



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

**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, MAY 6, 2024 – 2:00 P.M. TO 4:00 P.M.**

January-December 2024

Attendance

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	5	0
Peter Partington, Vice Chair	A	3	2
Gerald Angeli	P	5	0
Gregory Barnett	P	2	0
Shane Grabski (arr. 2:20)	P	4	1
James LaBrie	P	5	0
Michael Lambrechts	A	4	1
Marta Reczko	P	4	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	5	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	5	0

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

Staff

- Alan Dodd, Director of Public Works
- Omar Castellon, Assistant Public Works Director – Engineering
- Miguel Arroyo, Public Works
- Garry Brandy, Public Works
- Vicki Beauvais, Senior Administrative Assistant
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- Sylejman Ujkani, Program Manager
- Yvette Matthews, Assistant Director, Office of Management and Budget
- Aricka Johnson, Office of Management and Budget
- J. 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 2:01 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

ii. Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. LaBrie, to approve the Agenda as written. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – April 1, 2024

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Angeli, to approve the minutes with or without corrections. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

2. Old Business

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

ii. Result of Staff Input Survey

Aricka Johnson of the Office of Management and Budget gave a PowerPoint presentation on the City's outreach efforts and feedback, including outreach to City Staff members. Employees were engaged using two methods: an online survey and an Employee Town Hall Workshop.

132 completed surveys were received, as well as another 58 surveys with at least one response. Surveys were received from every Department in the City. 50 employees attended the Town Hall, again representing most Departments.

Key findings from the survey showed that City employees liked the previous City Hall's centralized Downtown location which was easy to reach and fostered collaboration. They were also in favor of the previous building's common areas. Most employees felt very or adequately secure at the previous facility, and would like to see green space, natural lighting, and integrated retail/office uses. All City employees indicated that the current number of conference rooms or more are needed. In terms of amenities, employees were in favor of a gym, cafeteria or coffee shop, outdoor space, and a centralized wellness center.

The Town Hall meeting offered an opportunity for free response rather than selected answers. There was consistent interest in security, both through features and an in-person Staff security presence. The preference was for public-facing services to be located on the ground floor, as in the previous City Hall building.

With regard to modern technology and facilities, Ms. Johnson reiterated the desire for conference rooms and flexible multi-purpose space which could accommodate a future hybrid work environment. Outdoor space for events was also mentioned, as were mixed use, amenities such as a gym, cafeteria, or coffee shop as well as a child care or

daycare facility. An on-site wellness center, which was part of the previous City Hall, was also discussed.

Ms. Johnson continued that the City conducts an annual Neighbor Survey for residents. This is a statistically valid survey which is representative of the community in both geographic and demographic terms. From January through March 2024, the survey included a question which asked residents what they felt was most important in a new City Hall. The number-one response was accessibility, including a central, accessible location with reasonable hours. Other key answers included parking and customer service.

Ms. Reczko asked how many residents responded to the Neighbor Survey. Ms. Johnson replied that there were 631 total survey responses; however, the number of residents who responded to the question about a new City Hall was only a fraction of this number.

Mr. Walters requested clarification of the interest in accessibility, including whether this referred to access in reaching the facility itself or access once individuals are there. Ms. Johnson advised that this was open to interpretation, as responses were written in.

i. Reimagine City Hall Upcoming Workshop

Sheryl Dickey, president of Dickey Consulting, showed a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the April 2024 Reimagine City Hall workshop, which invited attendees to identify their priorities for a new facility. All items received at least one priority vote, with the most going toward design, architectural significance, and affordable housing. Other items included space allocation for City officials and staff, space for the public, amenities, service as a community resource, and accessibility. Financing opportunities were also addressed.

Ms. Dickey advised that these results provide more information regarding what the public meant by the term community resource, including examples such as exhibits by local artists, providing opportunities for collaboration, serving as a welcome center, and providing neighbor services, among others. There was also interest in ensuring the location is accessible, including free parking and provision of meeting place for City advisory boards.

Chair Mammano recalled that at the April workshop, it was noted that the federal courthouse is not an option for a new City Hall; however, there was no elaboration on this. Chair Mammano requested that this be discussed further.

Mr. Grabski arrived at 2:20 p.m.

