



DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
VIRTUAL MEETING

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

MONDAY, MAY 3, 2021 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

<u>February 2021-January 2022</u>		<u>Attendance</u>	
Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	4	0
Gerald Angeli	P	4	0
Shane Grabski	P	4	0
Charlie Ladd (arr. 3:31)	P	3	1
Michael Marshall	P	3	1
Peter Partington	P	4	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	4	0
Roosevelt Walters	P	4	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	4	0

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

Staff

Raj Verma, Director of Public Works
Aneisha Daniel, Deputy Director of Public Works
Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works – Sustainability
Talal Abi-Karam, Assistant Director of Public Works – Utilities
Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works -- Engineering
Omar Castellon, Chief Engineer
Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
Pauline Ricketts, Senior Administrative Assistant
Daphnee Sainvil, Government and External Affairs Manager
Kymberly Holcombe, Senior Financial Administrator
Igor Vassiliev, Project Engineer
Gary Foster, Project Manager
Dronix Suarez, Project Manager II
Crysta Parkinson, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Ms. Scott, that the Infrastructure Task Force does not consider that a development moratorium related to infrastructure is necessary at this time; however, the City should consider the condition of the water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure impacted by developments in addition to the capacity of impacted infrastructure, and that the Ordinance currently governing development should be amended to include explicit consideration of condition of infrastructure. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).

Motion made by Chair Mammano, seconded by Ms. Scott, to forward this as a communication to the City Commission and request a workshop with them to discuss the recommendation and the next steps for the Infrastructure Task Force Committee. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. and roll was called.

ii. Approval of Agenda

Chair Mammano requested that Item 5 be heard at the beginning of today's meeting.

Motion made by Ms. Scott, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve the Agenda. [The **motion** passed by unanimous consent.]

5. New Business

i. Infrastructure Bill – City Lobbyist

Government and External Affairs Manager Daphnee Sainvil introduced herself to the Committee, explaining that her role with the City is to serve as in-house lobbyist. She oversees both state and federal lobbying duties for Fort Lauderdale on all subjects.

The City has made a number of federal earmark appropriation requests, including one for the Downtown Fort Lauderdale stormwater tidal valve project. This request was not advanced by Congresswoman Debbie Wasserman-Schultz, although Congressman Ted Deutch requested a joint water infrastructure package between Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park, and Wilton Manors for \$900,000. This would fund an upgrade and efficiency project for water and wastewater systems provide connectivity between the municipalities, and would address sea level rise, extreme weather, and rising temperature. The City has not yet received word of where this request stands.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of the reason Congresswoman Wasserman-Schultz had not submitted the City's earmark requests. Ms. Sainvil explained that these requests did not lie within the Congresswoman's own district. The City had asked her to take projects from the late Congressman Alcee Hastings' district into consideration as well. It was noted that each Representative may submit no more than 10 earmark requests.

Ms. Sainvil explained that the earmarks through Representatives' offices are unrelated to funding from the American Rescue Plan: they are instead a separate funding source that

is set aside for Congressional Representatives. While the state of Florida received \$10.2 billion and Fort Lauderdale \$39.6 million from the American Rescue Plan, these dollars have already been allocated, with the majority intended to recoup losses in the City's general revenue.

Regarding other transportation, water, and wastewater infrastructure projects, the City is seeking grant funding that they may provide to small businesses which are still suffering from the effects of the pandemic. These funds may cover personal protective equipment (PPE) and other COVID-19-related expenses. The City has aggressively sought both funding and earmarks; however, there are some funding sources for which certain infrastructure projects are not eligible.

ii. Proposed State Bill – Municipalities' ability to collect Impact Fees

Chair Mammano requested an update on the status of Florida House Bill (HB) 337. Ms. Sainvil explained that this bill requires local governments and special tax districts to credit any contributions related to public facilities or infrastructure against the collection of impact fees. It also specifies conditions for which credits cannot be applied and addresses how local governments vote on impact fees. The bill is currently awaiting the Governor's signature.

