identifying the costs resulting from this consumption could serve as an added incentive to conserve water. Chair Mammano requested an update on how much water was lost from breaks in 2021.

ii. CIP Financial Report

1. Unfunded Balance Report

7. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:56 p.m.

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



Old Business

- Top Ten Capital Projects and FY 23 CIP Priorities



New Business

- Asset Management Plan and Funding in FY23
- Consent Agreement - Mapping of the Water System
- Yearly Analysis of Water System Breaks from 2021



Public Works Asset Management Program

May 2, 2022



Asset Management Overview



- Purpose
- Cityworks (Enterprise Asset Management System)/Predictor
- Implementation Projections
- Next Steps



Asset Management Defined


What is Asset Management?

...A cross-functional discipline requiring ***solid governance, strong leadership and well-coordinated policies and practices*** to meet City of Fort Lauderdale objectives.



Cityworks EAMS

- Accurate reporting
 - Equipment, Labor, and Material costs
 - Semi-automated monthly or quarterly reporting
 - Work order counts by category, asst type, etc.
 - Avg. asset ownership cost
 - Real-Time Dashboard KPI's
- Seamless workflow within departments
- Increasing asset condition accuracy
 - Assetic Predictor software will use condition assessment to better determine overall system health
- Better cost and condition data for CIP planning






Asset Management Cont'd

THE QUESTIONS WE HAVE TO ANSWER...

- Asset stock
- Condition and Risk
- Service
- Money (RRM) Life Cycle
- Long Term funding




Maturation Path




Rewards:	Staged Decay Short Term Savings	Overtime Heroes	No Surprises Competitive	Competitive Advantage	Best in Class
AM FY Goal	Identify assets and condition(state)	AM Strategy Development	AM Plan Development \ Implementation	Quality data collection	Informed data driven decisions



Questions



- Legend**
- Water Break (37 Total)
 - Sewer Break (6 Total)
 - Commission District 1
 - Commission District 2
 - Commission District 3
 - Commission District 4
 - Fort Lauderdale Municipal Boundary



Water Distribution Breaks

Date of Break/PBWN	Q-Alert	Address	Type	Size	Cause	PBWN Issued?	Impacted Properties
1/12/2021	718838	207 SE 10 Ter	Water Main	6 inch	Broke while contractor was installing a 54-inch force main	Y	40
1/30/2021	720906	3700 N Federal Hwy	Water Main	6 inch	Age	Y	74
2/10/2021	729728	699 N Federal Hwy	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor Hit Line	N	0
2/15/2021	730637	1752 NE 1 St	Water Main	6 inch	Leak on Mechanical Joint	Y	31
2/25/2021	703142	NW 3rd Ave btwn Sunrise Blvd & NW 11 St	Water Main	8 inch	Emergency Repairs for Insertion Valve	Y	40
2/26/2021	N/A	6320 NW 12 Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor Performed Water Main Offset	Y	3
2/26/2021	736339	1701 N Andrews Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Emergency Repairs to Broken Water Main	N	0
2/27/2021	736429	NW 11 Ave & NE 6 St	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor Hit Line	N	0
3/13/2021	741874	NE 9 St & NE 15 Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor Hit Line	N	N/A
3/24/2021	746102	SW 16 Pl & SW 38 Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Valve Leak	Y	25
4/8/2021	749660	1600 NW 8 St	Water Main	8 inch	Age	Y	5
4/19/2021	756961	NE 15 Ave and NE 17 Ct	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor Hit Line	Y	98
4/20/2021	756961	NE 15 Ave and NE 17 Ct	Water Main	8 inch	Contractor Hit Line	Y	98
4/23/2021	756961	NE 15 Ave and NE 17 Ct	Water Main	8 inch	Contractor Hit Line	Y	98
4/28/2021	756961	NE 15 Ave and NE 17 Ct	Water Main	8 inch	Contractor Hit Line	Y	43
5/13/2021	765890	SE 9 Ave & Ponce De Leon Dr	Water Main	6 inch	Water Line Break	Y	23
5/17/2021	766772	NE 14 Ave & NE 11 St	Water Main	6 inch	Bell Joint Leak	Y	5
6/2/2021	772178	NW 13 St & NW 2 Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Conflict with new force main	Y	2
6/25/2021	403185 & 178719	E Las Olas Blvd at SE 1 Ave	Water Main	16 inch	Damaged Valve	Y	16
6/30/2021	784339	SE 9 St & Cordova Rd	Water Main	4 inch	Damaged Water Main	Y	5
7/1/2021	N/A	115 NE 3 Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Damaged Water Main	Y	2
7/1/2021	784664	1951 SW 29 Ave	Water Main	8 inch	Damaged Water Main	Y	32
7/19/2021	772178	NW 13 St & NW 2 Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Conflict with new force main	Y	2
7/27/2021	796341	NW 9 Ave between NW 7 St and NW 8 St	Water Main	6 inch	Broken 6 inch water main	Y	30
7/30/2021	797943	NE 18 St and NE 17 Ter	Water Main	6 inch	Broken 6 inch water main	Y	19
8/17/2021	806307	NW 9th St between NW 8th Ave and NW 9th Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Broken 6 inch water main	Y	55
9/6/2021	814606	NE 6 St and NE 16 Ave	Water Main	10 inch	Main that was damaged	Y	6
9/18/2021	820328	SW 9 Ave and SW 4 Ct	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor impacted	Y	38
9/24/2021	823305	4301 NW 12 Ter	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor impacted COFL Water Main	Y	30
10/4/2021	827745	104 Fiesta Way	Water Main	6 inch	Broken Valve	Y	64
10/5/2021	828443	3000 Coral Shores Dr	Water Main	6 inch	Contractor hit water main	Y	92
10/27/2021	NA	Bayview Dr & NE 13 Ct	Water Main	6 inch	Leak in water main	Y	16
10/29/2021	839759	626 Solar Isle Dr	Water Main	6 inch	Emergency Repair	Y	36
11/2/2021	NA	Sunrise Blvd & A1A	Water Main	6 inch	Crews made repairs that required a shutdown of system	Y	3
11/6/2021	843846	508 Antioch Ave	Water Main	6 inch	Deterioration	Y	21
11/18/2021	848618	NE 33 Ave & NE 33 St	Water Main	4 inch	Emergency Repair	Y	4
12/6/2021	854966	4511 NW 12 Ter	Water Main	6 inch	Emergency Repair	Y	159

