



DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2023 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

January-December 2023

Attendance

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	2	0
Peter Partington, Vice Chair	P	2	0
Gerald Angeli	P	2	0
Shane Grabski	A	0	1
James LaBrie	P	2	0
Michael Lambrechts	P	2	0
Michael Marshall (arr. 2:02)	P	2	0
Roosevelt Walters	P	2	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	2	0

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

Staff

- Alan Dodd, Director of Public Works
- Chris Bennett, Assistant Director of Public Works – Strategic Support
- Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works -- Sustainability
- Vickie Beauvais, Senior Administrative Assistant
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- Karen Warfel, Transportation Planning Manager
- Scott Teschky, Public Works – Engineering Division Manager
- Jamie Opperlee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

ii. Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Vice Chair Partington, to approve as written.

Chair Mammano requested that two Items be added to the Agenda under New Business: a discussion she had held with the Mayor regarding the Committee's priorities moving forward, and a letter the Committee had received from the Croissant Park Civic Association regarding drainage.

The **motion** passed unanimously (as amended).

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes: February 1, 2023 & February 6, 2023

Mr. Zeltman requested the following clarification to p.6, paragraph 5 of the February 6, 2023 minutes: add "vitrified" before the word "clay."

Vice Chair Partington requested that the meeting time for the February 1, 2023 meeting be corrected to 10 a.m.

Mr. LaBrie addressed p.3, paragraph 3 of the February 6 minutes, pointing out that the City Commission did not vote to proceed with the public-private partnership (P3) until after the Committee had made its recommendation in favor of a request for proposal (RFP). It was determined that "a year ago" would be added to the first sentence to clarify the timing of the Committee's recommendation and the Commission's vote.

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Vice Chair Partington, to approve with the three amendments/clarifications. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

2. Old Business

i. Water Plant Discussion

Chair Mammano advised that the comprehensive agreement for the new water treatment plant has been signed and groundbreaking is anticipated in late May/early June 2023.

ii. Comprehensive Agreement for Water Treatment Plant and Next Steps

Public Works Director Alan Dodd explained that there have been several meetings with the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD) and other agencies with regard to permitting. Water testing and sampling has begun and is expected to conclude later this week. This will allow for finalization of the membrane design and determine whether or not additional plant modifications will be necessary, based on the quality of the raw water. Additional preparatory work will be done on-site to enable the beginning of construction.

Mr. Lambrechts requested clarification of the date on which the comprehensive agreement was signed. Mr. Dodd replied that this was roughly within one week of the agreement's approval by the City Commission. The private entity, IDE/Ridgwood, has 42 months from the signing date to deliver the new plant.

Chair Mammano expressed concern with how the City's enabling work will dovetail with the private partner's work, as a failure to complete enabling work could extend the project's timeline. She recommended that the Committee focus on this work going forward.

Mr. Dodd advised that Assistant City Manager/Finance Director Susan Grant has begun work on bond funding. The bond is expected to be sold in October 2023, and an "intent to reimburse" Resolution will be brought before the City Commission in April so spending can begin. A task order is being prepared with owner's representative Hazen and Sawyer, which will include design review, preparation of design criteria packages, and other required documentation to move the enabling works forward. The City has also issued a solicitation for a company that will prepare the actual design packages for each of the enabling works.

Mr. Dodd further clarified that the intent to reimburse Resolution will be issued because there are no funds for the plant until the City sells bonds. Because the Commission knows bonds will be sold, a Resolution can be brought before them providing notice of the City's intent to reimburse. If the Commission approves this Resolution, this will allow for cash flow and the beginning of work while bond sales are put together. The City will reimburse itself once bonds are sold.

Vice Chair Partington asked where the approximately \$180 million in enabling works will come from. Mr. Dodd replied that this will come from part of the bond sales: the bond will be sold for the entire \$485 million needed for the project as well as the \$181 million for the enabling works. He reiterated that this will take place in the fall.

Vice Chair Partington also asked why the City needed to put forth a design solicitation. Mr. Dodd explained that Hazen and Sawyer acts as the owner's representative, which means they cannot create the actual design criteria packages for separate projects. They are helping the City prepare the solicitation and will assist in coordination of the projects.