Some of the changes in HB 337 include:

- Provision for a supermajority vote when local governments need to increase their impact fees
- Restricts increase of impact fees to 50% or less, applied in two equal 25% increments
- Fee increase limitations are retroactive to January 1, 2021
- In order to increase impact fees beyond 50%, local governments or special districts must apply a rational nexus test, or a study showing extraordinary circumstances that require the increase; this requires a 2/3 majority vote
- Impact fees cannot be increased retroactively for the previous or current fiscal or calendar year

Ms. Sainvil stated that she will have to review the final analysis of this bill, as a number of amendments were filed during the last week of the Florida legislative session. The bill is expected to have a significant impact on local governments.

Director of Public Works Raj Verma advised that he has worked closely with Ms. Sainvil with regard to infrastructure, and they believe that the City's impact fees are adequate at the moment, based on recent studies; however, they do not know what may happen in the future, which is why they conceptually opposed HB 337. He pointed out that the City does not set its impact fees arbitrarily: they must be preceded by an analysis of needs as well as of how rates are set.

Mr. Verma continued that smaller municipalities have a tendency to impose their impact fees arbitrarily, which may have affected HB 337. He noted that the analyses establishing the City's rates were very thorough. He also pointed out that on occasion, developers offer to provide certain improvements to expedite their projects or to act as good neighbors. These improvements are made on a voluntary basis and are over and above what the City may ask them to do.

Mr. Verma advised that he has discussed this issue extensively with the City's financial analysts, who conduct the studies that determine the City's impact fees. While HB 337 is new and has not yet been tested in court, he was informed that if a development causes the City to increase the size of its infrastructure, such as a pipe or pump station, and this increase was not accounted for at the time the impact fee was established, the City may ask for this increase without providing a credit.

Chair Mammano observed that the bill is likely to be addressed through the court system. Ms. Sainvil confirmed that the bill is expected to be signed into law by the Governor.

The Committee returned to discussion of infrastructure funding, with Ms. Sainvil pointing out that the City received \$10.5 million for a stormwater project in the Durrs neighborhood. This funding comes from the state, and is a combination of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and other grant dollars. The City received the full amount requested. Mr. Verma recognized the efforts of Ms. Sainvil and Public Works Staff in submitting this project. The City has also received a \$500,000 grant to improve seawalls on Hendricks Isle, although not all details are available at this time.

Ms. Scott asked how many federal lobbyists are employed by the City. Ms. Sainvil replied that there is one federal advocate at present, with three at the state level. The City is preparing a request for proposal (RFP) to consider new federal and state lobbyists. It has not yet been determined if they will retain their current lobbyists or change to new firms. She will serve on the ranking committee that evaluates respondents' qualifications.

Mr. Partington addressed the grant funding for the Durrs community, asking if this \$10.5 million will free up the same amount within the City's stormwater bond. Mr. Verma replied that the \$200 million stormwater bond covers only seven neighborhoods: the grant funds will allow the City to use its own \$10.5 million toward a more pressing need in another neighborhood, or to add more projects accordingly.

Chair Mammano recalled that the Committee had recently recommended to the City Commission that any funds reallocated due to the use of transportation surtax dollars be reapportioned for other transportation projects rather than assigned to non-transportation projects. Mr. Verma emphasized that Staff is aware of and follows this procedure.

Mr. Walters asked if HB 337 will affect impact fees across different types of infrastructure, including stormwater, wastewater, transportation, affordable housing, and other issues. Ms. Sainvil confirmed that the bill will affect impact fees across multiple programs. Mr.

Walters also requested additional information on how the \$900,000 in joint funding would be divided between the cities of Fort Lauderdale, Oakland Park, and Wilton Manors. Ms. Sainvil replied that this is not yet known, although it is likely the funds will either be divided equally among the three cities or according to the costs of implementation for the joint project.

Ms. Sainvil and Mr. Verma left the meeting at 2:44 p.m.

The Committee returned to Item 1.iii at this time.