Sewer Main Breaks

Date of Break/PBWN	Q-Alert	Address	Type	Size	Cause	Volume (Gal)	SSO Issued?	Impacted Properties
3/21/2021	744806	NE 32 Ave & NE 25 St	Force Main	12 inch	Undetermined, maybe due to contractor	10,060	Y	30
3/28/2021	747601	888 Intracoastal Dr	Force Main	18 inch	Age	2,000	Y	540
4/18/2021	756172	NW 13th St & NW 7th Ave	Force Main	24 inch	Age	12,750	Y	60
5/15/2021	766437	NW 13 St & NW 4 Ave	Force Main	24 inch	Age	1,000	Y	N/A
5/17/2021	767175	2601 NE 21 St	Force Main	16 inch	Contractor Damage	14,525	Y	173
10/5/2021	828495	6100 N Federal Hwy	Force Main	16 inch	Hole in main	1,500	N	N/A




Public Works Updates

- April Water and Wastewater Break Report
- Financial Report



City of Fort Lauderdale Water Distribution Breaks in April 2022




Water Break

Fort Lauderdale Municipal Boundary

Fort Lauderdale Commission Districts

- Commission District 1
- Commission District 2
- Commission District 3
- Commission District 4



Water & Sewer Bond Expenditures Summary April 21, 2022

Bond Funded Projects by Category	Total Budget Amount	Actuals as of 4.21.2022	% Spent to Date as of 4.21.2022	Encumbrances as of 4.21.22	Remaining Balance as of 4.21.22
Finance	23,595,311	19,268,331	82%	1,702,737	16,519,554
Fiveash Upgrades	24,656,858	5,781,575	23%	4,230,121	17,560,162
GTL Upgrades	14,000,000	3,306	0%	-	13,996,694
I&I	17,303,547	14,459,693	84%	164,835	2,679,019
Master Plan/Report	2,109,625	851,292	40%	1,072,670	185,662
Peele Dixie Upgrades	163,133	93,440	57%	12,856	60,773
Sewer Basin	1,821,149	1,268,735	70%	29	552,386
Sewer Force main	99,561,118	75,099,387	75%	6,120,976	18,340,754
Watermain	21,227,762	19,247,816	91%	1,298,702	681,244
Grand Total	204,438,503	136,073,576	67%	14,602,927	70,576,247