Ms. Dickey continued that in terms of architectural significance, attendees had indicated that this included consideration of historic architecture, including in the

surrounding area, as well as creation of an attractive structure which is representative of the City. There was also a clear desire for City Staff to have dedicated space, including space for elected officials, ensuring security, and providing centralized administrative functions in one location. There was also interest in flexible community space, such as conference rooms, as well as space for historical exhibits or educational purposes and outdoor space.

Mr. LaBrie asked how the summary results slide was developed. Ms. Dickey explained that this was based on the responses from attendees. Yvette Matthews, Assistant Director of the Office of Management and Budget, further clarified that items with the highest number of dots placed by attendees were presented in priority order. Staff included information from the public survey as well as employee feedback.

Mr. LaBrie stated that more items were presented than were included on the summary slide, such as demographic information. Chair Mammano pointed out that the summary is not included to address attendee information, but to show the attendees' preferences. Mr. LaBrie asserted that this information only represents the residents who attended the April meeting, which he felt should be clarified in the summary.

Chair Mammano noted that information provided by City employees was also reflected in the summary, as some of the items were priorities for both groups. The intent was to show the existence of "synergy" between Staff's and the public's priorities.

Ms. Matthews advised that when the information is presented to the City Commission, it will be done in two different components: employee feedback from their survey and workshop, and public feedback and survey results. It will be simple to distinguish which responses came from the public and which came from the employees. It will also be possible to see which responses arose from workshop attendees and which came from public surveys.

Ms. Matthews also noted that not all items discussed by one set of respondents was also addressed by another, citing the City employees' interest in a wellness center as an example. This item was unique to the employees.

Chair Mammano congratulated Staff and the consulting team on their work on the Reimagine City Hall project.

Chair Mammano continued that she and Mr. Barnett had each drafted a document reflecting their thoughts on the process. Mr. Barnett explained that he had created an executive summary presentation, and briefly reviewed his document for the Committee. The summary document included the following:

- Recommendation of a new building
- Recommendation that the new facility be Downtown
- Estimated budgetary amount

- Information on design, amenities, and space allocation was gathered from the general public
- The reimagined facility should be a more collaborative space

Mr. Barnett continued that his summary also addressed general building design, amenities, and public feedback methodology based on the series of workshops. He added that his summary does not include discussion of location options, as these were not discussed in depth at the workshops or by the Committee.

Chair Mammano observed that the Committee could inform the Commission that its members had reached consensus that a centralized Downtown location was preferred. Mr. Barnett noted that his summary also recommended a Downtown location, with a building design that could withstand further severe rain events and can be as energy-efficient as possible. He again emphasized that no candidate locations have been discussed by the Committee.

Mr. LaBrie asserted that there was no discussion of resilience at the workshops or afterward by the Committee. Mr. Barnett pointed out that this component could be assumed due to the effects of severe weather on the previous facility. He continued that design would be driven by the location, and reviewed some of the priorities discussed for the new facility, including collaborative/meeting space for community or nonprofit organizations, as well as a “possible convention style” and adaptive technology.

Chair Mammano proposed that instead of following the organizational structure provided by Staff, which broke the discussion up into several categories, the Committee may instead wish to present their recommendations using a different approach. She explained that her summary document had listed a number of fundamental qualities the Commission should consider when making a final decision on a new City Hall. These qualities included:

- Accessibility and security
- Welcoming and engaging space
- Flexible and expandable
- Historic and educational
- Technologically advanced but “people-friendly”
- Recognizable and cost-effective

Mr. Barnett confirmed that these ideas are also reflected in his summary document.

Mr. LaBrie commented that when the Committee first undertook this effort, they were asked to identify and develop guiding principles for a new City Hall. He added that they should also make it clear to the Commission that the workshops and survey did not result in statistically significant information from the general public; however, based on the information the Committee members heard and the meetings and discussed among themselves, they had arrived at a number of recommendations.

Chair Mammano clarified that the Committee was originally asked to develop a set of principles for the Commission to consider when making a decision on a new facility. She concluded that she would consolidate the two documents before the Committee's May 20, 2024 special meeting and would send the results to Staff for dissemination to the other members, who may then provide Staff with their comments. The document would then be presented at the May 20 meeting for further discussion.

ii. Current Consent Order Update (Water Mapping Project)

Sylejman Ujkani, Program Manager for the Consent Order water mapping project, stated that the project was extended due to a protest received by the City's Procurement Department. The mapping project now has until the end of calendar year 2024 to reach completion. It is progressing well, with most of the field connections mapped and information uploaded to geographic information systems (GIS). The City is on track to include all of its assets in GIS and complete this Consent Order requirement.

