



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**DRAFT**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE EXECUTIVE AIRPORT**  
**RED TAILS CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**6000 NW 21 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**  
**MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2023 – 2:00 P.M. TO 4:30 P.M.**

**January-December 2023**

**Attendance**

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	5	0
Peter Partington, Vice Chair	A	4	1
Gerald Angeli	P	3	2
Shane Grabski (arr. 2:04)	P	3	1
James LaBrie	P	5	0
Michael Lambrechts	A	3	2
Michael Marshall (arr. 2:13)	P	4	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	5	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	5	0

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

**Staff**

Chris Bennett, Assistant Director of Public Works – Strategic Support  
Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering  
Vickie Beauvais, Senior Administrative Assistant  
Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer  
Susan Grant, Assistant City Manager/Finance Director  
Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to the City Commission**

None.

**1. Call to Order**

**i. Roll Call**

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

**ii. Approval of Agenda**

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

**iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – May 1, 2023**

**Motion** made by Mr. Zeltman, seconded by Mr. Walters, to approve.

Mr. Zeltman stated that he would like to see his comments on the excellent job done by City Staff in addressing and minimizing the effects of the April flood included in the minutes. It was determined by consensus to include this in the current minutes.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**2. Old Business**

**i. Water Plant Financing and Rate Scenarios**

Sergio Masvidal and Mara Lugo, representing PFM Financial Advisors, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the financing scenarios considered for the new water treatment plant. The objective is to fully fund the capital obligations for the plant in the most cost-effective manner possible to help to mitigate the rate increase.

Mr. Masvidal explained that at present, there is approximately \$480 million in outstanding bonds in the City's existing water and sewer revenue bond credit. There are four outstanding bond series dating back to 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018. The maximum annual debt service is roughly \$32 million. This amount is "front-loaded," with the majority of the principal and interest debt service occurring in the first 10 years. This amount will step down in 2036.

Mr. Grabski arrived at 2:04 p.m.

Mr. Masvidal continued that there are different ways in which financing is structured within the municipal bond community. One is a level debt service structure, which is similar to the structure of a home mortgage, as payments remain the same every year. A wrapped debt service structure considers the existing bond portfolio and debt service payment and "wraps the debt around" this to create aggregate level debt service. In this case, the payment will remain the same every year without a step-down function.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of how this structure would affect the four previous debt series. Mr. Masvidal replied that those four series will remain as they are, with the new series wrapped around them. This allows the previous bonds to retain their interest rates.

With regard to construction funds, there can be a gross funded concept or a net funded concept. A gross funded concept will issue bonds for the full amount of the project at the time it is closed upon, while a net funded concept will use a

collateralized investment agreement within the construction funds in which interest can be earned to create the necessary proceeds. Roughly 18 months ago, net funding would not have been an option, as interest rates were very low and little would have been earned on the shorter part of the construction curve. At present, this yield curve has increased significantly, which means money could be earned.

Another concept is the rate covenant, in which the City enters into a covenant to maintain net revenues at a certain level for both newly issued and outstanding bonds. This allows the debt, and any other obligations, to be serviced on an annual basis. Fort Lauderdale's rate covenant is 1.25, which means the revenue must be 125% of the City's obligations every year. This provides a cushion for investors. 125% is a standard amount for water and sewer utilities. The maximum annual debt service is the maximum amount paid in any given year on the total amount of outstanding debt.

An additional bonds test, which is similar to the rate covenant, is also 125%. This means when the City issues new bonds, the Finance Director must sign a certificate stating that the revenues for 12 of the past 24 months are sufficient to cover the maximum debt service on existing debt service plus the new bonds expected to be issued.

Mr. Masvidal noted that in addition to this historical revenue perspective for an additional bonds test, there is also a provision within that test which allows the City's rate consultant to certify that a new rate structure, determined prior to the issuance of the additional bonds, would be sufficient to cover that amount.

Mr. Marshall arrived at 2:13 p.m.

Mr. Masvidal stated that the plan of finance has been written in three discrete components. The enabling works constitute roughly \$189 million on a gross basis. Because the City has roughly \$12 million in capital reserves, this will mean \$177 million goes toward enabling works alone. Another separate component is the \$485 million water plant, of which \$121.25 million will be funded from the project company. These payments are subordinate to the City's bonds. The remaining \$363 million will be funded with City-issued bonds from the water and sewer system.

