



DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, MARCH 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	3	0
Gerald Angeli	P	3	0
Shane Grabski (arr. 2:07)	P	2	1
James LaBrie	P	3	0
Charlie Ladd	A	1	2
Michael Marshall	A	1	2
Peter Partington	P	3	0
Jacquelyn Scott (dep. 4:01)	P	3	0
Roosevelt Walters	P	2	1
Ralph Zeltman	P	3	0

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

Staff

- Tracy Van Coit, Senior Administrative Assistant / Staff Liaison
- Patricia Jolly, Senior Administrative Assistant
- Alan Dodd, Director of Public Works
- Chris Bennett, Assistant Director of Public Works – [Strategic Planning](#)
- Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Kymberly Holcombe, Business Operations Manager
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- Rares Petrica, Senior Project Manager
- Sylejman Ujkani, [Project Program](#) 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 2:04 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

ii. Approval of Agenda

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

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

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Walters, to approve.

Mr. Partington noted a correction to p.11, paragraph 2: follow “construction management” with “at risk.”

Mr. Grabski arrived at 2:07 p.m.

Mr. Zeltman requested the addition of the phrase “by 1.87 times higher, almost doubling the existing rate” to p.10, paragraph 3, following “...water rates are being increased.”

Mr. Partington requested clarification that Mr. Zeltman was certain a member of City Staff had agreed to this figure. Mr. Zeltman stated that this was the case.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously [as amended].

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

Chair Mammano recalled that after the Committee's February 7, 2022 meeting, she had attended the next City Commission meeting in support of the Committee's communication, which expressed a preference for a request for proposal (RFP) rather than a public-private partnership (P3) for a new water treatment plant. However, the City Commission voted 3-2 in favor of a P3. They also ranked the proposals put forward for P3s and unanimously selected the IDE proposal. Chair Mammano advised that three of the City Commissioners felt it was more important to proceed quickly with the P3, as an RFP would require additional time.

Mr. Zeltman emphasized the importance of the City taking a strong role in developing the P3 contract to ensure there are no unintended consequences. Mr. LaBrie addressed the ranking of the P3 proposals, noting that the Commission also voted 3-2 to move forward with a comprehensive agreement with IDE. He also recalled that there had been significant Commission discussion of the item.

Chair Mammano advised that the Committee may have an opportunity, at a later time, to comment on the comprehensive agreement that will be drafted for the P3, relative to the concerns they had expressed at their February 7 meeting.

Chair Mammano continued that earlier in the Commission meeting, City Manager Chris Lagerbloom had indicated that the Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee (ITFAC) would be given a presentation from the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) regarding the issue of a tunnel beneath or a bridge over the New River. She asserted that

this was not a correct statement, and that the misunderstanding may have stemmed from the Committee's support for the City's preferred option. The Committee has never taken a formal position on this issue, but instead sent a communication to the City Commission supporting the City's pursuit, in principle, of a tunnel rather than a bridge.

Chair Mammano recalled that a copy of the Committee's statement of support for the City Commission's preference was also sent to FDOT District Four Secretary Gerry O'Reilly. She pointed out that the Mayor's Staff had encouraged the Fort Lauderdale public to write letters of support for a tunnel rather than a bridge. Mr. O'Reilly had indicated that FDOT would be happy to discuss the Broward Commuter Rail Project with the Committee, and Chair Mammano had accepted Mr. O'Reilly's offer to further discuss this project, of which the tunnel or bridge would be only one aspect of many.

Chair Mammano explained that the City Manager had informed the City Commission that no presentation on this issue to the ITFAC was necessary. The Commission had agreed with the City Manager's position.

Chair Mammano continued that the City Manager had instructed her to withdraw the Committee's invitation to FDOT to make a presentation. When the Chair had declined to withdraw the invitation, the City Manager had expressed the intent to withdraw the invitation himself. She noted that as a result, no presentation by FDOT on the Broward Commuter Rail Project was on today's Agenda.