Index Code / Project Title	Category	Project Status	Budget	Actuals as of 4.21.2022	% Spent to Date as of 4.21.2022	Encumbrances as of 4.21.22	Remaining Balance as of 4.21.22
FD495.01 WATER & SEWER MASTER PLAN 2017	Finance	Implementation	21,611,457	17,448,361	81%	1,627,267	2,535,829
FD496.01 WATER & SEWER REGIONAL MASTER PLAN 2017	Finance	Implementation	1,983,854	1,819,970	92%	75,470	88,414
P10814.495 CENTRAL NEW RIVER W/MAIN RIVER CROSSING	Watermain	Construction	1,632,562	951,318	58%	-	681,244
P10850.495 VICTORIA PARK A NORTH-SMALL WATERMAINS	Watermain	Construction	4,435,773	4,434,668	100%	1,105	0
P11080.495 PORT CONDO SMALL WATER MAIN IMPROVEMENTS	Watermain	Construction	932,320	51,606	6%	880,714	0
P11563.495 VICTORIA PARK SEWER BASIN A-19 REHAB	I&I	Construction	5,832,153	5,677,164	97%	7	154,982
P11566.495 RIO VISTA SEWER BASIN D-43 REHAB	I&I	Construction	4,268,936	4,143,245	97%	1,381	124,311
P11589.495 FIVEASH WTP DISINFECTION IMPROVEMENTS	Fiveash Upgrades	Construction	16,417,546	1,408,089	9%	1,302,323	13,707,134
P11901.495 VICTORIA PK STH SM WATERMAINS IMPROVEMNT	Watermain	Construction	5,149,658	5,147,939	100%	1,719	0
P11991.495 DOWNTOWN SEWER BASIN PS A-7 REHABILITATION	I&I	Construction	2,000,000	81,742	4%	-	1,918,258
P12049.495 FLAGLER HEIGHTS SWR BASIN A-21 LATERALS	I&I	Construction	1,318,983	725,441	55%	112,074	481,468
P12055.495 BASIN A-18 SANITARY SWR COLL SYSTM REHAB	I&I	Construction	3,883,475	3,832,101	99%	51,374	0
P12133.495 PUMP STN A-13 REDIRECTION E OF FEDERAL	Sewer Force main	Complete	478,014	478,014	100%	-	-
P12180.495 CROISSANT PARK SMALL WATER MAINS	Watermain	Complete	2,822,718	2,822,718	100%	-	-
P12184.495 DAVIE BLVD 18" WM ABAN I-95 TO SW 9 AVE	Watermain	Hold	297,692	297,692	100%	0	(0)
P12202.495 LIFT STATN D-11 FLOW ANALYSIS & REDESIGN	Sewer Basin	Construction	1,224,358	1,224,358	100%	-	-
P12319.495 EMERG REPAIR 30" FM - REPUMP TO GTL WWTP	Sewer Force main	Complete	2,697,299	2,697,299	100%	-	-
P12352.495 S MIDDLE RIVER FORCE MAIN RIVER CROSSING	Sewer Force main	Finance	609,000	609,000	100%	-	-
P12367.495 ASSET MANAGEMENT & CMOM PROGRAMS	Master Plan/Report	Design	-	-	-	-	-
P12367.496 ASSET MANAGEMENT & CMOM PROGRAMS	Master Plan/Report	Design	-	-	-	-	-
P12368.495 SEWER CAPACITY ANLY FOR GRAVITY & FM	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation Planning	-	-	-	-	-
P12368.496 SEWER CAPACITY ANLY FOR GRAVITY & FM	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation Planning	-	-	-	-	-
P12375.495 PROG MGMT OF CONSENT ORDER PROJECTS	Master Plan/Report	Design	1,462,500	691,944	47%	768,726	1,830
P12375.496 PROG MGMT OF CONSENT ORDER PROJECTS	Master Plan/Report	Design	115,000	110,511	96%	4,489	(0)
P12383.496 NE 25TH AVE FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT	Sewer Force main	Design	4,784,890	371,479	8%	551,532	3,861,879
P12384.496 NE 38TH ST 42" FM & NE 19TH AV 24" FM	Sewer Force main	Design	2,096,690	480,029	23%	800,857	815,804