Mr. Masvidal reviewed a chart showing when payments are expected within the project's construction schedule. The private entity will fund the initial part of the project through November 2023, after which time the City will begin making its payments. The first \$121 million is already in use through October 2023 and will cover up-front costs, including design as well as costs associated with the comprehensive agreement. Ms. Grant noted that \$20 million had already been spent by the time the City and the private entity signed the comprehensive agreement.

Chair Mammano asked if the City is required to pay the private entity back their \$121 million through rates. Ms. Grant advised that the City will make an availability

payment, which will be addressed during the rate discussion. The availability payment will not be made until the plant is fully commissioned.

Each of the four possible funding scenarios assumes that the \$177 million for enabling works is funded through 2023 A bonds. The City's remaining obligation to the water plant for \$363 million will be funded through 2023 B bonds. Both the A and B issuances will close at the same time.

Scenario 1 is for level debt service. Issuing the 2023 A and B bonds on a level basis over 30 years will fund 100% of the water plant and enabling works. Scenario 2 also includes level debt service on a single issuance, but is amortized over 40 years. This option would make for smaller payments, although the interest over the longer period of time will make the total payment greater.

Scenario 3 uses the wrapped debt service structure discussed earlier. When the existing payments step down in 2036, this scenario will "fill in" those payments, as the principal has been deferred to create level debt service with all outstanding water and sewer bonds. While previous bonds will not be affected, they are taken into consideration when the new bond is structured.

Scenario 4 also uses the wrapped debt service structure, but, because the project does not need funding through 2025 to date, postpones the issuance of the second bond until 2024. Ms. Grant emphasized that while this option is not recommended for the City, it is shown to demonstrate that the City has looked at every possibility. Part of the risk associated with this scenario is the potential for increasing interest rates.

Mr. LaBrie asked what the advantage to Scenario 4 might be. Mr. Masvidal explained that this scenario was explored to determine if an advantage existed; however, due to the current yield curve, no advantage was identified.

Another potential benefit to Scenario 4 could have been that the City would not issue all the bonds at once, therefore not taking on all the principal interest payments at once. The downside, however, would be that net funding could not be used and there would be no interest earned on that part of the construction fund.

Mr. Walters asked which scenario was used by Staff to project the total cost of the project. Ms. Grant explained that this has not yet been budgeted, as the bonds will not be issued until October 2023. The City is currently using Scenario 3, although she noted that this could be changed. The larger piece of the availability payment will not be made until the plant is commissioned in fiscal year (FY) 2027.

Mr. Masvidal showed a comparison of the four scenarios, noting again that Scenario 1 provides level debt service over 30 years, while Scenario 2 provides the same level debt service over 40 years. While each payment over this longer period would be smaller, the total payment at the end would be significantly larger.

If the principal interest is wrapped around the existing debt, as shown in Scenario 3, the payment would remain the same every year without the future step-down. The initial impact to the rate payer will be lower, and because the principal is deferred, it would not contribute to an excessive payment in comparison to the other scenarios. The payment would be stable.

Scenario 4 would issue bonds later than in Scenario 3, which would not have a significant impact and would not be as good a fit for the City. Scenario 4 is not recommended.

Mr. Masvidal also reviewed the amounts of each scenario, noting that Scenario 1 offers the lowest cost for the bond payments only. The total debt service, which includes both principal and interest, would be approximately \$950 million over a 30-year period, with an average annual payment of \$32 million. Maximum annual debt service would be \$63 million, which is the greatest amount among the four scenarios and would have the largest immediate rate impact.

Scenario 2, which extends the time frame to 40 years instead of 30, would increase the true interest cost by roughly 20 basis points. Total debt service would increase to \$1.1 billion over the 40-year period, with a maximum annual debt service of \$60 million.

Scenario 3, which is recommended for the City, would have a total debt service of roughly \$100 million higher than Scenario 1. The maximum annual debt service would be \$57 million, which would have a significant impact on utility rates. Scenario 4, which is shown primarily for purposes of comparison, would not be recommended for a project of this nature, as it would be preferable to lock in the cost of funds.

Ms. Grant noted that additional backup materials on the proposed scenarios are included in the appendix of the documentation provided to the Board. These show how potential increases in interest rates would affect the scenarios.

Mr. Walters asked if current market instability was one reason Scenario 3 is recommended over, for example, Scenario 1. Mr. Masvidal advised that while the market is volatile at the moment, it is hoped that some of this volatility has been worked through and recent funding increases from the Federal Reserve will further stabilize matters.