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes April 5, 2021

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

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

Mr. Partington stated that at the May 4, 2021 City Commission meeting, a contract for \$2.95 million will be awarded for a deep well power project. The description of this item suggests that one of the City's five injection wells at the George T. Lohmeyer Wastewater Treatment Plant may become nonfunctional in the near future. He expressed concern with this possibility, noting that the Reiss report indicated the City is in need of another injection well. The contract would cover electrical work related to the injection wells.

Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering), stated that the concern is not losing a well but losing the ability to remotely operate that well. The issue is in the electrical wiring that enables the movement of pumps through different wells by a control center. He emphasized that the function of the well itself is not at stake. Control still retains ability to operate the wells manually; however, this is a labor-intensive process, and the intent of the contract is to return to the automation process that allows the wells to be properly rotated.

Mr. Zeltman observed that there should be an emergency backup system once the compromised electrical line is replaced so the wells can be operated if an unexpected event occurs. He added that hopefully the aggressive replacement or repair of the gravity sewer lining, which is allowing the intrusion of significant groundwater, may delay the necessity for a sixth well farther into the future, if at all.

3. Public Comments (At Each Item)

Public comments were heard as each Item is discussed.

4. Old Business

i. Continued Discussion on Developing Moratorium

Resolution Statement – *To evaluate and provide a recommendation on the feasibility and impact of implementing a moratorium on the acceptance of an application for or issuance of a development permit within the City.*

Chair Mammano noted that at one point, the Committee had addressed the possibility of having a workshop with the City Commission prior to summer 2021 to discuss their recommendation regarding a moratorium. She recalled that she had prepared an outline of the issues on which the Committee may make recommendations. In addition, they have reviewed the spreadsheet used by Staff to evaluate projects that are currently underway.

Chair Mammano advised that the Committee may make one of three recommendations:

- No recommendation for a moratorium on the acceptance of applications for permits
- Recommendation in favor of this moratorium
- No need for a recommended moratorium if certain adjustments are made

Ms. Scott commented that she would like clarification of whether the Committee is discussing commercial buildings, including multi-family development, or single-family development only. She asked if they may make a recommendation for a moratorium on the development of some types of properties but not others, as she did not feel a moratorium was necessary for single-family homes.

Chair Mammano stated that during the moratorium discussion, the Assistant City Attorney had framed the issue as follows: if the Committee has identified a situation so significant that the City cannot meet its infrastructure requirements, a moratorium would be justified on some or all of the projects that are contributing to the issue. Ms. Scott pointed out that this may also apply to projects in an affected area. Chair Mammano observed that there is not sufficient evidence to suggest a moratorium, although there may be material information that suggests a moratorium may be necessary on particular developments in certain places.

Ms. Scott explained that what has been a concern for her is the condition of pump stations and other infrastructure in certain areas. She felt this was not closely considered when determinations are made on adequacy, as condition is not an aspect of the governing Ordinance. Mr. Partington agreed, stating that while the capacity of this infrastructure was taken into consideration, its condition was not. He also recalled that the Assistant City Attorney had identified one possible approach as implementing a moratorium that would allow for time to review and update the processes by which developments are examined; however, this would require expert testimony stating that development should be halted during this review.

Mr. Zeltman commented that he has seen moratoriums issued based upon the lack of capacity at a water treatment plant to meet the demand created by new developments. If large developments are being submitted and the system is approaching the limits of its capacity, a moratorium would allow provisions to be made to increase the capacity of the

plant. Chair Mammano noted that there has been no indication, however, that the system is approaching the limits of its capacity with regard to water. Mr. Zeltman continued that wastewater also presents a capacity issue that could affect the possibility of a moratorium.

Mr. Angeli advised that he was convinced of the ability of City Staff and City officials to review and make knowledgeable decisions about the impact that new construction will have on the community and its infrastructure. He also felt that condition should be a part of this analysis. He was not certain, however, of how well Staff follows up on whether or not the developer properly completes any action they are asked to take.