Following the exchange with the City Manager regarding the proposed FDOT presentation, Chair Mammano had sent an email to the City Commission objecting to the City Manager's characterization of the presentation, pointing out that the Committee had not solicited a presentation on a tunnel or bridge. She received responses from two City Commissioners stating that they were not aware that a mischaracterization had occurred, and adding that the Committee should see a presentation on the project in order to have as much information as possible.

Chair Mammano concluded that FDOT will not make a presentation on the Broward Commuter Rail Project unless the Committee invites them to do so through City Staff, which is the traditional method of requesting a presentation. If the ITFAC wishes to see a presentation on the project, they will need to ask City Staff to arrange the presentation. If it cannot be arranged by Staff, she advised that the next step could be to ask the City Commission if they may see a presentation on the project.

Ms. Scott observed that the City Commission has taken "a very strong position" on the bridge v. tunnel issue, and was not certain that the Committee should see a presentation on the Broward Commuter Rail Project, as she was not clear on the role the Committee might play in this process.

Mr. LaBrie commented that he has learned a great deal of information on his own since the Committee made its recommendation of support for the City in principle. He stated

that he would not vote the same way today as he had in January 2022, but agreed with Ms. Scott that it would not be productive for the Committee to spend further time discussing this issue. He advised that he would, however, reach out personally to Broward County Commissioners and other individuals who would participate in making a final decision. Any such communication would be on an individual level and would not involve the opinion of the Committee.

Mr. Partington noted that FDOT will typically discuss projects with any party that expresses interest, recalling that he has corresponded with this Department as an individual on various issues in the past. He felt the Committee was unlikely to change its position in support of the City Commission, even if they saw a presentation on the overall project.

Mr. Walters advised that positions taken by the Committee are not likely to affect the outcome of any issue, as they are acting in an advisory capacity only. He stated that the Committee should move on from this item.

Chair Mammano reiterated that the Broward Commuter Rail Project is much larger than the decision of a bridge v. a tunnel, and will have a significant impact on the City's transportation infrastructure in terms of both roads and commuter rail. She added that the Committee's mission is to consider all aspects of infrastructure, as well as consideration of funding. She pointed out that the financing of the Broward Commuter Rail Project is currently in flux, as the process is still in its early stages.

Chair Mammano continued that there is no more significant project that will impact the City's infrastructure due to its potential use of one-cent transportation sales tax revenue, as the project will use funds originally intended to be used toward items such as bridge repairs, bus operations, community shuttles, and other aspects of transportation.

Ms. Scott commented that the Broward Commuter Rail Project represents one of the largest decisions ever to be made by local government, and advised that it is incumbent upon the public to educate itself about the issue. She noted that in addition to the use of sales tax revenue for funding, federal money will also be available. She stated once again that the Committee should not weight itself down further with this issue.

Mr. Walters pointed out that the addition of a project of this magnitude is likely to have an impact on the amount of surtax funds that were intended to go to individual Broward municipalities for their use on local projects. He expressed concern that the use of surtax funds for the project could constitute a slippery slope.

Mr. Zeltman recalled that when the Committee was originally appointed, the areas they were intended to focus on were outlined by the Mayor and Commissioners at that time. These included review of existing infrastructure, sidewalks, airports, seawalls, and other areas of concern. He asked if the Committee should seek additional guidance from the Mayor and the current Commission on whether or not they should evaluate an area not

specifically listed as part of their purview. Chair Mammano stated that the Commission has already indicated they do not want the Committee to focus outside these originally identified topics.

Mr. LaBrie recalled that both he and Mr. Zeltman had attended a recent City Commission meeting to provide individual input on the P3/RFP issue as residents rather than as Committee members. After Mr. Zeltman had spoken, Mr. LaBrie had identified himself as a member of the ITFAC, although he clarified that he was not speaking in representation of the Committee. The City Attorney had stated, however, that multiple members of an advisory entity may not speak, as this would constitute a violation of the Sunshine Law. Mr. LaBrie was not permitted to address the subject on which he had wished to speak.

