



DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, AUGUST 30, 2021 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

February 2021-January 2022

Attendance

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	7	0
Gerald Angeli	P	7	0
Shane Grabski	P	7	0
Charlie Ladd (dep. 3:44)	P	5	2
Michael Marshall	P	6	1
Peter Partington	P	7	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	6	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	6	1
Ralph Zeltman	P	7	0

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

Staff

- Patricia Jolly, Sr. Administrative Assistant and Board Liaison
- Talal Abi-Karam, Interim Director of Public Works
- Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works -- Sustainability
- Omar Castellon, Chief Engineer
- Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
- John Travers, Building Official
- Igor Vassiliev, Project Manager II
- Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

I. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. and roll was called.

ii. Approval of Agenda

The Committee determined by consensus to remove Agenda Item iii, “Additional detail regarding unsolicited proposals for the water plant,” from Old Business, as there is no new information available at this time.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to adopt the Agenda. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes August 2, 2021

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve.

Mr. Zeltman noted the following correction to p. 4, paragraph 1: replace “his own storm drain systems” with “the City’s storm drain systems in the Imperial Point community”

Mr. Partington recalled that he had raised the issue of the City’s previous Public Works Director and his letter of resignation during the discussion recounted on p.5, paragraph 1. While there had been Committee consensus not to address this subject further, he requested that the issue be reflected following paragraph 1.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to accept the minutes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

II. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

Mr. Zeltman requested discussion of a potential public-private partnership to replace the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant. Chair Mammano recalled that the Committee had sent a communication to the City Commission on November 4, 2019, indicating that they were in favor of “broadly considering a public-private partnership approach” for this replacement, with the understanding that no form of the proposed partnership would allow the City to relinquish ownership of the water, water quality, or rate structure.

Mr. Zeltman asserted that since November 2019, additional members have joined the Infrastructure Task Force Committee (ITFC), and it may be advisable to revisit this issue for another vote. He characterized a recent public-private partnership involving Lockhart Stadium Park as unsuccessful, and suggested that this may be a reason to discuss the proposed partnership for the water treatment plant further.

Chair Mammano commented that there are a number of discussions on public-private partnerships going on in Fort Lauderdale at present, some of which are project-specific and some of which are related to recent legislation. She was not certain that further discussion of this type of partnership and its methodology would be productive, pointing out that there has been extensive previous discussion of this methodology.

Mr. Zeltman stated that in addition to the new Committee members, there has also been more information provided on public-private partnerships. He explained that his concern was specific to the Fiveash plant, as he felt no investors or other non-municipal entities should be making decisions on the type of water treatment and/or the processes involved. He expressed concern that non-City entities would be more concerned with profit, which could result in rising rates.

Chair Mammano requested feedback from Committee members who had not been present in November 2019. Mr. Grabski advised that he concurred generally with the

Committee's communication, as it was not a binding statement but requested consideration of a public-private partnership. Mr. Ladd noted that he is currently engaged in a public-private partnership involving the City, and is familiar with the process. Mr. Angeli added that one lesson learned from the Lockhart Stadium public-private partnership is that requirements of such a partnership must be clarified, including design, before the parties move forward with this type of agreement.

It was determined that the Committee would not discuss public-private partnerships further at this time.

III. Public Comments (at Each Item)

None.

IV. Old Business

i. Update on the tunnel project

None.

ii. Update on the Commission Communication regarding the Moratorium from June 1, 2021

Chair Mammano recalled that this was discussed at the August 2, 2021 meeting, at which it was suggested that the City's capacity letters to decision-makers, including the Planning and Zoning Board (PZB), state the condition of infrastructure as well as its capacity.

Talal Abi-Karam, Interim Director of Public Works, recalled that there was extensive discussion of this issue with Assistant City Attorney D'Wayne Spence, who has provided some guidance on this issue. He noted that the City Manager's Office issued a memorandum regarding what is done in other municipalities. Staff at the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD) continues to "follow the process."

Ms. Scott asked if the Committee's recommendation needs to be documented in an Ordinance in order to provide Staff with direction. Chair Mammano recalled that guidance from the City Attorney's Office indicated inclusion of this recommendation in the existing Ordinance was not appropriate: instead, the information should be added administratively through the capacity letters, which would be expanded to include the condition of the infrastructure affected by a given development.