Index Code / Project Title	Category	Project Status	Budget	Actuals as of 4.21.2022	% Spent to Date as of 4.21.2022	Encumbrances as of 4.21.22	Remaining Balance as of 4.21.22
P12385.496 SE 10TH AV 48" FM REPL & 36" BYPASS	Sewer Force main	Cancelled	18,326	18,326	100%	-	-
P12386.496 54" FM RPL SE 9TH/10TH AV & NEW PARALLEL	Sewer Force main	Cancelled	6,072	6,072	100%	-	-
P12387.496 EFFLUENT MAIN REHABILITATION	Sewer Force main	Project Initiation Planning	3,184,000	89,021	3%	294	3,094,685
P12388.495 NE 13TH ST 24" FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT	Sewer Force main	Construction	3,313,090	3,062,883	92%	250,207	0
P12389.495 18" FM RPL ACROSS NEW RVR FRM 9TH/ BIRCH	Sewer Force main	Complete	2,112,550	2,105,749	100%	6,801	0
P12390.495 16" FM ALONG LAS OLAS BLVD PHASE 2	Sewer Force main	Complete	2,410,943	2,410,943	100%	-	-
P12391.495 BERMUDA RIVIERA SML WTRMN IMPROVEMENTS	Watermain	Complete	4,838,041	4,422,876	91%	415,165	(0)
P12393.495 FIVEASH ELEC SYSTM REPLACEMENT (2015-20)	Fiveash Upgrades	Design	256,828	-	-	-	256,828
P12395.495 PEELE DIXIE ELECTRICAL STUDIES	Peele Dixie Upgrades	Master Plan & Report	63,133	63,133	100%	-	-
P12396.495 PEELE DIXIE SURGE PROTECTION UPGRADES	Peele Dixie Upgrades	Construction	100,000	30,307	30%	12,856	56,837
P12399.495 FIVEASH WTP PCCP REPLACEMENT	Fiveash Upgrades	Complete	33,511	33,511	100%	-	-
P12400.495 PROSPECT WELLFIELD ELC STUDIES & TESTING	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation Planning	185,000	1,168	1%	-	183,832
P12402.495 PEELE DIXIE WELLFIELD ELC STUD & TESTING	Master Plan/Report	Master Plan & Report	47,670	47,670	100%	-	-
P12404.495 EXCAVATE & DISPOSE OF DRY LIME SLUDGE	Fiveash Upgrades	Warranty	4,228,973	4,228,973	100%	-	-
P12406.496 REDUNDANT FORCE MAIN FROM B-REPUMP	Sewer Force main	Bidding	10,377	10,377	100%	-	-
P12407.495 SUBACQUEOUS FM CROSSING REINSTATEMENT	Sewer Force main	Cancelled	-	-	-	-	-
P12410.495 PUMP STATION C-1 REPLACEMENT	Sewer Force main	Bidding	620,000	29,843	5%	-	590,157
P12412.495 PUMP STATIONS A-16 UPGRADE	Sewer Force main	Design	3,000,000	23,230	1%	-	2,976,770
P12413.495 FM FROM PUMP STN D-35 TO D-36 UPSIZE	Sewer Force main	Warranty	517,445	517,445	100%	-	-
P12414.495 GRAVITY PIPE IMPV TO DWNTWN COL SYSTM	Sewer Force main	Bidding	3,335,370	193,227	6%	82,771	3,059,372
P12415.495 PUMP STATION A-7 UPGRADE	Sewer Force main	Construction	2,582,889	1,081,358	42%	1,406,879	94,652
P12418.495 WTR & W/WTR D & C SYSTEM MAPPING	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation Planning	-	-	-	-	-
P12419.495 FORCE MAIN ASSESSMENT	Master Plan/Report	Master Plan & Report	-	-	-	-	-
P12419.496 FORCE MAIN ASSESSMENT	Master Plan/Report	Master Plan & Report	-	-	-	-	-
P12456.495 SEWER BASIN D-40 REHAB	Sewer Basin	Construction	169,237	34,109	20%	29	135,100
P12463.495 CORAL SHORES SML WATERMAIN IMPROVEMENTS	Watermain	Construction	1,118,998	1,118,998	100%	-	-
P12485.495 FIVEASH WTP FILTERS REHABILITATION	Fiveash Upgrades	Construction	3,720,000	111,001	3%	2,927,799	681,200
P12529.496 EFFLUENT PMP STNBY GENERATOR & ADMIN BLD	GTL Upgrades	Project Initiation Planning	14,000,000	3,306	0%	-	13,996,694
P12566.496 REDUNDANT SEWER FM NORTH TO GTL WWTP	Sewer Force main	Construction	25,225,638	25,200,719	100%	24,919	(0)
P12567.496 REDUNDANT SEWER FM SOUTH TO GTL WWTP	Sewer Force main	Construction	35,249,741	33,723,361	96%	71,839	1,454,542
P12569.495 NE 5TH STREET FORCE MAIN IMPROVEMENT	Sewer Force main	Complete	1,928,910	1,928,910	100%	-	-
P12570.495 36TH STREET FORCE MAIN IMPROVEMENT	Watermain	Warranty	-	-	-	-	-
P12618.495 DOLPHIN ISLES B-14 SEWER BASIN REHAB	Sewer Basin	Project Initiation Planning	427,555	10,269	2%	-	417,286
P12619.495 BAYVIEW DR 16" FM TO PUMP STATION B-14	Sewer Force main	Design	2,570,000	62,103	2%	115,005	2,392,892
P12620.495 LAS OLAS MARINA PUMP STATION D-31	Sewer Force main	Project Initiation Planning	2,500,000	-	-	2,500,000	-
P12628.495 INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT WITH POMPANO BEACH	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation Planning	299,455	-	-	299,455	-
P12731.495 GRAVITY SWR RPR BAYVIEW FRM 36 TO 40 ST	Sewer Force main	Construction	309,875	-	-	309,875	-
Totals			204,438,503	136,073,576	67%	14,602,927	53,762,000