Mr. Marshall stated that he has not seen information that leads him to believe there is a capacity issue, or that Staff has not sufficiently required improvements to address capacity or service needs. He had, however, seen evidence of deferred maintenance, as well as weak points in the system that are not related to new development. He did not believe these issues could justify a moratorium in light of the consequences of shutting down development, and noted that the City is taking steps to correct these repair and maintenance issues.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of Mr. Marshall's concern for weak points in the system. Mr. Marshall explained that the Committee has seen instances in which pipes or lift stations are compromised and functioning at subpar levels. He felt the weak points were individual rather than systematic, and the City was not at a place where a moratorium was the best way to address these needs.

Mr. Grabski commented that there has been significant evolution of the City's water and wastewater adequacy letters in the past few years. He also agreed that further conditional analysis is necessary, and did not know the best way to explore this issue. He was not certain that there is an existing condition anywhere in the City that would require a temporary moratorium on development in that area. He pointed out that there are other means of identifying conditional issues, such as the City's valve exercise program, fire flow tests, and other testing that may be implemented to ensure that flows are sufficient and there are no existing issues.

Ms. Scott stated that she was prepared to support moving forward without a moratorium, acknowledging that Staff does a remarkable job; however, she recommended that the City revisit the Ordinance governing the issuance of capacity letters and fully ensure that condition is addressed.

Mr. Partington suggested that the Committee consider making a motion that would recommend the City Commission direct Staff to review and perhaps modify their development review process for water and sewer adequacy, with the intent of explicitly addressing the condition of this infrastructure. Another possibility might be for the Committee to make its own motion to this effect, and ask Staff to rework one of its most recent adequacy letters with a closer consideration of condition. He expressed concern

that the Staff members addressing capacity may not have the most up-to-date information regarding the condition of this infrastructure.

Mr. Walters added that if the Committee does not recommend a moratorium, they should let the Commission know it is necessary to put policy in place to ensure that Staff takes all necessary steps to identify potential problems in the future. He also recommended that the Committee use language similar to Staff's when referring to time frames, including terms such as "temporary," "permanent," "short-term," and "long-term," emphasizing that these terms are not interchangeable. Mr. Zeltman agreed with Mr. Walters' reference to language, suggesting that this could be made even more definitive, specifying exact timespans such as three, five, ten, or more years.

Ms. Scott noted that the adequacy statements issued by Staff are governed by an Ordinance that dictates how they are expected to evaluate condition. Chair Mammano observed that this Ordinance was discussed at a previous meeting and includes several subcategories. The Committee has only dealt with water, sewer, and stormwater.

Chair Mammano continued that Staff uses a spreadsheet reflecting these categories to determine adequacy, evaluating all projects on the basis of whether or not they will place significant new impact on pump stations. There was no mention of other infrastructure, such as pipes, on the spreadsheet. Ms. Scott agreed, asserting that evaluation of this additional infrastructure needs to be incorporated into the subject Ordinance.

Mr. Partington also felt the strongest method, short of a moratorium, to ensure condition is carefully considered would be to include it in the Ordinance. Chair Mammano proposed that the Committee invite a representative from the City Attorney's Office to attend their next meeting and make recommendations on how the existing Ordinance might be modified to incorporate a closer focus on condition. There was Committee consensus in favor of this option.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Ms. Scott, that the City should consider the condition of the water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure impacted by developments in addition to the capacity of impacted infrastructure, and that the Ordinance currently governing development should be amended to include explicit consideration of condition of infrastructure.

Mr. Marshall advised that while Staff reviews the condition of the City's aging infrastructure as part of the development review process, he also felt they should look at the condition of this infrastructure anyway, absent pending development or the submission of a development application. If aging infrastructure does not adequately support existing development, he did not feel the responsibility for improving that infrastructure should be placed on a single applicant who wishes to bring in new development.

Mr. Marshall continued that the **motion** currently on the floor asks Staff to consider and report upon the condition of affected infrastructure; however, his recommendation is that instead of having new development address a percentage of any deficiency, the City should keep up with this information so maintenance dollars can be directed to address the deficiencies. Ms. Scott pointed out, however, that if the condition of certain infrastructure is deemed deficient, it would be difficult for the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB) members to approve an application in that area. She felt it was the Committee's job to review findings and make a recommendation, not to propose how these findings might be addressed by the City.

