

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Infrastructure Task Force Committee
February 5, 2018
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
8th Floor City Commission Room – City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

1. **Call to Order:**
- **Roll Call**

MEMBERS		PRESENT	ABSENT
Marilyn Mammano	P	10	0
Ed Kwoka	A	8	2
Ralph Zeltman	P	10	0
Keith Cobb	P	7	3
Leo Hansen	P	9	1
Roosevelt Walters	A	9	1
Fred Stresau	P	9	1
Norm Ostrau	P	7	1
David Orshefsky	P	7	0

Staff Present

Lee Feldman, City Manager
 Chris Lagerbloom, Assistant City Manager
 Paul Berg, Public Works Director
 Raj Verma, Interim Assistant Public Works Director
 Nancy Gassman, Assistant Public Works Director
 Meredith Shuster, Administrative Assistant
 Michael Mitchel, Prototype-Inc. recording secretary

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Motion made by Mr. Orshefsky, seconded by Mr. Stresau, to approve the agenda. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Shuster advised the posted Notice did not list the fourth outreach meeting location now determined to be Hortt Park.

Chair Mammano indicated that the second suggestion was that a listed item called Future Agenda Items be included under Board Member Comments.

Motion made by Mr. Orshefsky, seconded by Mr. Stresau, to approve the agenda with the first amendment to make the fourth Outreach Meeting Hortt Park and not the second proposed agenda modification until further discussion. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Orshefsky introduced a work plan document used by the Budget Advisory Board (BAB) to keep track of issues to be addressed on future agendas. The document includes the backup and provides an outline for the next 12 meetings. Mr. Orshefsky suggested that by consensus the Board decide to adopt this document and create it to frame what is coming up in the future, which will solve the problem of where items go on the agenda.

Chair Mammano believed the work plan was a good approach. She suggested going out six months to see how it works and to revisit it at the next meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned the following topics that are pending from previous meetings; the CIP presentation due to the city staffer not being available and the 40-year inspection report which isn't completed yet. There was also a delay on the final presentation in terms of bonding for final steps with respect to the seven areas for stormwater.

Chair Mammano recalled that an update was also requested on the rate structure proposal. There are five months of things that need to go onto the work program.

Mr. Stresau mentioned putting together some sort of a synopsis as to what this Board had reviewed and studied.

Mr. Orshefsky suggested that outstanding informational items come back as "Here is the answer to your questions" or "The questions have been looked at and there is not an answer yet." Informational items do not have to go on the agenda unless a Board member wants to discuss it.

Chair Mammano stated that there was previous discussion about trying to highlight in the minutes something that was significant and important.

Mr. Cobb believed the Board spends a lot of valuable time on detailed information and at this stage needs to move up the ladder towards a more comprehensive formulation of ideas, thoughts, and recommendations.

3. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

A. January 4, 2018

Mr. Orshefsky made the following corrections, additions, and deletions:

- Page 3, first paragraph, last two sentences should read as, "The other is in the 12-22-17 critical projects report to the City Commission; the 40-year inspection **for City facilities.**"
- Mr. Orshefsky noticed a reference to "Charter" in a couple of places that he did not understand; however, it was not believed the reference was to City Charter.

Mr. Orshefsky believed it to be the Resolution for the Infrastructure Task Force Committee.

Mr. Zeltman made the following corrections, additions, and deletions:

- Page 6, fourth paragraph, should read as, “Mr. Zeltman mentioned the design and questioned what provisions have been considered to handle the lessening ability to discharge through the hydraulic **gradient** capability.
- Page 11, sixth paragraph, second to last sentence, should read as, “**When the ground water infiltration is reduced, the wastewater treatment plant capacity will increase for future development.**”
- Page 12, at the top, should read as, “**Mr. Zeltman commented that currently the ground water is going into the sanitary sewer gravity mains.**”
- Page 15, third paragraph from the bottom, **should have a space between these two paragraphs**, “Mr. Kwoka stated this was discussed and the reason it was thought that a structured meeting would be important because every meeting would be overrun by the wave or sewer and the idea is to gather useful information.”
“Mr. Zeltman believed the general list should be used. The public outreach meeting is for allowing the public to determine the priorities of their particular District, not the Committee.”