FY 2022 Water & Sewer Expansion Impact Fees
April 21, 2022

FY 2022 (Revenue (Posted as of 4.21.2022))	Fiscal Month 1 (Oct. 2021)	Fiscal Month 2 (Nov. 2021)	Fiscal Month 3 (Dec. 2021)	Fiscal Month 4 (Jan. 2022)	Fiscal Month 5 (Feb. 2022)	Fiscal Month 6 (Mar. 2022)	Fiscal Month 7 (Apr. 2022)	Year-to-Date Total
FD452.01 WATER EXPANSION/ IMPACT FEE CONSTRUCTION	237,774.00	464,931.00	25,345.00	44,124.00	12,099.00	262,190.00	185,561.00	1,232,024.00
B251 W&S IMPACT FEES - RESIDENTIAL	23,724.00	9,885.00	5,931.00	17,793.00	3,954.00	13,839.00	13,839.00	88,965.00
B252 W&S IMPACT FEES - COMMERCIAL	214,050.00	455,046.00	19,414.00	26,331.00	8,145.00	248,351.00	171,722.00	1,143,059.00
FD453.01 SEWER EXPANSION/ IMPACT FEE CONSTRUCTION	227,070.00	444,001.00	24,204.00	44,174.00	11,555.00	250,387.00	179,244.00	1,180,635.00
B251 W&S IMPACT FEES - RESIDENTIAL	22,656.00	9,440.00	5,664.00	16,992.00	3,776.00	13,216.00	13,216.00	84,960.00
B252 W&S IMPACT FEES - COMMERCIAL	204,414.00	434,561.00	18,540.00	25,145.00	7,779.00	237,171.00	163,991.00	1,091,601.00
N963 IMPACT FEES - SEWER				2,037.00			2,037.00	4,074.00
TOTAL	464,844	908,932	49,549.00	88,298	23,654	512,577	364,805	2,412,659

Consent Order Projects Financial Report Summary
April 21, 2022

Consent Order Projects by Category	Total Budget Amount	Actuals as of 4.21.2022	% Spent to Date as of 4.21.2022	Encumbrances as of 4.21.22	Remaining Balance as of 4.21.22
GTL Upgrades	28,295,566.00	166,669.00	1%	2.50	28,128,894.50
I&I	37,844,732.00	26,828,738.02	71%	4,482,476.67	6,533,517.31
Master Plan/Report	10,559,705.26	7,207,128.23	68%	2,889,403.91	463,173.12
Sewer Basin	2,164,992.37	2,164,992.37	100%	0.05	(0.05)
Sewer Force Main	120,269,528.29	104,192,034.42	87%	1,788,866.15	14,288,627.72
Stormwater	54,426,525.00	5,332,496.38	10%	43,316,375.87	5,777,652.75
Grand Total	253,561,049	145,892,058	58%	52,477,125	55,191,865