The recommendation of Scenario 3 is based on the typical nature of wrapped debt service for water/sewer bonds, as this is preferable to incurring a great deal of level debt service right away and stacking it onto existing debt. It considers the outstanding debt when determining the best time for the addition of new debt in order to smooth the rate impact. The \$57 million maximum annual debt service is also a best-case scenario for that component.

Andrew Burnam, representing Stantec, stated that part of the company's work with Fort Lauderdale is the maintenance of financial forecasting tools, which are helpful when considering multiple scenarios about how certain expenditures will affect the rates paid by citizens. This is part of the annual budget development process for both capital and operating costs.

Mr. Burnam reviewed the baseline forecast for the water system, which does not include incremental availability, incremental operations and maintenance, or debt payments. Because the City has already had two years of 8.6% water rate increases in anticipation of the new plant, they could actually increase rates by no more than 3% over the forecast period if no new plant was planned. This would be sufficient to cover operating expenses, renewal and replacement expenses, and planned bond issuances for other major capital projects.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of where the 5% surcharge for the plant would occur. Ms. Grant noted that this was included in the 8.6% increases from the current and previous years. The new rate increase will be based on the numbers generated by the City's chosen scenario: for example, if Scenario 3 is selected, the increase will be 17% in FY 2024 and FY 2025, followed by two additional 10% increases and two 5% increases. Without the water treatment plant, these increases would be 3% each year.

Mr. Burnam continued that once the baseline has been established, costs associated with the water plant are added, along with the availability payment, which is \$1.61 per thousand gallons for 50 million gallons per day (MGD). This is the amount to which the City has already committed. Incremental operations and maintenance costs will also be added beginning in 2027. With all other factors remaining the same, the only difference between the financing scenarios reviewed by Mr. Masvidal was the debt service payments. This shows the rate impacts that would be passed on to customers, including repayment of the \$121 million, which is already part of the rate structure.

Mr. Burnam noted that because Scenario 1 would incur debt right away at the same level, rates would increase very quickly in this option, as they would need to support a higher debt payment on top of the existing payment. This would mean two years of 21.5% increases, followed by two years of 7% increases to account for other incremental expenses, and 5% per year thereafter. Because these increases would compound beginning in 2024, by 2033 the increase would have reached 127% compared to a baseline of 34%.

Mr. Zeltman asked if, once the new water plant is in operation, the City would be paying 15% more for raw water, which is the percentage lost to the nanofiltration process. Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering), clarified that while the City will be using more water, they will not be paying for more water.

Mr. Burnam continued that Scenario 2, which is the 40-year option, would stretch the process out an additional 10 years, making the annual payment slightly less. This would allow the rate increase to be spread out as well. Instead of two 21.5% increases, this could be lowered to two 19% increases; however, the next two years would show 9% increases instead of 7%. Overall, the level of increase by 2033 would be approximately 125.6% rather than 126.9%. There would also be a commitment to pay an additional 10 years' worth of interest.

The wrapped debt service proposed in Scenario 3 would provide the City with more flexibility in terms of how rates can be adjusted. The FY 2024 and 2025 increases could be reduced to 17%, followed by two years at 10% and then 5% per year thereafter. This has a positive impact over the proposed 10-year time frame, with 121.9% cumulative impact rather than the 126.9% and 125.6% impacts in Scenarios 1 and 2 respectively.

Ms. Grant recalled that when the rate changes were previously presented to both the Infrastructure Task Force Committee (ITFC) and the City Commission, the cumulative increase over 10 years had been estimated at 140%. All the cumulative increases for the first three scenarios are below this amount.

Scenario 4, which is based on the issuance of two separate tranches of bonds, would provide for FY 2024 and 2025 rates of 15%, followed by two years of 11%. The long-term cumulative impact would be 118.5%. Mr. Burnam noted that Scenario 4, however, includes greater risk due to the issuance of a second tranche of debt without knowing how conditions may have changed by that time.

Chair Mammano commented that under the proposed Scenario 3, the City Commission will need to inform the public that their water rates will increase by 17% next year. Ms. Grant confirmed this, adding that this presentation will be made to the City's Budget Advisory Board (BAB) shortly, followed by a joint budget workshop later in June. The rate increase will be advertised during July 2023 on residents' water bills. Two public hearings will be held in September.