Mr. LaBrie continued that he had reached out to the City Attorney following the City Commission meeting, requesting a meeting to discuss this further. He explained that he challenged this interpretation of the Sunshine Law, as he had intended to address the Commission as a private citizen although he had identified himself as a member of the ITFAC. He also pointed out that the two Committee members present had not discussed the recommendation made by the full Committee. He concluded that he was still awaiting a response from the City Attorney.

Ms. Scott pointed out that the Committee is not quasi-judicial in nature: while they may make recommendations to the City Commission, they do not vote on items that eventually go before the Commission for approval. She recalled a similar instance in which she had been asked not to speak at a City Commission meeting, although she had wished to speak as a member of a neighborhood rather than in an official position as Chair of the City's Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Partington suggested that the City Attorney may have wished to ensure that the process before the City Commission, which had involved a contract decision, could not be seen as having been open to any future challenge. He agreed, however, that the action taken by the City Attorney was disconcerting, as there may be members of the ITFAC who wish to express individual opinions but are prohibited from doing so if the Committee has discussed the issue on which they wish to opine.

Mr. Walters observed that perception is an important consideration when dealing with the Sunshine Law. While he did not agree with the City Attorney's opinion regarding individual input outside the auspices of the Committee, he felt the City Attorney may have acted to defend against possible misperception. Mr. Zeltman agreed that City officials, such as the City Manager or City Attorney, may be operating from a different perspective that makes their positions more difficult to understand at times.

Chair Mammano asserted that her concern was for First Amendment rights, and suggested that the City Attorney be invited to discuss this issue further with the Committee. She explained that she would like the City Attorney to clarify his interpretation

of the Sunshine Law, as well as additional clarification of the Committee's obligations under this law.

Public Works Director Alan Dodd stated that he would reach out to the City Manager and City Attorney to request a presentation on the Sunshine Law in general, as well as the specific interpretation of that law as it was applied to Mr. LaBrie's and Mr. Zeltman's presence at the recent City Commission meeting.

Mr. Partington congratulated the City for the recent award of \$10.5 million in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) dollars for stormwater improvements in the City's Durrs neighborhood. He continued that the Durrs neighborhood improvements are currently funded at nearly \$12.7 million, and asked if the application of \$10.5 million in CDBG dollars would allow some of these funds to be put to other uses. Mr. Dodd replied that the funds in question are awarded through a reimbursable grant: the City may ask the grant program to reimburse them for funds spent for up to \$10.5 million. Once the project has been closed out, any extra funds may be reappropriated for other stormwater projects.

Mr. Partington expressed concern with funding provided to the City through the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) as well as the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), pointing out that the Governor of Florida has indicated large amounts of this money will go toward storm sewage improvements in cities other than Fort Lauderdale, although Fort Lauderdale has experienced repeated sewer-related issues. He advised that he has seen no indication in the news in recent months that any of these funds will come to Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Dodd recalled that in February, the City Commission voted to provide for an individual who will assist with the writing of grants to seek these funds. There are also City Staff members in the Office of Management and Budget who work on grant applications. Mr. Partington explained that he was concerned with news articles addressing the use of the aforementioned federal funds throughout the state but with no mention of Fort Lauderdale.

Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee may wish to discuss this further in the future, noting that it is possible some funds may come directly to individual cities rather than passing through the state. She did not know, however, whether or not the Governor has made a decision on the distribution of these funds, nor if the federal government has made a decision to provide direct grants to cities. Mr. Dodd replied that the COVID-19 funding provided by ARPA came directly to cities approximately 18 months ago, while IIJA funding will come to state agencies. The City is awaiting guidance from the state on how they may apply for grants to access these IIJA dollars. Chair Mammano requested that once this guidance becomes available, the Committee discuss it further at a meeting.

Mr. Partington recalled that on February 2, 2022, the Governor announced that Florida would receive \$404 million to combat flooding related to sea level rise, with local

newspapers citing specific amounts to be allocated to municipalities such as Hollywood and Dania Beach with no mention of Fort Lauderdale.