Mr. Partington advised that it is very difficult for an expert to determine whether or not a particular development would cause high-risk infrastructure to fail. He noted that if the development review process makes no mention of the condition of infrastructure on which additional load is being placed, the PZB and City Commission could point out that they were not informed of the risk to infrastructure by a development. He reiterated that an expert would not be able to state with confidence that the demand from a new project would cause the high-risk infrastructure to fail.

Chair Mammano asked if identification of a problem with a particular area of the City's infrastructure would cause the PZB to deny an application. Ms. Scott explained that applications go before the City's Development Review Committee (DRC) prior to coming before the PZB. By the time the application comes to DRC, Staff will have already determined whether or not there is an issue with existing infrastructure, and will need to make plans to address this issue. An application in an area with high-risk infrastructure would be unlikely to come before the PZB without plans for the risk to be corrected.

Mr. Zeltman stated that a moratorium would most likely be issued only by a regulatory agency mandate imposed upon a utility company, rather than a recommendation issued by the City. He emphasized the importance of a provision that would take the condition of the City's aging pipes, some of which may be 50 to 70 years old, into consideration and mandate the City to take action before a regulatory agency imposes a Consent Order upon it to maintain and replace this infrastructure.

Mr. Ladd joined the meeting at 3:31 p.m.

The Committee further discussed the **motion** on the floor, with Mr. Ladd asking if the **motion** did not simply return the issue to the City Commission. Chair Mammano asserted that the **motion** was a response to the Commission's request that the Committee make a recommendation: their recommendation is not for a moratorium, but that the Ordinance be reviewed to specifically include condition along with capacity.

In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).

Chair Mammano stated that the **motion** would be sent as a communication to the City Commission, and may be followed up by a workshop with the Commission so the

Committee can provide more information on how they came to their recommendation. She added that the Committee can also ask how the Commission asks them to move forward following their recommendation.

It was determined that the Committee has not addressed sidewalk condition, and that some items covered by the Ordinance, including traffic, parks, and Police, lie outside the Committee's purview. Mr. Zeltman recalled that in 2015, the City developed a program for the repair/replacement of sidewalks, as problems had occurred as a result of expanding tree roots. He suggested that the Committee continue this effort to address recurring sidewalk damage. Ms. Scott strongly agreed with a focus on sidewalk repair, pointing out that the previous City program to address sidewalks had not been carefully planned or executed.

Chair Mammano reiterated that it would be helpful for the Committee to meet with the Commission to advise them of where the Committee stands at present as well as to find out what the Commission wishes them to do in the future.

Mr. Grabski pointed out that while the Commission's charge was to make a recommendation on a moratorium, Mr. Partington's and Ms. Scott's **motion** had not specifically addressed a moratorium. Mr. Walters recommended that this earlier **motion** be reconsidered and amended as necessary.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Ms. Scott, to recall the motion that passed just 15 minutes ago. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Ms. Scott, that the Infrastructure Task Force does not consider that a development moratorium related to infrastructure is necessary at this time; however, all the rest of it exactly the same. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).

Motion made by Chair Mammano, seconded by Ms. Scott, to forward this as a communication to the City Commission and request a workshop with them to discuss the recommendation and the next steps for the Infrastructure Task Force Committee. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (9-0).

6. Public Works Update

i. Infrastructure adequacy for new development – Pump Station

Dronix Suarez, Project Manager II, showed a graphic representation of the adequacy update, explaining that it shows the basin corresponding to pump station B-8, which is provided as an example. When capacity analysis is performed, Staff reviews a number of items, including:

- Water availability, which is updated daily by the George T. Lohmeyer Water Treatment Plant

- Fire flow checks, which are conducted annually and reflected in geographic information systems (GIS) mapping
- Sanitary sewer analysis, which includes pump station run times

Mr. Suarez continued that the graphic provided to the Committee shows Staff's ability to track the status and condition of this infrastructure to a degree. If pump station run times begin to increase or spike, Staff can discuss what may be responsible for the increase.