Mr. Partington advised that there have been two memoranda from the City Manager's Office to the City Commission, one of which is dated April 19. This memo addresses the difficulty of incorporating condition into the development approval process. A second memo dated July 15, 2021 notes that Staff has surveyed various municipalities to

review their approval processes. He felt this suggested the City Commission has not yet fully considered the communication sent by the Committee urging incorporation of condition into the development approval process.

Chair Mammano asked if Staff has been instructed by the City Manager to include condition in capacity letters. Mr. Abi-Karam replied that there has been no such direction, and confirmed Mr. Partington's comments regarding the two memoranda. He was not aware of any further action on this issue.

Chair Mammano observed that if the Committee does not take some specific action, such as recommending the inclusion of condition in capacity letters or requesting its inclusion in an Ordinance, nothing would come of the communication sent to the Commission.

Mr. Partington referred to a motion made at the Committee's May 3, 2021 meeting, stating that it should either be repeated or "communicated fully for the first time" to the Commission at the September 13, 2021 joint meeting scheduled between the Commission and the Committee.

Ms. Scott asked where the Committee's communication had gone and whether or not the Commission or another City entity is addressing it. Mr. Partington noted that when the Committee's term was extended, their primary task given by the Commission was "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." He felt that since the Committee did not recommend a moratorium, they should follow up on their motion to recommend that condition be included in the Ordinance.

Chair Mammano pointed out that this recommendation has already been made, which resulted in the Commission asking if information on condition of infrastructure could be required by Ordinance. The City Attorney's Office had responded that it could not. After receiving this information, the Committee had discussed their options further and recommended that information on condition be included as part of administrative review.

Mr. Partington stated that he was less certain that the City Attorney's Office has denied the recommendation, as he understood the issue to be that approval or lack thereof cannot be predicated upon poor condition of infrastructure. He felt Attorney Spence was considering the possibility of adding language to the Ordinance to require that condition would be reported upon explicitly during the approval process.

Chair Mammano recalled that the recommendation had been to include consideration of condition as well as capacity in the letters sent from City Staff to the PZB during the approval process. She concluded that as Staff has indicated they were not directed to include this information, the Committee should take further action. Mr. Ladd recommended that this be addressed at the September 13 joint workshop between the

Commission and the Committee. There was consensus among the members to discuss the matter further at the workshop.

iii. Additional detail regarding the unsolicited proposals for the water plant

This Item was removed from the Agenda.

iv. Update on proposed pilot study at Prospect Wellfield and Fiveash Water Plant

Chief Engineer Omar Castellon reported that this finalized report is undergoing legal review and would be presented to the Committee once review is complete. He advised that the preliminary pilot study for the Prospect Wellfield is complete, and additional testing is underway.

Boyd Corbin, member of the public, recalled that the City's consultant, Reiss, had suggested this pilot study some years ago, as it is the first step that must be taken to determine how water going into the Fiveash plant should be treated.

Mr. Corbin also addressed the possibility of a public-private partnership, noting that another South Florida city is being sued by one such entity. He added that he did not know how the City could retain control of water quality standards, and expressed concern that these standards could be compromised by a public-private partnership. He concluded that the Committee should ask whether or not ammonia or chloramine would be added to the City's drinking water, and recommended caution if the City continues this practice.

Chair Mammano advised that the pilot study in question would affect the existing Fiveash plant rather than a future facility. Mr. Castellon further clarified that the pilot study would address the recommendations of the Reiss report from 2016, which would use filters to remove discoloration from water. The study was initially conducted by consultant Carollo Engineers, which determined that activated carbon was too expensive a method to proceed with. Reiss had not agreed, and was granted a contract to show that this method was financially feasible.

Mr. Castellon continued that the currently proposed pilot study would serve as "a second check" to determine the financial feasibility of the method recommended by Reiss. He reiterated that this study is undergoing legal review by the City Attorney's Office before its results can be released.

Mr. Partington asked if there is any relationship between the pilot study and the public-private partnership proposals that are exempt from the Public Records Act. Mr. Castellon replied that there is no such relationship: the new public-private partnership would use a different type of technology than the one addressed in the study.