Mr. LaBrie asked if a scenario similar to Scenario 3, but extended over 40 years, had been considered. Mr. Masvidal advised that extending Scenario 3 over a 40-year horizon would lower the first two years' rate increases to approximately 15%. Ms. Grant noted that there is no option which would reduce these increases in the first two years to single digits.

Mr. Walters observed that significant outreach to citizens will be necessary in order to educate the public on what a 17% rate increase would mean for them in terms of their individual bills. Ms. Grant noted that garbage services are also included on residents' water bills, and would need to be deducted from the total before the 17% increase could be calculated with any accuracy.

Mr. Walters pointed out that this is the type of information that should be shared with the broader community, and asked how Staff would undertake this outreach. Chair Mammano commented that the City Commission would need to convey this. Mr. Walters advised that the residents who are most likely to object to the increases are unlikely to attend City Commission meetings.

Ms. Grant reiterated that the increases will be advertised on the July water bills. Mr. Castellon recalled that two town hall-style meetings were held to present this information earlier in the process.

Mr. Zeltman asked if there are comparative analyses of other new water treatment plants which could be shown as examples, although he noted that the expenses associated with other types of treatment will differ from the costs associated with nanofiltration. Mr. Castellon advised that Florida communities, including Boca Raton and Delray Beach, use nanofiltration in combination with other technologies. Ms. Grant added that these types of presentations always include comparisons of rates in other Broward communities.

Ms. Grant continued that all scenarios include the new automated meter technology, which will allow the City to conduct remote readings as well as notify customers of breaks or leaks. Chair Mammano emphasized the importance of ensuring that residents are aware of this upgrade in technology.

Mr. LaBrie suggested that the presentation include a slide showing pros and cons of the various scenarios, which could make it easier for the public to understand. He also proposed that the slides reflect the recommendation of Scenario 3 and the reasons it was selected.

Mr. Walters emphasized the importance of ensuring the public is educated about the proposals. Chair Mammano commented that the presentation should be taken before the Council of Fort Lauderdale Civic Associations and to the Commissioners' pre-agenda meetings with their districts. She requested that the Committee's August Agenda include a discussion of a plan for sharing this information with the public before a rate structure is formally adopted. Ms. Grant stated that marketing and communications Staff will be asked to discuss this and develop a draft communication plan for the Committee's review, but pointed out that feedback from the City Commission will be necessary before any presentation can be taken to the public.

## **ii. City Hall Update**

Chair Mammano advised that an update on the status of City Hall is planned for the Tuesday, June 6, 2023 City Commission meeting. Short-term issues include what will be done at the present time, while mid-term issues extend over the next two to five

years while the City is seeking a place for operations. Long-term issues include what will be done with the existing building.

Chair Mammano continued that she did not feel the Committee should become involved in what will be done in the short term, as she felt this would constitute micromanagement.

Mr. Angeli requested clarification of where the City's backup control center will be in case of another emergency. Chris Bennett, Assistant Director of Public Works (Strategic Support), stated that the City has full redundancy at the Emergency Operations Center in Fire Station #53. The equipment currently remaining in City Hall is network switch gear which links three administrative buildings together, including City Hall. This is why the sixth floor of City Hall continues to have power: new switch gear and fiber must be installed to reroute network communications. All information is being transitioned quickly to cloud storage.

Chair Mammano requested additional information on mid-term solutions. There was discussion of potential sites for operations, including One Broward and the West Marine building, among others. Mr. Bennett noted that most of the potential locations within this corridor have quoted similar prices for square footage.

Mr. LaBrie asked what the Committee's role is with respect to the rebuilding, replacement, or relocation of City Hall functions. Ms. Grant replied that the Mayor would like the Committee to be involved in "helping shape the plan for the longer term." She clarified that at present, the City is seeking to move Staff into spaces in which they can work efficiently until a new City Hall is available. The Mayor would like the Committee's input on the longer-term vision and plan.

Chair Mammano asked if the Budget Advisory Board (BAB), of which Mr. Marshall is a member, has discussed the impact of City Hall emergency issues on the current year's budget. Mr. Marshall replied that this has not been discussed at the most recent meetings. He added that the Commission has directed City Staff to work under the assumption that there will be no millage rate increase in the next fiscal year.

Ms. Grant stated that a percentage of expenses related to the flood, including dewatering, emergency neighborhood operations, and generators, will be covered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), as there was a declaration of disaster for the City. 75% of these funds will come from federal sources, 12.5% from the state, and 12.5% from the City. A budget amendment will be necessary to address this issue.