The nominal average pump operation times (NAPOT) show how often pumps are running on a given day. Areas of concern are identified when these numbers rise above 8 to 10 hours total, with 10 hours as the desired maximum. He referred to the example graphic, pointing out that the increasing trend in these figures has been building since 2014. These values are provided once a month.

The graphic shows a drop-off in the hours of operation in October 2020. Mr. Suarez explained that inflow and infiltration (I&I) or other improvements may have been made at the subject pump station to bring these numbers down. The City can determine a number of issues from the numbers alone, including when new development significantly affects the operation of a pump station.

Chair Mammano asked if the increasing numbers would inform Staff that additional development permits in the subject area would be a concern. Mr. Suarez advised that Staff does not use this graphic internally: instead, they review the numbers generally. Once the numbers reach a certain level, however, they report that the pump station in question is seeing an increase in demand. They ensure that both Operations and Engineering are aware of the increase so issues can be investigated and/or addressed at the subject location.

Chair Mammano asked if the PZB would be made aware of the existence of any issues as well as the Department internally. Mr. Suarez replied that a similar graphic is provided to advisory bodies with every capacity letter.

Chair Mammano asked if Staff was aware of how many more approved projects might be coming online in the subject area before the graph reached its greatest increase prior to the drop-off. Mr. Suarez confirmed this, noting that this information is also provided in capacity analysis letters. Staff can also reach out to Operations to discuss ongoing trends.

Mr. Zeltman observed that the drop-off in use might also indicate the completion of recent sanitary sewer gravity lining, and noted that the dates of when repairs are made to the basin might correspond to this information. Another possibility could be a drought or other weather event. Mr. Suarez confirmed that this is taken into account whenever a negative change, such as an upward trend, is noticed.

Mr. Partington recalled that at previous meetings, the Committee has heard that some pump stations are being fitted with variable speed pumps, and asked how this might affect

the figures on the graphic. Mr. Suarez replied that while regular pumps require a specific consistent amount of flow in order to work at their optimum level, variable speed pumps have multiple points of efficiency, which allows multiple flows to achieve the same amount of efficiency in the pumps. There are only four variable speed pumps that are considered in three re-pump stations and one regular basin.

Mr. Partington requested clarification of the source of information on run times. Mr. Suarez advised that this information comes from the pump stations themselves and is reflected in a monthly operations report. This information is recorded manually and entered into an electronic database before it is transmitted to Staff.

Chair Mammano asked if this real-time data is available on all pump stations, as well as whether or not any of these stations are located in areas of concern. Mr. Suarez stated that while Staff reviews specific pump stations, they are connected with Operations in a way that allows them to maintain records for all pump stations. This permits them to look at adjacent pump stations to determine whether or not there may be issues in neighboring areas.

Chair Mammano asked if some problems might be solved before new development comes online. Mr. Suarez replied that he did not deal directly with timing: his responsibility is to analyze pump stations and run times, and convey data to the pertinent individuals and/or departments.

Mr. Angeli requested additional clarification of what the graphic's trend lines show. Mr. Suarez explained that one line serves as an "early alert" system for Staff: once the figures exceed this measurement, it is protocol to alert Operations and the rest of Engineering to inform them that there is an issue with that pump station. Once the figures reach the second indicator line, however, Staff is aware that the pump station is overtaxed. He noted that it is possible for pump stations to run at longer hours than intended, as there are safety factors in place.

Chair Mammano asked how many of the City's pump stations have numbers above either of the indicator lines, requesting a graphic of this data. Mr. Suarez replied that this information can be provided at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Ladd asked what exactly was indicated by an increase above the first indicator line, such as demand, weather patterns, I&I, or other considerations. Mr. Suarez reiterated that this is discussed internally to determine a cause. He added that there are 194 pump stations within the City, which means detailed analysis can take significant time. Staff typically does not investigate these issues until their numbers reflect a need for concern. He advised that if the pump stations were examined based upon whether or not they have benefited from the City's relining project, they would show a decrease in I&I through the rainy season.