Chair Mammano recalled that there were two separate Consent Orders, one of which addressed the City's water system and the other the sewer system. Mr. Ujkani explained that the water Consent Order included mapping of the City's water infrastructure and uploading it to GIS, which would allow the City to know the location of all assets and more easily address breaks.

Ms. Reczko asked how the mapping data was collected. Mr. Ujkani replied that the City is verifying all information they have on file and uploading it to GIS. As-built information, such as pipe size and material, will be linked to GIS as well.

Mr. Walters asked if the mapping will include links to information such as whether a specific pipe is out-of-date or in danger of breaking. Omar Castellon, Assistant Public Works Director (Engineering), advised that this may be part of the next phase of the project once mapping is complete; the state has not yet informed the City of what will be required of that next phase. Mr. Ujkani noted, however, that one aspect of the water Consent Order is a requirement that once the system has been mapped in GIS, it must be updated when new construction of projects is underway.

Mr. Castellon added that the mapping of the water system will be integrated into CityWorks, which is the City's asset management program. This will show information on when pipe was installed as well as its probability of breaking.

Ms. Reczko commented that it would be more efficient to collect as-built data when assets are opened for mapping rather than to look again at this data once the mapping is complete. Mr. Ujkani explained that there is a significant amount of infrastructure for which no information is on hand, even if as-built data is considered.

Chair Mammano suggested that once GIS mapping is complete, information associated with breaks should be overlaid onto that mapping, such as how many times a given pipe may have broken recently.

Public Works Director Alan Dodd explained that the goal of the mapping as part of the water Consent Order is to help ensure information is uploaded into CityWorks for asset management. This involves knowing the condition, age, and other key factors of infrastructure in order to be more proactive on the repair and/or replacement of assets. The City has over 400 miles of pipe that is more than 60 years old.

Chair Mammano stated that the Committee should know how much money is budgeted in the City's current Capital Improvement Program (CIP) toward new water pipes, as well as how pipes were prioritized within the CIP. Mr. Dodd advised that some pipes can be replaced more quickly than others if there is already a capital project in place for that location, as that project can be advanced. When other breaks occur, Staff is aware of the condition of most of the pipes in that area, and can determine how large an area they wish to replace at that time.

Mr. Barnett asked when the mapping project is expected to be complete. Mr. Ujkani reiterated that the deadline for compliance with the Consent Order is December 2024 and the project may be complete by September. The results of the mapping will be added into the CityWorks asset management program, which will provide predictions on when breaks may be likely to occur or when assets need to be replaced.

Mr. Dodd further clarified that while CityWorks is currently functional and usable, the data in this system is currently not 100% accurate, as it is based on historical records. This is the reason for more in-depth mapping of the full system. He estimated that 30% to 40% of what was previously included in mapping had "unknowns" associated with it.

Another aspect of CityWorks involves Staff reviewing the conditions of pipes when repairs are made and providing feedback. This is combined with the use of predictive software to identify where investments should be made.

The CityWorks team includes three to four positions and ties in with the Staff used to manage the software program. It will include information on water, stormwater, and wastewater, and Staff will work toward including all assets in the system, including treatment plants.

Chair Mammano asked how much of the current CIP is affected by the CityWorks program's predictive component. Mr. Dodd explained that CityWorks is not yet being used for asset management. He estimated that it may take one to two more years to build the program to a level where asset management can be done.

Ms. Reczko expressed concern that there should be more aggressive action planned within the CIP. Mr. Dodd pointed out that it is not possible to increase spending on I&I,

pipe replacement, and pump stations at the same time: the Department must balance these needs. Budgeting for one type of project will take money away from another project. In addition, a further spending increase will affect residents' service rates, as all of this funding cannot be provided through impact fees.

Mr. Walters requested additional information on wastewater capacity. Mr. Dodd replied that the overall capacity at the wastewater treatment plant was recently increased to 161.5 million gallons per day (MGD); however, within individual basins and stations, there may still be a need for greater capacity. When a capacity letter is provided in support of development, it will identify whether or not there is enough capacity at the plant as well as at the lift station, and may require that pipes need to be increased in size in some areas. The developer may be required to fund some of these increases in addition to impact fees. If this occurs, the value of this infrastructure work is deducted from the impact fees as required by state law.