With regard to temporary City Hall quarters, Ms. Grant continued that a "placeholder" line item of \$2.9 million had been added into the FY 2024 budget, based on the estimated square footage needed. This placeholder item would address the anticipated costs of rent or debt service over the next three to five years.

Ms. Grant continued that the City has been aware that they would eventually need to move into a new City Hall, and had already included a placeholder in the budget approximately three years into the future. This placeholder has been moved to a closer date.

Ms. Grant stated that the FY 2024 budget anticipates an increase of over 11% in property values. This includes an increase in the value of existing properties as well as net new development, with the latter estimated at \$950 million.

Mr. Castellon briefly reviewed a presentation on the anticipated cost of restoring City Hall, which is currently estimated at \$15 million to \$16 million. This would include address of the electrical, HVAC, fire, elevator, and other systems. The process could take up to two years. Ms. Grant advised that the City's insurance company has visited the site and negotiations with this carrier are expected to determine what will be paid out. The payment is expected to be for the depreciated value of City Hall. The building is also being examined to determine if the flooding has compromised its structural integrity.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of when the Committee would need to begin its discussions of the long-term future of City Hall, including whether functions will be centralized or decentralized going forward. Ms. Grant advised that these discussions could begin in the latter part of the year, once a decision has been made regarding mid-term relocation.

### **iii. Lessons from the Flood**

Mr. Castellon showed a presentation on lessons learned from the recent flood, which include:

- In areas with more than 1 ft. of flooding, pumps are the best way to move a large volume water, while pump trucks are more appropriate for areas with a few inches of water
- If the location of pumped water is farther than roughly 500 ft. away, multiple pumps are recommended
- Stormwater operations are not staffed on a 24-hour basis, which means they are not sufficiently staffed in emergency situations
- The City needs to seek inter-local agreements with other municipalities, as well as with Broward County, when drainage capacity is diminished because water levels in canals are too high
- Use of emergency contracts is necessary to bring in as many pump trucks as possible
- A tracking system for deployed equipment should be implemented
- Use of drones and helicopters can be helpful for assessments
- More frequent clearing of debris from stormwater systems will aid in water flow

- Integration of the Q-alert, geographic information systems (GIS) mapping, and other methods are recommended to improve situational awareness
- Review of the waste management schedule is necessary immediately following dewatering operations

Mr. Zeltman suggested that lower-lying areas with a greater inundation of water could benefit from installation of a shallow well pump, which could be used to inject water into areas where there is saltwater intrusion. Mr. Bennett replied that this has not been discussed, as drilling wells for the purpose of a drainage system or for emergency dewatering has different permitting mechanisms than those required by surface water management. He noted that this option is one possible temporary measure for neighborhoods that experienced severe inundation during the storm, while at the same time projects from the Stormwater Master Plan for these neighborhoods will be ramped up over the next five years or more.

Mr. Angeli commented that the system to which Mr. Zeltman had referred may not be viable in certain low-lying areas, as pressure becomes an issue. A minimum height over the water table is required in order to provide enough pressure to push water into the well.

Chair Mammano asked if there have been lessons learned regarding the need for pre-approved inter-local agreements with other agencies which would allow the City to pump water into other agencies' systems. Mr. Bennett replied that there are ongoing discussions with the South Florida Water Management District as well as with Broward County and other nearby municipalities. If a storm is not localized specifically over Fort Lauderdale, he pointed out that these agencies will want to pump into their own permitted canals and drainage systems. This may mean they do not have the increased capacity to take on more water from Fort Lauderdale.

Chair Mammano also observed that a pre-arranged emergency agreement with environmental regulatory entities may be necessary, as these agencies may not want to allow pumping dirty water into a system. Mr. Bennett confirmed that it can be difficult to secure these types of arrangements. In the recent flood, this meant the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) was not willing to allow Fort Lauderdale to pump into their systems until FEMA had approved the emergency declaration.

Mr. Bennett continued that the City continues to discuss and work through the opportunities for inter-local agreements (ILAs) with major entities. He cautioned, however, that this is unlikely to be resolved soon.

With regard to stormwater operations Staff, Mr. Bennett stated that there are employee contracts with various trade unions, as well as different job titles and positions, which make it more difficult for the City to call in services. He further clarified that certain licenses are required to operate some equipment, such as pump

trucks. There is currently insufficient staff to provide the level of service necessary for a storm like the recent flood.