Mr. LaBrie asked if Hazen and Sawyer is paid by hourly rate or by contract. Mr. Dodd replied that they are paid by hourly rate, based upon who performs the work for the City.

Mr. Lambrechts asked what the projected pricing of the bond would be. Mr. Dodd stated that he would defer to Assistant City Manager/Finance Director Susan Grant on this issue. Mr. Lambrechts explained that his concern was that these projections may have changed significantly since they were first estimated, and he would like to see the impact of these potential changes on the City's debt service.

Mr. Walters asked how it will be possible to keep track of the projects that are and are not being done before bond funds are available. Mr. Dodd replied that a cash flow projection will be built to show when money will be needed. The projects for which these dollars will be used are identified and put into the City's capital program as individual projects with certain amounts attached, based on what was approved by the Commission. The City will provide the cash needed for these projects through short-term loans or other means until the bonds are sold in October.

Chris Bennett, Assistant Director of Public Works (Strategic Support), further clarified that the City maintains reserve funds for daily operations and projects. They may maintain a lower balance of these reserves as long as there is the intent to issue bonds.

Chair Mammano asked how much of the \$121 million to be advanced by the private partner has been spent, as well as how these dollars are being tracked. Mr. Dodd replied that he did not have this information. Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee invite Assistant City Manager/Finance Director Susan Grant to discuss this further at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. LaBrie asked if the Committee should hear from the Senior Project Manager for the new water treatment plant. Mr. Dodd explained that Hazen and Sawyer, as owner's representative, is performing much of the administration of the overall project. The Senior Project Manager oversees Hazen and Sawyer's contract, reviews their invoices, and acts as a conduit between City Staff, the private partner, and Hazen and Sawyer. There are four additional Project Manager II positions beneath the Senior Project Manager.

Chair Mammano requested a list or spreadsheet of the various enabling projects and how they are managed. Mr. Dodd reiterated that the Senior Project Manager will oversee this, although there is not yet a timeline for all the projects. Annex B of the comprehensive agreement includes a rough overall schedule, although there is not yet a Gantt chart for the project.

Mr. Walters expressed concern with some of the guaranteed completions required by the project, asking what might happen if the City fails to meet some of its commitments. Mr. Dodd stated that as contracts are awarded for every part of the project, there are dates by which completion must be met or liquidated damages will occur. These would be particularly significant damages if the enabling works are not provided on time, as these delays would have an impact on the overall project.

Mr. Dodd continued that there are clauses within the comprehensive agreement which allow for change orders. At present, no substantial change orders are anticipated, although some minor modifications may be necessary. He acknowledged that future changes to the regulatory environment, for example, may require modification of the

plant's design; however, the City has tried to avoid change orders to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Dodd noted that the enabling works will be constructed primarily by the City, which means the City maintains any risks associated with these works. The City is also paying 100% of the cost of the enabling works, including any additional costs, with the exception of the pre-treatment facility, for which the private entity has given a guaranteed maximum price (GMP).

Chair Mammano recalled that when the final presentation was made to the City Commission, Staff had referred to bringing a discussion of the changing financial environment back to the Committee. Mr. Dodd explained that as the rate structure is considered for the upcoming year, the Assistant City Manager/Finance Director had indicated she would like to review these rates with the Committee, as well as specific options for debt servicing.

Mr. Dodd continued that the City is also considering applying for a Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) grant to help fund some of the enabling works. No grant programs have been identified, however, for which the plant itself would be eligible.

Mr. Angeli asked who is in charge of the "special topics" included in discussion of the plant, such as hurricane resistance, cybersecurity, and continuity of water delivery, suggesting there may be grant funds available for these specific needs. Mr. Dodd stated that in order to access these funds, the private entity would need to be asked if they would commit to the numerous federal requirements associated with these funds.

Chair Mammano requested that the Assistant City Manager/Finance Director be invited to the Committee's April meeting.

iii. Update on Sidewalks and Road Repairs

Chief Engineer Jill Prizlee showed a PowerPoint update on this topic, noting that \$1.5 million was budgeted for sidewalk and road repairs beginning on October 1, 2022. The City has since completed \$620,000 worth of work on street resurfacing, including locations such as SE 8th Avenue, Citrus Isle, Orange Isle, and NE 18th Avenue.