Chair Mammano concluded that the Committee was anxiously awaiting the conclusion of review of the study, and would place this Item on an Agenda once it is available.

v. Planning for the workshop with the Commission in September 2021

Chair Mammano advised that following an earlier meeting, she had compiled a list of the Committee's background and discussions, and condensed it into a summary history of their work. The document was included in the members' backup materials.

Chair Mammano continued that the Committee should consider what it will recommend to the City Commission going forward. They already hope to follow up on their recommendation regarding a moratorium. Another consideration is that the Committee will sunset in February unless the Commission renews them in some fashion or assigns their work to another advisory body.

Mr. Zeltman recalled that he had also recommended the Committee be "more focused on buildings" in addition to tasks related to water, stormwater, and sewer infrastructure. These included the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant and the George T. Lohmeyer Wastewater Treatment Plant (GTL). Mr. Zeltman noted that the City has already addressed wastewater gravity sewer facilities, which reduced infiltration into the system through pump stations and force mains leading to the GTL plant. With the reduction of inflow and infiltration (I&I), it is possible that the City will not need to create a sixth deep injection well at that facility.

Mr. Abi-Karam advised that Staff was aware of I&I and the need to improve infrastructure to reduce it. Between 2016 and 2021, they have addressed roughly \$30 million worth of I&I and have implemented an ongoing program to fund additional work to reduce it. He confirmed that as more work is completed, less I&I will come into the GTL facility, which reduces the need for deep injection wells that have been proposed near that plant.

Mr. Zeltman requested additional information on new regulations that might affect the construction of a sixth proposed deep injection well. Mr. Abi-Karam advised that these regulations would require high-level disinfection, which is more comprehensive than the processes currently used at GTL.

Chair Mammano asked if issues such as these were sufficient reason to recommend that the Commission consider maintaining an advisory body to focus on infrastructure past the Committee's current sunset date of February 2022. She pointed out that the Committee has accomplished the task of addressing repairs and has moved on to serve in an advisory capacity. They would need to determine what they can do in this capacity going forward.

Mr. Angeli commented that the Committee has discussed addressing the City's bridges, particularly those located on major roadways. Chair Mammano observed that it was her understanding that bridges would be repaired or replaced in the future using Broward County transportation surtax funds. Mr. Zeltman added that this would mean not only addressing the depreciation of bridges, but elevating them as tidal areas become more regularly inundated with water.

Chair Mammano asked if the City has a Bridge Master Plan and funds in the capital budget to repair or improve its bridges. Mr. Abi-Karam replied that the City completed a Bridge Master Plan five to six years ago with the assistance of a consultant. All bridges were surveyed to determine their structural condition. Funding for these improvements, however, remains an issue. There are approximately 52 City-owned bridges in the Bridge Master Plan. It is hoped that more bridges may be repaired or replaced in the future using surtax dollars.

Mr. Angeli pointed out that the Committee can provide value to the City by determining if plans for the repair and maintenance of infrastructure are being executed properly. He noted that in many cases, there may be opposing viewpoints on the right way to proceed with infrastructure improvements. Chair Mammano added that the Committee has focused closely on monitoring water and sewer breaks in recent months, although there is not yet a Water Master Plan that codifies plans for improvements.

Mr. Abi-Karam advised that the 2017 Reiss report includes extensive information on the City's water distribution system. This document analyzes water and sewer operations from a master planning perspective. Another consultant is mapping the City's entire water distribution system in compliance with the Consent Order. This information will be placed in a geographic information system (GIS) database that will be part of the City's asset management system.

Ms. Scott observed that there may be a role for a permanent ITFC to help the City establish priorities aside from emergent issues. Mr. Partington commented that he could also see an ongoing role for the Committee past February 2022, which could include monitoring expenditures, monitoring progress on the Consent Orders, and review of infrastructure condition. He felt the key question would be whether or not the Commission felt the Committee could have a role in monitoring or reviewing major projects which may or may not include repair and/or replacement of infrastructure. Mr. Marshall and Mr. Ladd agreed that the Committee should request clarification of their future role.

Mr. Zeltman recalled that when the Committee was formed as a Task Force in 2017, the Commission directed them to focus on specific issues within their scope. He felt it was incumbent upon the Mayor and Commission to direct the Committee to address and make recommendations on what the Commission sees as important.