Mr. Ostrau mentioned that the conversation between the seawalls was exceptional and thought Mr. Orshefsky and Mr. Kwoka did a good job.

Motion made by Mr. Orshefsky, seconded by Mr. Stresau, to approve the January 4, 2018 meeting minutes as amended. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

4. General Discussion (Board Members) – 15 minutes

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the items he has already collected for the work plan document are: #1 is the CIP presentation; tentatively penned in for March. #2 is updating the stormwater rate structure. #3 is the ETC special community survey about traffic, homelessness, and schools that was presented to the BAB. The presentation was very good and presented by the consultant staff, Chris (last name). He suggested it be added to the March agenda if possible. It may be useful prior to the outreach meetings to see what the community has responded to.

Chair Mammano questioned the 40-year inspection.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that was the fourth item on a future agenda.

Mr. Verma advised that staff is reviewing the report prior to releasing it.

Mr. Berg commented that the rate study on the stormwater would probably be available in April or May because it is about a 60-day process.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that in the past the rate studies were not provided for the capital reserve funds.

Mr. Feldman indicated that he was not sure where the notion came up that they did not provide for the capital reserve funds but they do and they will.

Mr. Feldman advised that their rates currently for water and sewer are approximately about \$30 million per year into the capital budget.

Mr. Berg believed the Committee was referring to capital projects which are operational for replacing existing parts and components to the collection of treatment systems. Those numbers are included in Operations. There are two sides [capital and operations] and that is how the Reiss report ended up with the numbers.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned the survey that covers homelessness and questioned if discussion is anticipated about homelessness.

Mr. Orshefsky replied no. It was to make everyone aware of what neighbors are thinking.

Chair Mammano found it interesting because she read that study and thought different issues would be heard when going out into the field.

Mr. Orshefsky thought it was interesting that the neighbors seemed to be responsive to the City spending additional dollars to deal with homelessness.

Chair Mammano expressed that homelessness is not one of the issues of this board.

Mr. Zeltman had a concern that the rails for the WAVE would be an impediment to the wastewater and water repair programs dealing with the failing utility systems.

Mr. Feldman stated that consideration of the water and sewer is all part of the WAVE design. The money is there; the City has put in \$5.6 million from water and sewer projects to deal with that purpose.

Mr. Zeltman expressed his experience was that the systems did not always help and sometimes made it worse and he wanted to make sure the Committee makes a recommendation of caution or to do an analysis or investigation to avoid what happened to other cities from happening here.

Chair Mammano advised that this (WAVE) was discussed and the consensus was that the Committee "Was not going down that route."

Mr. Stresau questioned if the \$5 million that has been saved means that those lines would be relocated out from underneath the tracks.

Mr. Feldman indicated that it depends on the line. The lines would be relocated or upgraded.

Chair Mammano questioned if \$5 million was the number.

Mr. Feldman stated that was the number given by the State based on the project estimate. Most of the waterlines are under the street and the sewer lines will be upgraded or repaired.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that the minutes are essentially back to verbatim, which is fine, they are just lengthy. They are much better than before. Mr. Orshefsky stated that he could be cut out of the loop and will bring comments as necessary to the meetings.

Chair Mammano agreed that the minutes are looking good.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if staff could circulate a copy of the Resolution by the City Commission that extended the tenure of this Committee.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned a listing of various infrastructures issues from an article he wrote for the Imperial Point Association newsletter and suggested a motion be made so the list could be used as a guideline and as information to the new Commission.

Mr. Orshefsky suggested that since this was distributed at the beginning of the meeting that it be put on the next agenda.

Chair Mammano indicated discussion of Mr. Zeltman's list would be included in an agenda item about preparation of some type of document to inform the Commissioners of where the Committee was at this point so they would be brought up to speed with what has been learned.

Mr. Ostrau believed the list in a bullet format is a good backdrop for the meetings and tells the public what is there.