Chair Mammano asked if Staff could provide the Committee with a list of all the grants for which the City has applied to various federal funding sources. Mr. Dodd replied that while he did not know everything the City has or has not applied for before he joined City Staff, he felt the funds to which Mr. Partington had referred may be from the Resilient Florida Program, which is a \$500 million funding source from which the Governor has made allocations. He reiterated that no municipalities have received funds from the IJA thus far, as the state has not yet issued instructions on how cities may apply for these dollars.

Chair Mammano reiterated that the Committee may wish to discuss the grants for which Fort Lauderdale has already applied as well as grants for which they may apply in the future. Ms. Scott added that the Committee may be able to take action as a group to help with the securing of these funds, possibly by making recommendations to the City Commission.

Mr. Zeltman stated that he would like the Committee to invite City consultant Hazen and Sawyer to a future meeting to discuss the prospective treatment process or processes that may be used by the planned water treatment plant. Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering), advised that the Carollo report includes a summary of potential methods.

3. Public Comments (at Each Item)

4. Old Business

i. Top 10 unfunded priority projects list

Mr. Dodd showed a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee, explaining that he would address not only which items are prioritized on the unfunded project list, but how they are prioritized. Issues and challenges facing the City include obsolete technology, aging infrastructure, deferred maintenance, the changing regulatory environment, jurisdictional issues, and the expectations of the public.

Mr. Dodd advised that one major issue is the City's economic growth, particularly in areas such as Downtown, where growth has outpaced the capacity of the existing infrastructure. This includes "upsizing" pipes at lift stations. In addition, the City is seeking not only to upsize infrastructure, but to implement infrastructure that is more energy-efficient, reliable, and durable.

Mr. Walters asked if the replacement of infrastructure is intended to provide satisfactory performance by today's standards or by future standards. Mr. Dodd replied that these decisions are made with consideration of any projected growth in the specific areas, based on what has already been approved or what may currently be in the development

process. When a pipe is put into the ground, for example, the expectation is that it will be there for 50 years. With this in mind, the City replaces most pipes by upsizing at least one size to accommodate projected growth or further build-out of the area.

Chair Mammano asked if Broward County population projections are used to make these estimates. Mr. Dodd replied that the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD) is responsible for these projections, which are used in modeling growth and the appropriate size of replacement pipes. Mr. Castellon added that the materials of the new pipes are also considered.

Mr. Walters asked if Broward County or Fort Lauderdale population projections are used. Mr. Dodd reiterated that Public Works uses projections provided by the DSD: he did not know that Department's source for their figures. Mr. Walters explained that his concern was in part due to Fort Lauderdale's support of other cities through its water system. He wished to know if the projected growth of these supported cities, such as Oakland Park, is also taken into consideration. Chair Mammano requested that a representative of the Department of Sustainable Development be invited to attend a future Committee meeting and explain how population projections are determined.

Mr. Dodd addressed how prioritization decisions are balanced, explaining that a number of factors must be taken into consideration:

- Legal requirements, such as Consent Orders
- Life, health, safety, and environmental issues
- High-risk infrastructure
- Developmental needs and future growth
- Integration of new technologies
- Developments that have occurred over the past 20 years
- Effects of climate change, including groundwater and sea level rise
- Incorporation of carbon neutrality goals
- Improve community resilience by measures such as undergrounding, where appropriate
- Provide redundancies in areas with single points of failure
- Support City Commission priorities

Mr. LaBrie requested additional information on impact fees. Mr. Dodd explained that impact fees for developments are determined through the DSD process; in some cases, a developer may make an infrastructure improvement in lieu of this fee. He did not know how Fort Lauderdale's impact fees compared to those of other cities, but pointed out that the fees must be proportionate to the level of impact the development will have on the infrastructure. They cannot be an arbitrary amount.

Mr. Dodd estimated that at present, the City has roughly \$600 million worth of Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects that have been identified for address in the current and upcoming years. Funding sources for infrastructure projects include:

- The City's General Fund
- Stormwater Fund
- Water and Sewer Fund

The Water and Sewer Fund is broken into two parts: the force main system that connects Fort Lauderdale to other municipalities, and the individual water fund which addresses gravity systems and smaller force mains.