3. New Business

i. Temporary Booster Chlorination Injection and Water Sampling

Garry Brandy of the Public Works Department provided an update on chlorination through temporary booster injections, including a map showing where booster injections have been necessary thus far in 2024. Not all of these injections have corresponded with breakages, as some were related to the replacement of valves and pipes or plant maintenance.

It was asked what happens if a contractor is responsible for a break. Mr. Brandy replied that the contractor is issued a service interruption cost.

Mr. Dodd added that when a booster injection is necessary, it is typically done at night and left in place for one to two hours before it is flushed out. The water is turned back on the next morning, which is followed by two days of testing.

Mr. Zeltman asked if there has been any consideration of placing chlorine injection stations at some of the outer areas of the system which are farther away from the plant. Mr. Brandy advised that this has been discussed internally, but Staff has opted for a type of flushing where chlorine is sent through the entire system via a series of events.

Mr. Dodd introduced Miguel Arroyo, who is responsible for the water and wastewater plants as well as the lab and SCADA process control engineers. Mr. Arroyo explained the chlorination process from the plant, including the required maximum and minimum thresholds. The plant's laboratory gathers approximately 30,000 samples per year, which are followed by roughly 100,000 individual tests. Every day, the raw water coming into the plant is also analyzed and tested. He reviewed other tests conducted by the laboratories.

Mr. Walters asked who is responsible for the chlorination following breaks in other municipalities that use Fort Lauderdale's water treatment system, such as Oakland Park. Mr. Brandy confirmed that this would be Oakland Park's responsibility, as they own their own infrastructure even though they purchase water from Fort Lauderdale. These municipalities are held accountable by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for maintaining their own systems.

Mr. LaBrie asked if the laboratory tests water from other municipalities or only from Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Arroyo replied that until recently, the lab tested water from large users, but determined that this was not in the City's best interests. Those communities are now responsible for testing their own samples.

Mr. Dodd added that testing is done on the farthest edges of the City, which means if chlorine levels drop between leaving the plant and reaching those areas, the settings may be adjusted to ensure that minimum chlorination requirements are met in those areas without exceeding levels when leaving the plant. This is also managed from the plant.

4. Public Works Update

i. CIP Financial Report

ii. Water & Sewer Breaks Report

It was noted that there were no breaks in April 2024.

5. General Discussion and Comments

i. Committee Members

Chair Mammano stated that she recently met with Kelly Hall, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) engineer responsible for overseeing inspection and maintenance of state bridges. Ms. Hall is also in charge of inspection and reporting for City- and County-owned bridges. She had provided an overview of how these inspections are done, criteria for inspection, and consequences to the County or the City if FDOT's recommendations for repairs and/or maintenance are not met.

Chair Mammano concluded that once the Reimagine City Hall project is complete, it may be useful for the Committee to see a presentation on bridges.

Mr. LaBrie addressed the City Hall project, asking if there is consideration of moving some Departments, such as Building Services, from their current locations to a centralized City Hall location. Chair Mammano commented that ensuring the accessibility of City Hall does not necessarily mean bringing all Departments back to a

single building. Mr. Barnett added that his recommendation was for each City Department to make its own recommendation on the City Hall space they feel would be appropriate.

Chair Mammano noted that the Staff input portion of the City Hall discussion did not include any input from the City Manager and Department Managers. Mr. Dodd observed that he has consistently indicated that Public Works needs a dedicated space in which all of its employees can work collaboratively. He was in favor of establishing space for 100% in-office work, with the ability to work from home through technology if necessary.

Chair Mammano recalled that there had also been discussion of the need for Departments to collaborate with the City Attorney's Office, for example. Mr. Dodd stated that Public Works has one to two members of that Office with which they work regularly, and noted that proximity to Procurement and the Financial Department is also necessary at times. He reiterated that some face-to-face discussion is required for some aspects of work.

Mr. LaBrie asked if there are satellite locations for Public Works. Mr. Dodd explained that all office personnel are based in a single building, while some engineers work at the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD). Utility employees may work at various City plants.

Mr. Castellon reported that the lead testing results Mr. Zeltman had requested at a previous meeting have been posted. No lead was found in the samples.

ii. Public Comments

None.

6. Adjournment – NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE: Monday, May 20, 2024 (Special Meeting)

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

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