Consent Order Projects Financial Report
April 21, 2022

Index Code / Project Title	Category	Project Status	Budget	Actuals as of 4.21.2022	% Spent to Date as of 4.21.2022	Encumbrances as of 4.21.22	Remaining Balance as of 4.21.22
P11563.454 VICTORIA PARK SEWER BASIN A-19 REHAB			1,606,619.00	1,431,421		175,198	(0)
P11563.482 VICTORIA PARK SEWER BASIN A-19 REHAB			-	-			-
P11563.495 VICTORIA PARK SEWER BASIN A-19 REHAB			5,832,153.00	5,677,164		7	154,982
P11563 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	I&I	Construction	7,438,772	7,108,585	96%	175,205	154,982
P11566.454 RIO VISTA SEWER BASIN D-43 REHAB			3,523,431	2,206,730		574,958	741,743
P11566.482 RIO VISTA SEWER BASIN D-43 REHAB			381	381		-	-
P11566.495 RIO VISTA SEWER BASIN D-43 REHAB			4,268,936	4,143,245		1,381	124,311
P11566 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	I&I	Construction	7,792,748	6,350,356	81%	576,338	866,054
P11842.470 EDGEWOOD STORMWATER PRELIMINARY DATA & REPORT			1,928,448	1,853,865		12,152	62,431
P11842.473 EDGEWOOD STORMWATER PRELIMINARY DATA & REPORT			16,846,632	1,326,751		15,519,880	0
P11842 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Stormwater	Construction	18,775,080	3,180,617	17%	15,532,032	62,431
P11868.470 RIVER OAKS STORMWATER ANALYSIS			957,578	887,514		19,011	51,053
P11868.473 RIVER OAKS STORMWATER ANALYSIS			33,535,000	1,067,896		27,717,723	4,749,381
P11868 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Stormwater	Construction	34,492,578	1,955,410	6%	27,736,734	4,800,434
P11879.454 PUMP STATION B-10 REHAB			1,908,427	1,908,427		-	-
P11879 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	1,908,427	1,908,427	100%	-	-
P11881.454 PUMP STATION D-45 REHABILITATION			509,868	509,868		-	-
P11881 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	509,868	509,868	100%	-	-
P11991.454 DOWNTOWN SEWER BASIN PS A-7 REHABILITATION			9,664,894	4,700,338		3,532,598	1,431,958
P11991.482 DOWNTOWN SEWER BASIN PS A-7 REHABILITATION			3,335	3,335		-	-
P11991.495 DOWNTOWN SEWER BASIN PS A-7 REHABILITATION			2,000,000	81,742		-	1,918,258
P11991 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	I&I	Construction	11,668,229	4,785,415	41%	3,532,598	3,350,216
P12001.454 SEWER BASIN D-40 REHAB			731,713	731,713		-	-
P12001.482 SEWER BASIN D-40 REHAB			3,766	3,766		-	-
P12001 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Basin	Complete	735,479	735,479	100%	-	-
P12049.454 FLAGLER HEIGHTS SWR BASIN A-21 LATERALS			2,457,469	1,209,044		-	1,248,425
P12049.482 FLAGLER HEIGHTS SWR BASIN A-21 LATERALS			8,255	8,255		-	-
P12049.495 FLAGLER HEIGHTS SWR BASIN A-21 LATERALS			1,318,983	725,441		112,074	481,468
P12049 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	I&I	Construction	3,784,707	1,942,741	51%	112,074	1,729,893
P12055.454 BASIN A-18 SANITARY SWR COLL SYSTM REHAB			3,276,801	2,809,541		34,888	432,373