Mr. Dodd moved on to roads, noting that the City has 536 miles of roadways, which are broken down into good, satisfactory, fair, or poor condition. Public Works receives approximately \$1.5 million each year for milling and resurfacing, ~~for which is done on~~ roads that are in poor to fair condition. Chair Mammano noted that 86 miles of roadways are classified in poor to ~~failed~~ fair condition.

Commented [JP1]: OK statement

Commented [JP2]: See legend - Exhibit

Another unfunded priority in addition to paving is alleyways, which are not part of a funded program within the City. The Department hopes to recommend that alleyways be considered for funding in next year's budget cycle.

Mr. Dodd continued that the City has 53 bridges. Public Works is working from a Bridge Master Plan which was completed in 2014; in addition, FDOT inspects the City's bridges on a regular basis, so more current details on the condition of bridges are available. At present, 18 bridges are considered structurally obsolete and need to be replaced, while others have had their load-bearing capacity reduced to lessen risk. Each of the 18 bridges in need of replacement would cost \$3 million to \$5 million. The City has identified and ranked bridges in need of work, prioritizing its top five, and has submitted this list to the County. The remaining bridges are listed in later years of the CIP.

Mr. Dodd explained that whenever a specific project is pushed up into a more recent fiscal year, something else must be postponed to accommodate this change. Bridges typically compete with other bridges for funding.

Chief Engineer Jill Prizlee advised that the following are the top five bridges prioritized ~~listed~~ in the ~~current CIP~~ City's bridge master plan for replacement:

- SE 13th Street over Cerro Gordo River
- ~~Laguana Lagoon~~ on Terrace over Diane River
- West Lake Drive over Diane River
- West Lake Drive over Lucille River
- West Lake Drive over Mercedes River

Chair Mammano asked how much money would be saved if Broward County pays for the repair/replacement of bridges submitted to them. Mr. Dodd pointed out that funded projects are listed separately in the CIP from unfunded ones. The City has provided the County with a priority list, although it is not known how much funding the County will provide toward these needs.

Ms. Scott asked who is responsible for outreach to the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to discuss the prioritization of City projects. Mr. Dodd replied that Ben Rogers of the Department of Transportation and Mobility is the City's primary contact with the MPO. He emphasized that Public Works and Transportation and Mobility work together to realize these projects.

Regarding sidewalks, Mr. Dodd pointed out that there have been a number of challenges for several years, including cracking and upheaval caused by tree roots. The City performed an assessment some years ago that identified 106 out of 465 miles of sidewalk in need of repair or replacement. Public Works has been working on this list for several years now.

Mr. Dodd also noted that in 2020, the responsibility for taking care of sidewalks was changed from a homeowner responsibility to a City responsibility, unless a homeowner did or allowed something to damage the sidewalk. Trees and tree roots can cause sidewalk damage, as can driving heavy vehicles over the sidewalks.

Ms. Prizlee recalled that a presentation was made to the Committee a few months ago, for which the backup materials included a copy of the Ordinance governing sidewalks. The Ordinance in question is C71-64, Sections 25-26. If an accident occurs on a City sidewalk that is in front of a private home or business, it is up to the City Attorney's Office to determine which party is liable for damages.

Commented [JP3]: Statement verified and approved to use by CAO Litigation Office

Chair Mammano asserted that Staff should be able to provide the Committee with an estimate of how much the City paid out in the previous fiscal year for "trip and fall" accidents on City sidewalks. It was determined that this information for the year 2020 until the present day -would be provided.

Ms. Scott asked how this information would be used by the Committee. Mr. LaBrie replied that they would make a recommendation to the City Commission to increase the budget for sidewalk repairs/replacement.

Mr. Dodd continued that approximately roughly \$1 million is included in the budget for sidewalk repairs. In the coming year, funding will also be sought for the construction of new sidewalks. This will be funded in part through impact fees. There has also been a request made for surtax money for this purpose, although it is not yet known whether or not this request will be approved.