Mr. Hansen suggested adding this list with the schedule suggested by Mr. Orshefsky to use as a reminder of the six or seven different areas of study. Even if nothing is done it is a reminder that these are the items of interest. This would be helpful to make sure the Committee is focused and establishing some structure.

Chair Mammano thought once the Committee held the Outreach meetings a lot of the definition and topics would come in.

Chair Mammano clarified that rather than receiving the material as it becomes available that it be put together a week before the meeting and sent out.

Discussion ensued that materials for the meeting were being sent out when received and it was difficult to keep track. The conclusion was that Ms. Shuster would compile the materials and send it out as one package a week before the meeting. Unless there was an absolute urgency, material received after the package is sent would be held for the next meeting.

Mr. Verma clarified that the information would be forwarded one time on Wednesday or Thursday. If something needs to be added it can always be done.

5. Old Business

A. Outreach Meetings

i. Topics defined

Mr. Cobb questioned the theme and if the Committee is presenting information, looking for information, or both.

Chair Mammano clarified that when this was discussed at the last meeting there was a consensus that the Committee was looking for information; it is a listening tool. At the last meeting it was decided that this was going to be self-selective; the Committee was not going to decide what was going to be discussed.

Table discussion resulted in membership requesting city staff that has been through this process describe an approach that was effective.

Dr. Gassman volunteered to provide some guidance on successful approaches used for similar meetings. She found giving three dots to each attendee is a good number. The neighbors would place their dots on a board with the different topics. If the Committee would like an understanding of where their priorities lie among those three dots, they could be color coded. The neighbors would put the dots, in terms of their priorities, into what should be no more than ten categories. The value of the residents having an opportunity to do this as a group is that they can feed off each other to understand the priorities of the community. When this type of exercise is done usually the priorities can be seen visually. When asked if knowledgeable staff should be present to discuss the different topics, Dr. Gassman expressed the event will turn into an education process when this is supposed to be a listening process. Other approaches:

- Individuals may only come up once per topic and they do not have a chance to come to the microphone again to respond to other comments.
- Speakers must be held to three minutes and
- It must be clear that the Committee is there to listen, not to answer questions.

The Committee must be very focused on what they are trying to accomplish, which is trying to understand the community's priorities for funding infrastructure and listening to specific concerns going forward.

No one will be completely happy because everyone wants to have a voice. There could be some guidelines that allow people to come up and concur with a statement but waive their speaking time.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if Dr. Gassman has done the dots before.

Dr. Gassman advised that the dots have been used lots of times. With good direction, the dots could be done in 15 minutes. It can be organized as people come in the room but it is better if they are given a group instruction.

Chair Mammano mentioned there may be several people who come to the meeting and indicate their priorities but do not feel comfortable speaking.

Dr. Gassman stated that needs to be captured as well, which can be done with the dots.

Chair Mammano commented that the sense of the room is captured and the people who have the interest in the topic will speak.

Dr. Gassman mentioned that because the group process is being allowed to dictate topic areas, a microphone probably should be put out and a line created for people to speak so people do not have to sign up.

Mr. Orshefsky suggested staff could hand out the dots at the door and the people could sign in and include their address.

Chair Mammano stated it was friendlier with an introduction and telling them the rules of the game. It is a participatory kind of a thing.

It was mentioned that a photograph could be taken of each board that could be compared across each district.

Mr. Cobb suggested appointing Dr. Gassman to assist with the meeting structure.

Dr. Gassman stated that she would be happy to work with Ms. Mammano to help create some structure.

Mr. Verma advised that although engineering would not be discussed he would be willing to provide that information if needed.

Chair Mammano suggested general topics with subtopics and the consensus was to keep topics broad and to use the main topics on the list she provided without the subcategories. The list of topics is:

1. Water
2. Sewer
3. Stormwater
4. Roads
5. Bridges
6. Sidewalks
7. City Buildings
8. Parks

Discussion ensued on whether to discuss all city buildings or just the police department and city hall in absence of the 40 year inspection report. The topic will be revisited at the next meeting.