The City has scheduled another \$500,000 worth of upcoming work, which will include NE 16th Avenue, Kentucky Avenue, and 9th Avenue. Streets are prioritized according to a pavement condition index (PCI), and Staff seeks to distribute the work equally throughout the City.

The \$620,000 funded the equivalent of 3.66 miles, while the \$500,000 task order will pave roughly 2.87 miles. The City has 536 miles of roadway under its jurisdiction. All

budgeted funds for sidewalk/roadway repairs must be spent before September 30, 2023.

Chair Mammano commented that the City should consider increasing this budget further in future years. Mr. Bennett advised that for a city of Fort Lauderdale's size, it would take an infusion of over \$20 million each year over the next five years to raise its PCI averages. Afterward, another approximately \$5 million per year would be required for a roadway maintenance program, which would include methods other than milling and resurfacing to prolong the life of the asphalt.

Mr. Zeltman asked if all underground work for damaged roadways is addressed before the roadways are repaired to ensure it does not undermine the work. Ms. Prizlee confirmed that the City ensures sub-grade materials are in good condition and will not have to be addressed again over the next few years.

Mr. Walters asked if any of the City's 536 miles of roadway are co-owned by the state or federal highway system. Ms. Prizlee replied that these miles are under City jurisdiction only and do not include Broward County or Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) roadways.

Mr. LaBrie asked how much it should cost to repair one mile of roadway. Mr. Bennett replied that this is \$150,000 to \$200,000 with milling, resurfacing, spot-patching, and repairs. This is subject to variation based on the width and number of lanes.

Vice Chair Partington commented that this shows the insufficiency of gas tax money to properly fund maintenance of the City's roadways. He also noted that gas tax revenue may be diverted to other purposes. He pointed out that other cities, such as Oakland Park, are using Broward County surtax funding to repave their roadways, and asked why more Broward municipalities are not provided with surtax dollars for this purpose.

Mr. Dodd advised that the City Commission plans to address surtax projects at its next Conference Agenda meeting. He pointed out that surtax program projects must meet specific requirements, such as expansion of roadway capacity; in addition, the City is limited in the number of surtax projects they may submit for consideration. There have been recent changes to the criteria for surtax projects, including prohibition of using funds for regular operations and/or maintenance.

Karen Warfel, Transportation Planning Manager, explained that in the first year of the surtax, extra money was available for repairs and maintenance only; however, most cities have not received these funds, and the Public Works Department has moved in another direction for their critical projects. Repair and maintenance funding is no longer offered through the surtax, which now focuses on expanding roadways. Eligible Fort Lauderdale projects include expansion of a roadway in the River Oaks community and improvements to NE 26th Street.

Mr. Walters asked what the City has done with its share of the one-cent surtax. Ms. Warfel replied that there is no City share of these funds: they are project-based only and focus on the expansion of roadways.

Mr. Bennett further clarified that Fort Lauderdale receives approximately \$1 million each year in gas tax funds. Ms. Prizlee added that there is a separate asphalt resurfacing program funded with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) dollars within the boundary of a particular area.

Chair Mammano concluded that more funding for sidewalk/roadway repairs should be requested in the next budget cycle as well. It was noted that these dollars typically come from the General Fund.

Chair Mammano asked if the City has sufficient staff to undertake more repair projects if they received more funding. Ms. Prizlee advised that the same amount of work is done to manage \$1 million in funding as could be done in managing \$2 million. One key factor is whether or not contractors wish to bid on this type of work. The current contract expires early next year, after which time the City will need to go out for bid once more. There is no way to predict the changes in prices that may occur by that time.

Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works (Sustainability), added that when the City undertakes large infrastructure projects, they typically put down new roads. Other roadways are being replaced as infrastructure projects are done. These improvements fall under a separate category from sidewalk/roadway repairs and are paid for out of the funding for those projects.