P12055.482 BASIN A-18 SANITARY SWR COLL SYSTM REHAB			-	-		-	-
P12055.495 BASIN A-18 SANITARY SWR COLL SYSTM REHAB			3,883,475	3,832,101		51,374	(0)
P12055 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	I&I	Construction	7,160,276	6,641,642	93%	86,262	432,373
P12124.454 CNTRL BCH ALLIANCE PUMP STN REPLAC D-41			2,132,448	2,132,448		-	0
P12124 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	2,132,448	2,132,448	100%	-	-
P12133.454 PUMP STN A-13 REDIRECTION E OF FEDERAL			4,147,596	4,147,596		-	-
P12133.495 PUMP STN A-13 REDIRECTION E OF FEDERAL			478,014	478,014		-	-
P12133 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	4,625,610	4,625,610	100%	-	-
P12177.454 E LAS OLAS 12" FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT			1,689,730	1,689,730		-	-
P12177 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	1,689,730	1,689,730	100%	-	-
P12202.454 LIFT STATN D-11 FLOW ANALYSIS & REDESIGN			205,156	205,156		0	(0)
P12202.495 LIFT STATN D-11 FLOW ANALYSIS & REDESIGN			1,224,358	1,224,358		-	-
P12202 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Basin	Construction	1,429,513	1,429,513	100%	0	(0)
P12264.470 CITYWIDE CANAL DREDGING PLAN - CYCLE 1			1,158,867	196,469		47,611	914,788
P12264 CITYWIDE CANAL DREDGING PLAN - CYCLE 1	Stormwater	Design	1,158,867	196,469	17%	47,611	914,788
P12319.454 EMERG REPAIR 30" FM - REPUMP TO GTL WWTP			13,182,064	13,182,064		-	-
P12319.495 EMERG REPAIR 30" FM - REPUMP TO GTL WWTP			2,697,299	2,697,299		-	-
P12319 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	15,879,363	15,879,363	100%	-	-
P12352.454 S MIDDLE RIVER FORCE MAIN RIVER CROSSING			874,016	874,015		0	(0)
P12352.495 S MIDDLE RIVER FORCE MAIN RIVER CROSSING			609,000	609,000		-	-
P12352 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Finance	1,483,015	1,483,015	100%	0	0
P12367.495 ASSET MANAGEMENT & CMOM PROGRAMS			-	-		-	-
P12367.496 ASSET MANAGEMENT & CMOM PROGRAMS			-	-		-	-
FD495.01 WATER & SEWER MASTER PLAN 2017			871,387	533,008		338,380	(1)
FD496.01 WATER & SEWER REGIONAL MASTER PLAN 2017			204,430	125,057		79,373	-
P12367 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation & Planning	1,075,817	658,065	61%	417,753	(1)
P12368.495 SEWER CAPACITY ONLY FOR GRAVITY & FM			-	-		-	-
P12368.496 SEWER CAPACITY ONLY FOR GRAVITY & FM			-	-		-	-
FD495.01 WATER & SEWER MASTER PLAN 2017			725,896	725,759		137	-
FD496.01 WATER & SEWER REGIONAL MASTER PLAN 2017			35,560	35,553		7	-
PBS670501 LOHMEYER REGIONAL PLANT SUPPORT			9,811	9,799		12	-
PBS060101 UTILITIES ENGINEERING OPERATIONS			200,279	200,025		254	-
P12368 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation & Planning	971,546	971,136	100%	410	-
P12375.451 PROG MGMT OF CONSENT ORDER PROJECTS			1,295,458	624,155		582,164	89,139
P12375.454 PROG MGMT OF CONSENT ORDER PROJECTS			1,013,442	757,420		98,844	157,179