Chair Mammano mentioned that timing becomes interesting. The first meeting is on March 19th and the next Committee meeting is March 5th. There is time to refine the topic, as needed.

Chair Mammano questioned who would be at the meeting besides the Committee.

Ms. Shuster stated that she and Mr. Verma would be there. The City would be providing a time clock and two microphones.

Chair Mammano requested water and cookies should be available.

- ii. Dates and Locations
 1. March 19th Beach Community Center (Dist. 1)
 2. March 21st Carter Park (Dist. 3)
 3. March 27th Holiday Park (Dist. 2)
 4. March 22nd Hortt Park (Dist. 4)

Chair Mammano indicated that there are four Outreach meetings, the dates of which are March 19 at the Beach Community Center, March 21 at the Carter Center, March 22 at Hortt Park and March 27 at Holiday Park. Chair Mammano questioned how many members are available to attend the meetings and noted that there needs to be some representation from the Committee at each meeting.

Chair Mammano requested that everyone let Ms. Shuster know which dates they would be able to attend and stated that there should be at least one or two members at each meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the meetings would be noticed.

Ms. Shuster advised that the meetings would not be quorum based but they would be noticed and publicized through the City's Strategic Communication Division. The meetings are on the city's event calendar and staff is waiting for a motion and approval.

Chair Mammano asked about a citywide meeting.

Ms. Shuster stated they have not gotten to that meeting yet.

Motion made by Mr. Cobb, seconded by Mr. Stresau, to adopt the aforementioned meeting dates. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Mammano indicated that the time of the meetings would be from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. and everyone agreed.

B. Outreach Meeting Structure

- i. Meeting Leader
- ii. Time Keeper
- iii. Sign Up Speakers
- iv. Set Up and Clean Up

9. Board Member Comments – None.

10. New Business

Chair Mammano introduced the maps of the I/I (Inflow and Infiltration) requested by the Committee. She recalled that the City Manager said, "You can never have enough money to devote to I/I." The question became how much money was devoted to I/I and what was left. This material was put together by staff to answer that question.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the material is an informational item.

Mr. Verma advised there are two sheets; one is the basins in the consent order and clarified that the basins are not the same basins or watersheds as the stormwater master plan. He clarified they are sanitary sewers. The first spreadsheet provides how many feet there are in different basins that need lining, what has been completed and what is remaining. The second sheet gives the approximate cost. As far as cost is concerned, it is like a moving target, the numbers are subject to change because task orders are continually being issued.

Chair Mammano questioned if it would be correct to say that under the consent order the City has committed to spend \$20,172,000 and change.

Mr. Verma indicated that the total estimate according to the fourth column was about \$26 million and about \$5.4 million has been spent. Close to \$3 million was issued last week for additional work orders.

Chair Mammano stated there is \$20 million more to go.

Mr. Verma replied yes and noted that the majority of the I/I in the consent order is coming out of the \$200 million bond fund.

Mr. Berg advised there was \$15 million in the CIP for I/I that is part of the consent order.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that \$15 million was already in the CIP and only \$6 million additional was coming from the bond for I/I. Mr. Orshefsky was trying to get to what percentage of the \$26 million was coming out of the bond or from other sources in the CIP.

Mr. Berg indicated that in terms of the bond issue, because they had to spend the money within a short period of time, the bond money will be used to front those CIP expenditures and will put additional dollars in the CIP after the fact for other similar projects.

Mr. Cobb questioned the urgency of spending the bond money.

Mr. Verma stated that spending the money within 3 to 5 years is a bond requirement.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that the purpose of his question was previous discussion about bond or other sources of funding that were likely to supplant existing CIP dollars and the Committee did not want that to happen. If some of this was coming out of existing CIP dollars that was fine and if the balance was coming out of bonds that was fine. The mechanism and proportion were questioned. Mr. Orshefsky would like to know the answer.

The other thing was when these two things were put together, what percentage of the total universe of potential I/I was covered in these two pieces; was it 100%?