Mr. Zeltman observed that there are different sidewalk widths in different Fort Lauderdale communities, typically depending upon the communities' age. He asked if the City hopes to standardize this size. Ms. Prizlee replied that new sidewalks are installed to the current standard width of 5 ft.

Mr. Zeltman also asked if analysis is necessary to determine where sidewalks can be installed in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and its standards. Ms. Prizlee explained that this is considered on a case-by-case basis. Street resurfacing is sometimes coupled with necessary sidewalk repairs.

Mr. Walters recalled that at one time, if trees planted by the City damaged a sidewalk in front of a resident's house, that resident would be responsible for the cost of repairs. Ms. Prizlee replied that this Ordinance was changed in 2020 and the burden is most often placed on the City. Exceptions may occur if the sidewalk is in front of a business which uses heavy equipment, which may damage the sidewalk.

Chair Mammano asked if funds from settlements and claims are used toward sidewalk improvements. Ms. Prizlee explained that settlements and claims are a separate section of the budget and is not a source of funds for repairs.

Ms. Warfel advised that while the subject funds are used for sidewalk maintenance, there are times in which a new sidewalk may be installed or repaired to correct a situation. She cited the example of a short sidewalk segment installed in the Harbordale neighborhood, where Code Compliance had received numerous complaints from residents.

Mr. Dodd added that a sidewalk gap analysis is being prepared to determine where there are missing segments. Public Works is partnering with the Department of Transportation and Mobility to add these segments to the long-term program. There are at least 20 miles of sidewalk gaps that have been requested and will be prioritized, depending in part on their proximity to schools or parks as well as the roadway classification.

Ms. Warfel continued that when this presentation was made to the Committee in 2022, they had expected roughly \$200,000 for implementation of this program; however, no additional funds were budgeted for sidewalks. \$180,000 was budgeted for the gap and condition analyses.

Dr. Gassman advised that her team has worked on laser imaging, detection, and ranging (LIDAR) scanning of the entire right-of-way as part of their continuing work with asset management. The intent is to map the City's curbing, swales, roads, and sidewalks. Once the work is done and the data collected, it will be determined whether or not a task order is necessary to perform additional analyses to gather more information on sidewalk condition, roadway condition, and sidewalk gap analysis. This can be brought back to the Committee for presentation once more data has been processed.

Mr. LaBrie asked where the funds came from for the installation of new sidewalks along Bayview Drive. Ms. Warfel replied that these came from the Broward Metropolitan Transportation Organization (MPO), which is the regional transportation planning agency which distributes federal safety dollars for mid-range local projects on City roads funded at \$1 million to \$3 million. Broward County also implements similar projects on County roadways.

Vice Chair Partington asked which entity makes decisions on the spending of surtax dollars. Ms. Warfel replied that the Broward County Board of County Commissioners makes these budget determinations. The Broward MPO assists by reviewing projects and identifying whether or not they are eligible for surtax funding; the projects then go before the County Oversight Board, which makes the final determination on eligibility and provides a funding recommendation to the County Commission.

Mr. Angeli asked if developers undertaking new construction are responsible for providing any sidewalks. Ms. Warfel confirmed that new development must create these streetscapes. The Department of Urban Planning, which is part of the DSD, addresses

this need during development review to ensure sidewalks, landscape buffers, and other requirements are included in projects.

3. New Business

i. Increasing Permit Capacity at Sewer Treatment Plant

Mr. Bennett recalled that Public Works issues capacity letters for water and sewer demand created by development. They monitor the actual permitted capacity in comparison to the demand on the system. At present, the City's systems are very close to exceeding this capacity. With this in mind, Public Works is looking into different ways to physically increase capacity, as well as considering how the requirements behind the permit were originally calculated and the potential to increase the permitted capacity, which is different from physical capacity.

Mr. Bennett continued that Public Works has partnered with consultants and reached out to the County to explore the possibilities of increasing physical capacity as well as permit capacity. Permit capacity is calculated based upon the physical capacity as well as peaking factors. The City can show, using current calculation methods, that there may be the possibility of raising the plant's capacity. They are also studying the physical constraints of the plant itself to determine what small and affordable projects can be done to increase physical capacity. This could be presented to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to request that the plant's capacity be re-rated.