Mr. Zeltman continued that he was concerned that inspections of City buildings may not have occurred as regularly as they should have, and there may be other issues in addition to saltwater intrusion that should be inspected.

The Committee determined that the following items would be on the Agenda of their joint workshop with the City Commission:

- How the Commission would implement the Committee's recommendation regarding the moratorium
- Supporting the Committee's and the Budget Advisory Board's (BAB's) recommendation to allocate specific amounts from ad valorem property taxes toward capital projects
- Determine whether or not the Committee has a future role of monitoring or reviewing new large projects and policy decisions as well as infrastructure issues
- Provide guidance on whether or not the Committee should review and make recommendations on new large individual projects
- Whether or not the Committee should review reports from 40-year inspections and make recommendations to improve the inspection program for City structures

V. New Business

i. Unfunded Capital Projects

Chair Mammano noted that the Committee was provided with several background documents on this topic, which indicated that one of the City's largest unfunded projects is a training facility for the Fire Department. Other unfunded capital projects include the proposed tunnel and other transportation projects.

Mr. Abi-Karam advised that one of the Public Works items included in the list of unfunded capital projects is a joint City/County facility that would house City teams that perform operations for roadways, water, and stormwater. While the City has roughly \$3.7 million budgeted toward this facility, another \$1.7 million is needed from the General Fund to cover roadway crew activities.

Mr. Abi-Karam continued that the unfunded capital projects should not be confused with Enterprise Funds, which have their own funding mechanisms through revenue or bonding. The unfunded list refers to projects that would be paid for through the General Fund.

Chair Mammano asked if there are any significant unfunded portions of the CIP, which will be presented to the Commission for approval along with the budget. Mr. Abi-Karam stated that the CIP is part of the FY 2022 budget and includes projections throughout the next five years. These projects are all funded or will be funded over the five-year horizon.

Mr. Abi-Karam stated that there was a joint Budget Advisory Board (BAB) meeting with the City Commission on March 2, 2021, at which there was discussion of unfunded capital projects. The Commission requested that Staff prepare a list of these projects.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of the BAB's role in reviewing capital projects. Mr. Abi-Karam advised that the BAB is not typically involved with the City's operational budget. They look at the five-year CIP and focus primarily on General Fund expenses rather than Enterprise Funds.

Chair Mammano suggested that if no advisory body is reviewing the CIP to the same extent that the City's operations are reviewed, the Committee could be able to perform this review in the future.

Mr. Ladd left the meeting at 3:44 p.m.

ii. Bridge Master Plan

Mr. Abi-Karam explained that the Bridge Master Plan was prepared by a consultant in 2016 and is posted on the City's website under the Master Plans tab.

Chair Mammano asked if the City has enough funds "to get through this list." Mr. Abi-Karam advised that this is unlikely. Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee discuss this further with Staff at the next meeting. Mr. Abi-Karam confirmed that Staff can provide an update on which projects are slated for completion over the next five-year CIP cycle.

Chair Mammano requested that Staff review the Sidewalk Master Plan with the Committee at the next meeting as well.

iii. Building Inspection Report and Condition of City-owned Buildings – John Travers, Building Official – Department of Sustainable Development

Building Official John Travers showed a PowerPoint presentation on this Item, explaining that both Miami-Dade and Broward Counties have programs that require third-party inspections by architects or engineers when a building reaches the 40th anniversary of Certificate of Occupancy (CO) issuance. These inspections are required to continue subsequently ever 10 years afterward. This requirement is part of Florida Building Code in Broward County. Broward also refers to this program as an inspection program, while in Miami-Dade it is known as recertification.

These requirements consider two components of aging buildings:

- Structural integrity
- Electrical system integrity

The inspection process does not include plumbing or mechanical issues.

Each June, the Broward County Property Appraiser's Office provides information to the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals on all buildings that are approaching their 40th anniversary of occupancy as well as the subsequent 10-year intervals. The County distributes this information to the appropriate municipalities. When Fort Lauderdale receives this report, they review it to eliminate all structures in the City that are not required to participate in this program. These include federal and state buildings, school buildings under the jurisdiction of the Broward County School Board, buildings constructed on Native American reservations, one- and two-family homes, and minor structures of 3500 sq. ft. or less.