Mr. Verma replied it was not 100%. There are still some areas that are not developed. The priority was the consent order.

Mr. Zeltman questioned if the time period was five years for I/I.

Mr. Verma stated the time period was five years to spend money in the bond.

Mr. Stresau mentioned the second chart and questioned if someone was adding the numbers.

Mr. Verma indicated that the numbers were added on Excel and they were double-checked.

Mr. Stresau questioned if the numbers were rounded.

Mr. Verma stated the number of miles were rounded. Mr. Verma commented it was just I/I to the best of his knowledge. According to staff, this has been an ongoing program but not with the intensity as has been proposed by the consent order.

Mr. Zeltman believed the City of Fort Lauderdale did a lot with the I/I studies in the 1990's and after that it seemed to be inactive for a period of time.

Mr. Ostrau advised that the I/I program started in 2014.

Chair Mammano mentioned that the budget said the program started in 2014 to 2019. Chair Mammano questioned if it would be correct to say that the sanitary sewer consent order total number of linear feet for sewer lines was 238,000 linear feet and for sewer lines in the non-consent order there is a remaining 363,000 linear feet of pipe that needs to be fixed. If the dollars are approximately the same, it would cost \$26 million to fund the amount of linear feet in the consent order. A rough estimation could probably be made as to how much more money is needed to do the remaining non-consent order I/I. The question is if this Committee believed that I/I should be the highest priority in terms of money.

Mr. Verma indicated that the cost is dependent upon the situation, such as the size of the pipe. For the sake of planning, an extrapolation could be done with some spot-checking to come up with what is called a weighted average, which could be used to determine the amount of funding for planning purposes.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that the prioritization is consent order versus non-consent order. It was questioned where the Reiss report fits into the prioritization decision. Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the State was pushing high priority items, or Reiss, or both.

Mr. Verma stated that numbers represent what was being presented by the State.

Dr. Gassman reminded the Committee the consent order was not imposed upon the City. The City negotiated the consent order. There was the opportunity to prioritize those basins staff felt were of the most critical nature and where run times related to costs, demonstrated the biggest issues with I/I. The consent order basins are those basins that City staff feel are the ones that need to be tackled first and would provide the greatest benefit.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if that universe is congruent with the Reiss report.

Dr. Gassman replied “yes” because Reiss talked to staff about what needed to be done and in what order.

Chair Mammano questioned if one were to overlap one map over the other if it would cover the whole City.

Mr. Stresau replied no because the maps were scaled differently.

Mr. Verma stated that the rest of the City needs to be lined but the issue is not as intense or immediate as the areas these two maps represent.

Mr. Cobb questioned the general timeframe.

Mr. Stresau stated that it has to do with the age of the pipe. Almost everything in the consent order is in old Fort Lauderdale and everything in the non-consent order is all new work.

Mr. Berg could not provide a timeframe because he would be guessing, there are so many variables. Every line needs to be televised and then determined if it needs to be lined at all and what the priority is. Mr. Berg noted that the ones in the consent order are the worst.

Chair Mammano questioned if the \$200 million bond had not been done if all this money for these projects would have had to come out of the enterprise fund.

Mr. Berg stated some of the consent order I/I projects had already been in the CIP and have been started. It frees up funds in the CIP for future use.

Mr. Feldman advised that the CIP fund was infused with the \$200 million and that combined with what they have will take care of funding obligations for the next five years of the consent order and their aggressive approach for I/I will continue. The money taken from the Fiveash rehabilitation project will be restored.

When asked about the cost of the bonds and if the \$200 million was gross or net, Mr. Feldman indicated that the net proceeds were \$200 million. The cost to issue bonds was \$3 million.

Mr. Berg stated that the debt service was about \$4 million, which is due in September and then the payments would be twice a year.

Mr. Cobb thought it would be helpful if this Committee had a basic cash flow chart of the CIP supplemented by the new bond issue.

Mr. Feldman indicated that a chart is being put together.

Mr. Verma added that hopefully the rate study is going to capture whatever is not covered.