Mr. Bennett advised that at present, the City does not have any answers to this issue; however, they believe that a few minor Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects at the George T. Lohmeyer Wastewater Treatment Plant may be able to help the plant be re-rated for a higher number, which would also affect the plant's County permit. The City is also spending significantly more than in previous budgets to address infiltration and inflow (I&I) in an attempt to reduce the flows coming into the system.

Vice Chair Partington recalled a previous presentation which addressed the actions that could be taken to increase capacity. Mr. Bennett reiterated that this includes actions that can be taken at the plant to improve its numbers, as well as working with DEP and the County to agree to increase its permit capacity. Another option is requesting more than \$100 million over the next five years of the CIP to address I&I.

Mr. Dodd further explained that some projects in the development process have requested capacity letters to determine the water and sewer capacity a building will need. It was recently determined that the City will not reserve these allocations until the project reaches the permitting stage. The capacity letters are being rewritten to reflect the actual committed allocation that is determined at the time of permitting.

Vice Chair Partington asked why Staff would believe the plant's capacity is greater than its permitted number, and what actions would be taken to increase this capacity. Mr.

Bennett replied that Broward County's calculation of the plant's capacity includes a peaking factor and is based on a 12-month rolling average of daily flows. This is known as Average Annual Daily Flow and differs from the three-month annual average daily flow calculations used by DEP. The County looks at the last five years' worth of flow data to determine the peaking factor that is applied to the plant, which downgrades the plant's physical capacity. During the last two renewal cycles, the plant was not re-rated at the time of permit renewal. The City's numbers show that the plant should be re-rated and gain either one half or a full MGD of additional capacity according to the last five years of flow data.

Vice Chair Partington asked what is currently in the pipeline to physically improve the capacity of the Lohmeyer plant. Mr. Bennett replied that there are no specific projects in the CIP that would accomplish this other than continued I&I flow reduction, as well as a request to begin cleaning injection wells on a two- to two-and-a-half-year basis as opposed to the current five-year basis required by permits. By cleaning these wells more often, the capacity of the plant will degrade less and will remain closer to the designed physical capacity.

While there are no projects of this nature currently in the CIP pipeline, Staff is considering adding them as CIP requests in order to continue increasing the plant's physical capacity. Cleaning the injection wells only every five years can decrease their capacity from 93 MGD to roughly 80 MGD at the end of the cleaning cycle. A major rain event, or mechanical or electrical failure at the plant, can result in overflows that require use of emergency outfall, which must be reported to DEP. The water that is sent through outfall is the same water that would otherwise be put into an injection well.

Vice Chair Partington asked why outfall must be reported to DEP. Mr. Bennett advised that any event which requires use of the outfall must be reported to DEP. He added that the City is lucky to have this outfall due to the grandfathering of its permits, which were renewed approximately 20 years ago. This type of outfall is not allowed in more modern plants.

Mr. Zeltman addressed I&I, asking if the City has determined how much this has decreased and how much more time would be needed to reduce I&I even further. Mr. Bennett stated that there is currently not enough reduction to show a large percentage decrease at the plant; the decrease can, however, be seen at the various basins and pump stations. He explained that lining a pipe in one place can create more flooding at other points, which means until the entire system has been re-lined, there will not be a large overall reduction at the end point.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of the physical limit of the injection wells. Mr. Bennett replied that when the wells are fully cleaned, their limit is approximately 93.5 MGD.

Vice Chair Partington asked how Staff would characterize the water that is either injected into wells or ejected through outfall overflow. Mr. Bennett replied that while fully treated effluent is not safe for consumption, exposure to this water would not be harmful to a person. Treating this effluent to make it drinkable would require two additional stages of treatment, including high-level disinfection.

Dr. Gassman added that the City is not permitted to discharge potable water into its waterways. The goal for treated effluent is not the same goal as for drinking water. Any discharged water is fully treated so there is no human impact, although there is a nutrient flux when treated water is discharged in emergencies.