Ms. Scott stated that repair of existing sidewalks should be prioritized over the construction of new sidewalks. Mr. Dodd clarified that surtax funds cannot be used toward maintenance: instead, they may be used to increase the capacity of infrastructure systems such as bridges and sidewalks, or to build new facilities on these systems. This can be a challenge for Fort Lauderdale, which is more built out than many other cities.

Mr. Dodd further explained that two City teams investigate sidewalks: one team is proactive and determines where improvements may be made and economies of scale may apply, while the other team is purely reactive and responds to complaints. Because there is a lack of funding for these programs in the current fiscal year, there is a backlog, which means it may be several months after a complaint has been received before the sidewalk is repaired.

It was noted that complaints of this type can be made using the LauderServe system. Ms. Scott commented that she would like to see a presentation on this system at a future meeting.

Mr. Dodd moved on to seawalls, explaining that while these structures are related to stormwater infrastructure, their improvements are typically funded through the General Fund. The City has 200 total miles of seawall, of which 4.8 miles are City-owned. Some seawalls are crumbling due to age and some are now too low to accommodate sea level rise.

Mr. Walters asked if money from the General Fund and Stormwater Fund are used exclusively on City seawalls. It was confirmed that this is the case. Mr. Walters asked if the City is providing any assistance to homeowners who cannot afford to repair, replace, or upgrade their own seawalls. It was confirmed that City dollars are not used for this purpose. Mr. Walters pointed out that City funds were used to assist homeowners in the implementation of sewer systems, and that seawalls are more expensive than sewers.

Ms. Scott pointed out that assistance from the City would help ensure that seawalls are raised in a more timely manner. Chair Mammano added that this expense could be amortized for homeowners. Mr. Dodd recalled that in 2021, the state of Florida considered a bill that would have added seawalls to the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) program, but this was ultimately not approved.

Mr. Walters explained that if the City repairs its seawalls, but the seawalls adjacent to these repairs are not also upgraded or replaced, there would be no improvement to seawater intrusion, which can flood public roadways. He noted, however, that it could be difficult to determine which homeowners require assistance. Chair Mammano suggested that there may be grant or other funds available at the state level for this purpose.

Ms. Scott asked if this has been discussed internally by City Staff. Mr. Dodd advised that there have been several such discussions, but the issue is the use of public money on private property. Mr. Partington suggested that a discussion of potential funding mechanisms for seawall improvements be placed on a future Agenda.

Mr. Dodd stated that the City maintains 146 buildings, for which the Parks Department oversees general maintenance. These buildings are included in the 40-year inspection process. He noted that the Fort Lauderdale Police Station is slated for replacement, and

the joint Public Works facility that would house the stormwater and roadway services teams has been prioritized by the Commission, although it is not yet in the budget.

Ms. Scott left the meeting at 4:01 p.m.

Mr. Dodd explained that at present, the stormwater team parks its vehicles at the CMS facility, while other parts of the team work from other buildings. The entire team is not at a single location from which it can be managed. The same is true for the road services team, which also lacks dedicated office space. Consolidating these maintenance crews in a single facility would improve efficiency and the advancement of the priorities they address.

Chair Mammano asked if the Committee wished to recommend to the City Commission that the joint Public Works facility be included in the next budget. Mr. Partington commented that the review of infrastructure priorities shows how difficult it is to balance the need for new facilities with many other needs throughout the City. Mr. Dodd emphasized that all of these priorities are important: however, all of the needs compete with one another as well as with priorities that are currently funded within the budget. Today's presentation showed the top unfunded priority projects across a variety of categories.

Mr. Dodd continued that his top priority at present is the joint Public Works facility. He also pointed out that fire safety is another important issue, and that construction of Fire Station #13 needs to be completed as well.

Mr. Walters asked how many unspent funds are left over after other projects and might be used toward projects on the unfunded priority list. Mr. Dodd advised that when money is left over, it is reallocated to a project within its same funding category as part of the budget process. Leftover funds from stormwater projects, for example, go toward other stormwater projects.