Mr. Berg mentioned the Reiss report is a 30-year report. The system is going to be worked systematically over the next 30 years and the projects would be funded based on priorities that are established.

Mr. Cobb questioned if the timeframe was five, ten, or 15 years.

Mr. Feldman believed between the bond issue and available dollars in the CIP the needed \$50 million for identified I/I is available.

Mr. Cobb stated that is what the Committee needed to know just to determine what the overall aggregate issues were from a macro level.

Mr. Feldman agreed. The City wants the Committee to know the financing and tell them if they need more resources. The other part of the I/I was that they still need to work on their large users.

Chair Mammano stated that is a 40,000-foot issue that must be addressed.

Mr. Stresau questioned if there was any way to determine the quality of the product the large users are sending.

Mr. Feldman believed the large users could be required to do an I/I study to demonstrate their I/I efficiency.

Chair Mammano questioned if the large users would be doing the same studies as the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Mr. Feldman did not believe the studies were being done.

Mr. Berg stated it was still an issue.

Mr. Zeltman questioned if there is any leverage.

Chair Mammano questioned if the I/I could be shut at the City limits. Chair Mammano asked how they could physically test so much sand coming into the pipes.

Mr. Feldman advised that how much water is being collected is looked at. If the answer is that they have more coming in than the City of Fort Lauderdale sent out, then they have infiltration.

Chair Mammano assumed that since a certain amount of dollars was being spent on the I/I out of the enterprise funds previously, if that rate of spending would continue in

addition to the consent order money or if it was going to flip over to the consent order. Chair Mammano questioned how much that would free up.

Mr. Verma indicated that all the pipes have not been lined. Once that is done they will move on to the next basin until everything is complete. The ratio should be close to 80% completion and until that is met they need to continue working on the I/I problems. The amount of money depends on what is available in the budget.

Chair Mammano mentioned that the bond funds have given a lot more flexibility in the CIP and enterprise fund for the wastewater situation. An acceleration should be seen of other projects as well.

Mr. Verma commented that depends on how much is coming in.

Mr. Zeltman advised that the lining is not going to be the answer for all conditions. Some of the pipe is in such bad condition that it cannot be lined and must be replaced.

Mr. Berg indicated that there are three groups of expenses related to the bond. The first group is the consent order items that were not included in the CIP, which is about \$81 million. There is a second group, which is generally water projects with wastewater issues over the last year. Re-funding water projects including the Fiveash reliability project, which was about \$50 million and the group of projects was about \$55 million. Those are projects that came out of the Reiss report priorities.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that those projects were not otherwise funded by the CIP.

Mr. Berg stated that the Reiss report, by definition, did not address anything in the CIP.

Mr. Cobb questioned if there is enough staff to solve all these issues.

Mr. Berg advised that everything is being contracted out with city staff oversight.

Mr. Feldman indicated that they have staff. This is very similar to what was done with the Water Works 2011.

Mr. Berg stated that Hazen & Sawyer would be doing the design on all those projects.

Mr. Stresau commented that the consultants are an extension of staff that allows all the projects to be done and then they report back to City staff to make sure everything is organized.

Mr. Cobb mentioned staff shortages in major projects and stated that the City cannot afford 30% overruns and underruns. Mr. Cobb would like assurance that there is full staff to execute these plans.

Mr. Feldman assured that staff is available.

Chair Mammano questioned if there was a rule of thumb that there is a reasonable amount of supervisory staff to a dollar amount of contracting of this kind.

Mr. Berg assured that assignments for staff was monitored.

Mr. Verma acknowledged Ms. Shuster's hard work.

Mr. Zeltman expressed appreciation and commented that the Committee is fortunate to have such talent in the City staff. It is nice to have people who are interested and great to have devoted City employees.

Mr. Stresau stated that Mr. Feldman always seems to have the answer.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned that he contacted the City six years ago to have sidewalks redone. Mr. Feldman came to the site and looked at the situation and the project was completed. The Commission should respect the City Manager's talents.

11. Public Comments – None.

12. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting – March 5, 2018

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

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