Chair Mammano requested an update on an additional pipe that would send water from the plant to the injection wells. Mr. Bennett explained that the City is finalizing a criteria package to put this item out for bid for the design/build process. They have worked with the County to ensure all necessary agreements are in order to install this pipe to the wellheads. The new pipe will be a redundancy of an existing pipe and will become the primary use pipe, with the older pipe serving as backup once the new one is in place.

Vice Chair Partington asked if Fort Lauderdale treats any effluent coming in from other cities. Mr. Bennett replied that the City has agreements with Wilton Manors, Oakland Park, and portions of Tamarac and Davie, as well as Port Everglades and other small inflows. The City does not have control over those municipalities' address of I&I in their own systems, nor of the developments they may be approving. The City meets quarterly with the larger sewage users, but cannot require them to provide the City with permit requests for capacity allocation.

Mr. Bennett continued that the large users, such as Wilton Manors and Oakland Park, are exceeding the numbers set forth in their permits. The City can fine these cities for the overage, but is not likely to convince them to deny developments that could bring them millions of dollars of income. He noted that a recent plan use amendment proposed by Wilton Manors triggered the addition of a requirement that they let Fort Lauderdale know about pending developments of 0.1 MGD or more.

Mr. LaBrie asked if the City charges Wilton Manors and Oakland Park additional fees for sewer treatment. Mr. Dodd explained that the cities pay a 25% surcharge on their water and sewer rates; if they exceed their allocations, they are charged another 25%.

Chair Mammano requested that the Committee discuss how the water/sewer capacity availability calculations are made in greater depth at a future meeting, as it is no longer the same procedure they had discussed previously. Mr. Dodd recommended that Assistant City Manager Anthony Fajardo be present for this discussion.

ii. Discussion with the Mayor

Chair Mammano explained that she had met with Fort Lauderdale Mayor Dean Trantalis, who requested clarification of what the Infrastructure Task Force Committee (ITFC) will focus on going forward. She had advised that the Committee hoped to continue monitoring other infrastructure issues now that the comprehensive agreement for the water treatment plant has been signed. She had indicated interest in focusing on roads and sidewalks, as well as water quality in the City's canals and waterways. She requested additional feedback from the Committee members on future topics.

Mr. Marshall commented that roads and sidewalks are likely to constitute a large segment of infrastructure once the Committee begins to fully explore these areas. He noted that topics could include how this infrastructure is being paid for and the extent to which it is subsidized. Other areas of interest could be user fees, which are used to offset capital expenditures for the infrastructure and service provided, and how these fees are understood in the context of roads and sidewalks.

Mr. LaBrie observed that he felt the water/sewer discussion was ongoing, and also expressed interest in further discussing roads and sidewalks. He added that the Committee has also discussed bridges in the past. He felt water quality might be more accurately discussed as a sustainability issue.

Chair Mammano explained that there are multiple subjects under water quality, citing the example of the City's Seawall Ordinance as an example. The City's Ordinance is required to comply with Broward County's Ordinance; however, the City's Ordinance does not address topics such as living seawalls that help clean the water. Dr. Gassman clarified that the County's Ordinance requires that anyone replacing natural shoreline with a new tidal barrier must provide habitat as part of the replacement. Chair Mammano concluded that she felt water quality was part of the Committee's charge.

It was noted that there is likely to be some overlap with the City's Budget Advisory Board (BAB), and the two advisory entities may inform one another. Chair Mammano suggested that a joint meeting between the Committee and the BAB could be scheduled in the future, as could a joint meeting with the City's Sustainability Advisory Board.

Mr. Angeli stated he was in favor of continuing the Committee's discussion of water, as it is both an infrastructure item and a mode of transportation in Fort Lauderdale. He also felt they should discuss multiple modes of transportation and how they interact with one another as a system, including interaction across jurisdictions.

Vice Chair Partington noted that the Ordinance which created the Committee has a sunset date and includes many of the issues the members hope to address. He suggested placing this Ordinance on a future Agenda.

Mr. Zeltman addressed canals, pointing out that the city of Miami is restoring some of its deeper canals to lesser depths in order to promote a healthier marine environment. He proposed a discussion of how Fort Lauderdale's canals could benefit from similar

action, as well as how the effect this type of change would have on other marine considerations.