Index Code / Project Title	Category	Project Status	Budget	Actuals as of 4.21.2022	% Spent to Date as of 4.21.2022	Encumbrances as of 4.21.22	Remaining Balance as of 4.21.22
P12375.495 PROG MGMT OF CONSENT ORDER PROJECTS			1,462,500	691,944		768,726	1,830
P12375.496 PROG MGMT OF CONSENT ORDER PROJECTS			115,000	110,511		4,489	0
P12375 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Master Plan/Report	Design	3,886,400	2,184,029	56%	1,454,223	248,148
P12383.451 NE 25TH AVE FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT			1,363,353	3,393	0%	-	1,359,960
P12383.496 NE 25TH AVE FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT			4,784,890	371,479		551,532	3,861,879
P12383 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Design	6,148,243	374,872	6%	551,532	5,221,839
P12384.496 NE 38TH ST 42" FM & NE 19TH AV 24" FM			2,096,690	480,029		800,857	815,804
P12384 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Design	2,096,690	480,029	23%	800,857	815,804
P12387.496 EFFLUENT MAIN REHABILITATION			3,184,000	89,021		294	3,094,685
P12387 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Project Initiation & Planning	3,184,000	89,021	3%	294	3,094,685
P12388.454 NE 13TH ST 24" FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT			3,761,244	169,477		67,987	3,523,780
P12388.495 NE 13TH ST 24" FORCE MAIN REPLACEMENT			3,313,090	3,062,883		250,207	0
P12388 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Hold	7,074,334	3,232,360	46%	318,194	3,523,780
P12389.454 18" FM RPL ACROSS NEW RVR FRM 9TH/ BIRCH			238,620	126,325		-	112,295
P12389.495 18" FM RPL ACROSS NEW RVR FRM 9TH/ BIRCH			2,112,550	2,105,749		6,801	0
P12389 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	2,351,170	2,232,074	95%	6,801	112,295
P12390.454 16" FM ALONG LAS OLAS BLVD PHASE 2			637,577	637,577		-	-
P12390.495 16" FM ALONG LAS OLAS BLVD PHASE 2			2,410,943	2,410,943		0	(0)
P12390 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	3,048,520	3,048,520	100%	0	(0)
P12413.454 FM FROM PUMP STN D-35 TO D-36 UPSIZE			615,099	615,099		-	-
P12413.495 FM FROM PUMP STN D-35 TO D-36 UPSIZE			517,445	517,445		-	-
P12413 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Warranty	1,132,545	1,132,545	100%	-	-
P12418.495 WTR & W/WTR D & C SYSTEM MAPPING			-	-		-	-
FD495.01 WATER & SEWER MASTER PLAN 2017			3,441,353	2,424,335		1,017,018	-
P12418 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation & Planning	3,441,353	2,424,335	70%	1,017,018	-
P12419.495 FORCE MAIN ASSESSMENT			-	-		-	-
P12419.496 FORCE MAIN ASSESSMENT			-	-		-	-
FD495.01 WATER & SEWER MASTER PLAN 2017			924,284	924,284		-	-
FD496.01 WATER & SEWER REGIONAL MASTER PLAN 2017			45,279	45,279		-	-
P12419 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Master Plan/Report	Complete	969,563	969,563	100%	-	-
IMPROVEMENTS			14,295,566	163,363		3	14,132,201
IMPROVEMENTS			14,000,000	3,306		-	-
IMPROVEMENTS	GTL Upgrades	Project Initiation & Planning	28,295,566	166,669	1%	3	28,128,895
P12566.451 REDUNDANT SEWER FM NORTH TO GTL WWTP			4,524,621	4,444,507		14,431	65,682
P12566.496 REDUNDANT SEWER FM NORTH TO GTL WWTP			25,225,638	25,200,719		24,919	(0)
P12566 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Construction	29,750,259	29,645,227	100%	39,350	65,682
P12567.496 REDUNDANT SEWER FM SOUTH TO GTL WWTP			35,249,741	33,723,361		71,839	1,454,542
P12567 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Construction	35,249,741	33,723,361	96%	71,839	1,454,542
P12569.495 NE 5TH STREET FORCE MAIN IMPROVEMENT			1,928,910	1,928,910		-	-
P12569 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Complete	1,928,910	1,928,910	100%	-	-
P12570.495 36TH STREET FORCE MAIN IMPROVEMENT			76,655	76,655		-	-
P12570 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Sewer Force Main	Warranty	76,655	76,655	100%	-	-
FD495.01 WATER & SEWER MASTER PLAN 2017			212,876	-		-	212,876
FD496.01 WATER & SEWER REGIONAL MASTER PLAN 2017			2,150	-		-	2,150
P12720 TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	Master Plan/Report	Project Initiation & Planning	215,026	-	0%	-	215,026
Grand Total			253,561,049	145,892,059	58%	52,477,125	55,191,865

The following information pertains to the Stormwater Projects listed on the Consent Order Project Report. Paragraph 18 of the Amended Consent Order (CO) requires that the City pay \$2,116,500 in cash as civil penalties or implement In-Kind projects with a value of at least \$3,167,250 in lieu of making cash payment. This CO mandated that the project be either an environmental enhancement or an environmental restoration project. The City proposed to construct a new stormwater drainage system within the low lying areas of River Oaks Stormwater Analysis (P11868), Edgewood Area Stormwater Improvements (P11842) and the Osceola Canal as part of the Citywide Canal Dredging Plan - Cycle 1 (P12264) to offset the penalties. The proposal included multiple water quality improvements, such as several pollution control measures to treat stormwater runoff before it is discharged in the river, exfiltration trenches, dredging and bank stabilization, and a new wetlands area, in addition to typical stormwater best management practices. The proposal was approved by FDEP on January 20, 2021 and must be constructed by March 2024.



General Discussion and Comments

- Committee Members
- Public Comments