Mr. Bennett continued that the City cannot view its system independently of other nearby systems with regard to stormwater. He pointed out that if the storm had been County-wide rather than focused over the City, water would have been flowing through at much higher levels in canals. He added that the City will continue working actively on arrangements with other entities.

Chair Mammano noted that the City's budget shows plans to purchase another pump truck. Mr. Bennett advised that this truck was needed before the flood to replace another vehicle which is at the end of its useful life. The City has four pump trucks for stormwater operations. In addition, because the City pays more for its debris contract than most other local contracts, this provides them with priority when debris pickup is necessary.

Mr. Bennett continued that most of the area commanders during the flood, particularly within the first three to four days, worked within the City's Project and Program Management teams. Some were engineers, while others were construction managers. All have knowledge regarding how the City's systems work.

Mr. Angeli noted that emergency responsibilities for workers may change depending upon the conditions present during storm or hurricane watches or warnings. Mr. Bennett confirmed that this is similar to how the City operates: national incident response protocols and different employee roles must be followed once an emergency has been declared and/or the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) is activated.

Mr. Bennett continued that when an emergency protocol is activated within Fort Lauderdale, a handful of Staff members are present at the City's EOC. There, they maintain contact with the County's EOC and other agencies that can help to provide supplies, materials, equipment, and staff. The EOC also serves as a centralized location from where City Staff is directed and information is disseminated to various management teams, such as Fire and Police Staff. Contact is mostly maintained via telephone, text message, or email.

With regard to the use of drones and helicopters, Mr. Bennett advised that the City was able to access a contact which used helicopters to fly over the City. The City itself also has a drone that can be used for this purpose.

Mr. Castellon noted that there was significant debris in many of the City's canals and drainage ditches. The stormwater operations team is responsible for maintaining clearance of these facilities. Many have already been cleaned following the storm.

Chair Mammano noted that there is a schedule for the cleaning of storm drains and basins, and asked if there is a way for concerned residents to access this information. Mr. Bennett explained that this program involves inspection twice per year, with cleaning done at a minimum of once per year, as well as “hot spot” cleanings based on requests or flooding issues. This is not administered in a gridded or scheduled fashion. He suggested that it may be possible to request clarification of which neighborhoods will be addressed next. He noted that the City’s Q-alert system and requests made through the 828-8000 number are responded to in a relatively quick manner.

With regard to the need for waste management following a water emergency, Mr. Bennett stated that both additional trucks and more staff are needed to remove muck and debris from the streets, as well as re-cutting swales that may have become clogged. This could be achieved by modifying the City’s emergency storm response contracts to include these services.

Chair Mammano recommended that the presentation be made available online or at public meetings so residents can see what the City accomplished in response to the emergency. She complimented Staff on the work they have done during the extraordinary circumstances of the flood as well as the post-evaluation period.

#### **iv. Alternate Date for September meeting**

It was clarified that the Committee can meet on the alternate date of September 11, 2023 during its usual time frame.

**Motion** made by Mr. LaBrie, seconded by Mr. Walters, to move the September meeting to September 11. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

### **3. Public Works Update**

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

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

### **4. General Discussion and Comments**

#### **i. Committee Members**

Mr. LaBrie recalled that following the flood, the City was conducting soil testing on 20<sup>th</sup> Street to determine whether or not a sewer line was leaking. Mr. Castellon and Mr. Bennett advised that they were not aware of any such testing. Mr. Castellon stated that he would look into this further.

Mr. Grabski recalled that at the previous meeting, he had requested an update on cost sharing requirements in relation to wastewater capacity letters. He explained that this would address instances in which multiple developments within the same basin are required to make upgrades. Mr. Bennett stated that there has been no movement on this issue since it was last discussed. He reiterated that Staff reaches out to known developers who are going into an area in order to facilitate conversation about cost sharing. The City is working to become more aggressive in what they request from developments when it is known that other pending projects may create a need for future upsizing; however, this must be requested within reason.

Mr. Bennett continued that when a developer requests permits, Staff re-analyzes the capacity availability as well as the needs of that project. If they find additional upgrades are necessary, Staff will make edits in their requests at the time of permitting.

Chair Mammano requested that additional discussion of this issue with Staff be continued outside the meeting.

## **ii. Public Comments**

None.

## **5. Adjournment – NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE: Monday, August 7, 2023**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:08 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.]