Mr. Zeltman concluded that the issue of the deep injection well at the Peele-Dixie Water Treatment Plant may also be a topic for additional discussion, as the loss of this well could result in the shutdown of that plant by DEP.

Mr. Walters stated that the Committee may wish to review what they have discussed in the past since its inception, including early goals and objectives, what has been completed, and what has not been completed. He pointed out that none of the major issues they have discussed, such as water, sewer, and stormwater concerns, have been completed, nor have many of the smaller issues addressed in the past. He also recommended that the Committee discuss affordable and workforce housing, particularly with regard to transportation systems, as these two issues are related.

Mr. Lambrechts agreed that there are some areas of overlap, such as the impact of infrastructure, including sewers and drainage, on waterways, contributing to the quality of that water. He also agreed that waterways as a mode of transportation should also be discussed, as use of this mode has expanded significantly and become more dangerous as a result. He was not certain that homeowners understood the potential importance of providing habitats as a part of tidal barriers.

Mr. Lambrechts continued that other municipalities designate a chief bay officer whose primary focus is water quality, and suggested that Fort Lauderdale may wish to consider adding this type of position in recognition of the importance of its waterways.

Mr. Zeltman added that it could be helpful if the City informed the Committee of how they might be able to assist the City in addressing various infrastructure issues. Chair Mammano concluded that the Committee would discuss their interests further at a later meeting.

iii. Letter from Croissant Park Civic Association

Chair Mammano advised that the Committee received a letter from a member of the Croissant Park Civic Association regarding flooding in a portion of that neighborhood where swales are the primary source of water retention. Chair Mammano asked how the Committee could best respond to this type of concern, and whether or not they wished to address this specific circumstance.

Dr. Gassman explained that while she had not received direct correspondence from the Association member, she had been forwarded a copy of the email. She described how the drainage system in that area works, pointing out that it is a multijurisdictional area with several direct outfalls. The City has programs to rehabilitate swales where appropriate; however, as the letter does not describe the exact location of the problem, she could not address it with specificity.

Dr. Gassman continued that the City's stormwater operations manager has not reported any ponding in Croissant Park that exceeds City standards, with the exception of extreme rain events. When these events occur, the system will require more time to manage the amount of water it receives. She concluded that she has emailed the resident to request the specific location of the issue with which he was concerned.

Mr. Zeltman stated that he had spoken with the resident to discuss the issue, including different modes of drainage used by the City in different locations. Dr. Gassman recommended that individuals with concerns about flooding call the City's 828-8000 line, which would generate a work order to examine whether or not a flood assessment or other work may be needed.

Dr. Gassman continued that the City is proactively undertaking swale replacement in some neighborhoods. In Croissant Park, some residents have replaced swales with rock to use them as parking areas. She reiterated that the resident was asked to advise City Staff of the exact location with which he was concerned, and to report that location using the 828-8000 number if he felt drainage was being impeded in that area.

Mr. LaBrie requested an update on the City's Stormwater Master Plan at a future meeting. He also suggested that the Committee further discuss who may respond or how in the future.

Chair Mammano observed that while the Committee may wish to be helpful to residents who may contact them, a direct response may not be the best tactic. She felt the more appropriate response in this case would have been to direct the individual to reach out to Dr. Gassman or the City's customer service line to express concern, as the Committee is not equipped to become involved in specific community complaints. Mr. Lambrechts agreed that the Committee would not want to accidentally give the impression that they can act as liaison to the customer service line. The Committee agreed by consensus to proceed in that manner should similar issues arise in the future.

- 4. Public Works Update**
 - i. Water & Sewer Breaks Report w/Mapping**
 - ii. CIP Financial Report**
- 5. General Discussion and Comments**
 - i. Committee Members**

Mr. Walters thanked Staff for their presentations and assistance at today's meeting as well as at previous meetings. Mr. Angeli also thanked Mr. Dodd and Public Works Staff for arranging a tour of the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant for him.

ii. Public Comments

None.

6. Adjournment – NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE – Monday, April 3, 2023

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

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

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