Once the Building Official's team eliminates these exempt structures, they notify the principal owners and/or management companies of the buildings required to participate in the inspection program. These buildings then have 90 days to hire a third-party consultant, which may be an architectural or engineering firm, to perform the inspection. The consultant must return their results to the property owner or manager, which supplies the City with a copy of the report.

The City audits the report, but does not approve or disapprove. The audit is intended to determine whether there are improvements or corrections that must be made to the building. The owner/property manager has 180 days in which to present a mitigation process for any deficiencies that have been identified in the report. The Building Official may grant an extension as necessary.

Mr. Travers advised that one of the greatest challenges of this process is identifying the current owner or association manager in order to provide notice of the requirement for an inspection.

The Building Official's team consists of an assistant official, a building inspector, and other building or Code inspectors who may assist with the process. The document is filed in the City's system, and the City follows up on any identified corrections by requiring permits. If the association does not move forward with permitting these corrections, the City can advance the case to Code Enforcement or require appearance before a Special Magistrate.

The City receives approximately 300 to 350 addresses each June from the Board of Rules and Appeals. Mr. Travers characterized this as an ongoing process throughout the year. He noted that the recent condominium collapse in the city of Surfside has brought many aspects of the building safety inspection program into the spotlight. Miami-Dade and Broward Counties are currently the only two Florida counties with these programs in place. The Broward County Mayor has appointed an ad hoc committee to make recommendations to improve the process. Individual Broward municipalities may not make changes to the process, as it is part of Florida Building

Code in this county. This chapter must be resubmitted every three years when Florida Building Code is revised and updated.

Mr. Travers noted that he is a member of the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals' Structural Subcommittee, which has recently met to discuss the current program. Thus far, they have decided to allow experts to complete their investigations into the cause of the tragedy in Surfside before making reflexive changes to the Building Code Safety Inspection Program.

The program was first developed by Miami-Dade County in the 1970s following the collapse of a building. An ad hoc committee was established which determined the review process for buildings once they reached a specific age after their COs were issued. The program was incorporated in Broward County in 2006.

Mr. Travers addressed the program as it applies to City-owned buildings in Fort Lauderdale, stating that the building team includes a total staff of approximately 125. Roughly 60 to 70 of these individuals are certified plans examiners and inspectors across multiple disciplines. While there are engineers on this team, they do not act in their capacity as engineers, but participate as plans examiners and inspectors, which is overseen by the Building Code Administrators' Board.

Mr. Travers continued that there are 135 City-owned buildings, of which 71 were removed from the list because they are less than 3500 sq. ft. in size. There are roughly six buildings that are actively collecting information for their building safety reports. His team has heard input from members of the Public Works Department, the Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, and the City's Facilities and Maintenance Administrator, among others. The City does not use its own engineers to perform safety inspection reports for its own buildings, but uses a third-party engineering service to prepare these reports. City buildings are treated no differently from privately owned buildings.

Mr. Travers noted that there has been significant discussion of the Fort Lauderdale Police Station. The Department plans to maintain operations while building a new station and parking garage. Some individuals will be relocated to the Fleet Maintenance and Parks and Recreation Administration facilities during this time. The new station will be raised so its height falls within the parameters required for the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA's) special flood hazard areas in anticipation of climate change and the resulting sea level rise.

The Department of Sustainable Development (DSD) building has suffered from water intrusion and mold in the past. There is now a monitoring system in place which requires regular inspections to ensure indoor air quality.

Ms. Scott asked to know the entity responsible for looking at infrastructure in City-owned structures in order to prevent mold, plumbing, HVAC, or other issues. Mr. Travers replied that Facilities Maintenance is tasked with this job, as well as addressing non-

structural or non-electrical complaints. There is no schedule within which these components must be addressed. The Building Official's team does not perform routine inspections for either City-owned or privately owned buildings.

Chair Mammano asked what type of backlog the Building Official's team experiences due to the volume of buildings in need of inspection. Mr. Travers advised that his office reaches out to all properties that are not exempt from the list. The greatest challenge comes when condominium or other multi-family or high-rise associations stall or request extensions in order to postpone what can be an expensive inspection. If the association ultimately does not act within the appropriate time frame, including extensions, a Code Enforcement case may be issued in order to encourage quicker action. These may result in bringing a case before a Special Magistrate.