Mr. Grabski requested clarification of the pump times at which the indicators show cause for concern. Mr. Suarez explained that if average pump time exceeds 10 hours for one day, this indicates a need for further investigation. It was noted that duplex pump stations operate two pumps at an average of five hours per day; in addition, safety factors are in place for each pump in the event they exceed the recommended flow for a brief time.

Chief Engineer Omar Castellon further advised that Operations monitors all pump stations on a daily basis; Engineering reviews this information when there is an application for development.

Mr. Partington noted that the Hazen and Sawyer report identifies pump stations that operate in excess of 10 hours per day, and pointed out that this source of information should be reconciled with the graphic provided at today's meeting. Mr. Suarez stated that Staff maintains a similar table in its spreadsheet showing reports from all the City's pump stations. This table is constantly updated from the monthly reports provided by Operations.

Mr. Zeltman commented that the graphics shown can be misleading, as there are a number of variables that may come into play, including the number and size of pumps at a specific location, as well as variable speed. He emphasized the importance of coordination between Operations and Engineering to provide information about these factors.

ii. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping

Gary Foster, Project Manager, reported that there were a total of 10 water breaks from January through March 2021, including breaks due to age, a leak, and a contractor hitting the line. The total includes planned maintenance, which is reported as breaks. Most breaks are due to ongoing work in the area rather than systematic issues with infrastructure.

Mr. Zeltman asked if one area in which a cluster of breaks is located involves pipes constructed and installed at approximately the same time. Mr. Foster replied that most of the pipes in this area were constructed from cast iron and were compromised due to the vibrations from work being done nearby.

Chair Mammano asked how a similar study of water mains in the area is progressing. Ms. Daniel stated that this mapping is ongoing, with roughly 80 raw water valves located thus far. Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager Rick Johnson is overseeing this effort. This model is expected to be completed in July 2021.

Mr. Partington noted that a good deal is already known about the condition of a number of the City's pipes where breaks have occurred. Ms. Daniel confirmed this, explaining that the City must make strategic decisions about the funding and timing of these projects. A number of meetings have been held to determine whether or not projects included in the

City's Community Investment Plan (CIP) should be expedited if they involve infrastructure that suffered recent breaks. This led to the prioritization of some repair projects when funding was available.

iii. CIP Financial Report

Chair Mammano observed that this report provides an overall project analysis for bond funding, which totals \$204 million across multiple categories. She noted that a graphic for this presentation shows that 56% of bond funds have already been spent, with another significant portion encumbered. The remaining balance of the first tranche of bond funds is roughly \$67 million.

Chair Mammano continued that another graphic provided in this report reflects a different sum of \$259 million, and requested clarification of the difference in these funds. Ms. Daniel replied that while all of the listed projects are part of the City's Consent Order, a number of the projects may also be included in the bond, while others are funded through cash from Enterprise Funds. The next tranche of bond funds is scheduled to become available in 2023. A list of projects has already been identified for this tranche.

Ms. Daniel continued that a revenue estimating conference will be held in the next few weeks, which will review the funds available and revenues anticipated for the City to meet its bond covenant for debt payment.

7. Information

i. Impact Fees paid by Developers

Chair Mammano requested a total of the impact fees paid between October 2020 and April 2021. Mr. Castellon advised that the total is \$180 million during this time frame.

Chair Mammano requested additional information on the impact fee report. Project Engineer Igor Vassiliev replied that the chart reflects all impact fees paid by developers of various projects, including parks, sewer, and water. Broward County also receives an impact fee for traffic.

Mr. Partington asked how the water and sewer impact fees are used, recalling that HB 337 requires these dollars to be explicitly accounted for. He also requested a total of how much revenue is generated by these fees each year. It was determined that the impact fee report would be discussed in greater detail at the Committee's June 2021 meeting.

8. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting TBA

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:48 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.]