Mr. Dodd continued that other unfunded priority projects include increasing the number of streetlights and replacing existing lights with energy-efficient LED technology, as well as undergrounding of utilities in a number of neighborhoods. Any community may ask the City to begin an undergrounding project, which is paid for by an assessment of property owners in that community.

Mr. Dodd moved on to the Stormwater Master Plan, noting that the Committee has been briefed on this Item a number of times. The original Plan included seven neighborhoods, to which one more has been added. Projects are in construction for two of these communities and in design for another five communities. The eighth and final neighborhood has gone out for solicitation of the design process. These projects have been funded through a loan from the Stormwater Utility Fund. A \$200 million bond is in preparation and will eventually reimburse this loan.

Mr. Partington commented that a number of designs for neighborhood projects were done several years ago. Mr. Dodd recalled that when the Stormwater Master Plan was developed, it included payment for the design process for the original seven neighborhoods. These were already prioritized and fully designed as part of that Master Plan, and paid for from the Stormwater Utility Fund.

Mr. Dodd advised that one major issue with the water system is its size and complexity. Staff is working to map and update its system for better asset management and visibility, as well as projection of future needs. The consultant who will perform the GIS-digitized mapping has not yet been brought on board.

Mr. Dodd showed a list of currently funded projects that are underway, as well as a list of unfunded high-priority projects that will be included in future years of the CIP. He emphasized that these constitute a small number of the total list of projects in the CIP.

Chair Mammano requested an update on the smart meter project, which is currently not funded. Mr. Dodd explained that while this is a priority, the City does not have the \$30 million necessary to fund this project.

It was asked how much the smart meter project can be expected to save the City. Sylejman Ujkani, Project Manager, advised that there is the potential for up to \$500,000 in savings associated with meter readings. The new meters will also provide for more accurate technology in capturing water that is currently being lost. This is expected to provide significant revenue over the next eight to ten years.

Mr. Dodd noted that the Committee is very well-informed on the City's wastewater system. Significant progress has been made, particularly in relation to force main systems.

Chair Mammano requested additional information on a recent water main break in the Las Olas area, which necessitated a precautionary boil water advisory for some time. Mr. Dodd explained that the design of the pipe system in that area includes a number of "dead-end" pipes. When water pressure drops below 20 psi, which occurred while the break was being repaired, a precautionary boil water notice is necessary until there have been two days of clean readings. In this case, it took more time than anticipated to secure these clean readings. He concluded that very cold weather has a detrimental effect on old pipes due to contraction and expansion.

Mr. Dodd concluded by reviewing a list of funded and unfunded priority projects over future years, all of which are included in future CIPs. He estimated that there are another 60 to 80 projects in future CIPs: the ones listed for the Committee have been recognized as top priorities.

Chair Mammano recalled that the Committee has discussed providing the City Commission with a top ten list of priorities. Mr. Partington advised that the idea of a top ten list was suggested in the context of water and sewer projects alone: however, the

presentation showed how it would be difficult to finance one project or group of projects at the expense of another. He concluded that the Committee will need to determine if they want their top ten list to include water and sewer projects only or to be drawn from the more comprehensive presentation.

Chair Mammano asked that the presentation be revisited at the next Committee meeting.

ii. Training for new committee members

Chair Mammano recalled that this training was not limited to the basic training received by all City advisory body members, but was intended to be specific to what the Committee has discussed and accomplished in the past. Mr. LaBrie replied that he has discussed these issues with a number of Staff members and plans for further discussions in the future.

iii. Status update on the \$200 million stormwater bond

This Item was previously discussed under Old Business.

iv. Update on the smart meter project (AMI)

Full discussion of this Item was deferred until a later date.

5. New Business

i. [No Item listed]

6. Public Works Update

i. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping

ii. CIP Financial Report

1. Unfunded Balance Report

iii. Impact Fees – Usage

7. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

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

Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee
March 7, 2022
Page 15

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