Another complication occurs when the third-party inspection report identifies issues in need of address but the association fails to act upon them. In this case, the buildings are brought before the Unsafe Structures Board (USB).

Mr. Zeltman explained that he had expressed concerns at the August 2, 2021 meeting regarding the structural integrity of a multi-story City-owned building. He asked if Mr. Travers' team had inspected a helistop above a parking garage, which was one of the structures in which he had seen damage. Mr. Travers confirmed that this structure is currently under report investigation, and both safety and engineering inspection reports are underway. He noted that the actions third-party consultants may take include installing "crack monitors," which track changes that may occur in cracks.

Mr. Travers also addressed the issue of condominium associations which permit the installation of tile or marble on balconies, pointing out that these loads may not have been calculated properly when the building was constructed. He pointed out that railings on balconies may also begin to deteriorate where they are attached to the concrete.

Chair Mammano observed that the Building Official and team do not proactively inspect private or City-owned buildings, but respond to the reporting of issues. Mr. Travers confirmed this, adding that his team of field inspectors performs approximately 500 inspections per day. When a complaint is made as part of a safety inspection report or from a private individual, the team reacts to that complaint.

Mr. Travers continued that the Governor signed legislation in June 2021 which states anonymous complaints cannot be acted upon by Code Enforcement; however, this legislation includes an exception permitting complaints that specifically address life safety issues.

Mr. Partington asked if the City might be able to enact its own minimum standards for structural and electrical inspections. Mr. Travers replied that the Mayor and City Commission recently asked him a similar question; however, he had advised that the

County and City Attorneys would need to vet any such action that resulted in a more stringent Code than Florida Building Code.

Mr. Travers also noted that the County ad hoc committee has heard testimony from engineering firms suggesting that Broward County consider modifying the current rules of the Building Safety Inspection Program. This issue will be voted upon at the committee's September 17, 2021 meeting, when the committee considers enacting a 30-year rather than 40-year requirement. Should this be approved by the County, Broward would forward the request to the state. He emphasized that these are preliminary steps which have not been voted upon thus far. It is important that Broward and Miami-Dade County continue to work in conjunction with one another.

Chair Mammano requested clarification of what is involved in an inspection. Mr. Travers explained that Broward County Administrative Order 05-05 provides guidelines for both structural and electrical inspections, including a list of items that must be checked for each. While the inspection is visual, these guidelines ensure that inspections are thorough and legitimate. Some firms which provide inspections will "go a step beyond" the visual inspection if they recognize deficiencies. This may include deploying additional methods such as ground detection radar.

Mr. Travers advised that the Chair of the Broward County Board of Rules and Appeals, who is a structural engineer, has acknowledged that buildings begin to deteriorate immediately once a CO has been issued. It is important for building managers to "listen to their building" and have an ongoing maintenance program that addresses minor issues before they become major. He concluded that there are many components to the Building Safety Inspection Report process, and these are being reviewed throughout Florida and beyond.

Mr. Angeli requested clarification of how the 40-year inspection requirement arose. Mr. Travers stated that a structural engineering firm was asked by Miami-Dade County in the mid-1970s to look at the aging of buildings and develop a proposed plan that would help the County identify buildings that may be in need of mitigation efforts. The 40-year time frame is an arbitrary figure.

VI. Public Works Update

Chair Mammano requested an update on the City's search for a new Director of Public Works. Mr. Abi-Karam reported that the new Director will be Alan Dodd, who previously served both Fort Lauderdale and the City of Miami. Mr. Dodd is familiar with the City's processes.

- i. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping**
- ii. CIP Financial Report**

iii. Impact Fees – Usage

Chair Mammano noted that these are monitoring items for which information was included in the Committee's backup materials.

The Committee briefly addressed the items proposed for discussion at the upcoming joint workshop with the City Commission once more. It was determined that the Committee would ask the Commission what they would like them to undertake next, as well as whether there may be items the Commission would like to see them address which are not on the Committee's list of topics.

Ms. Scott recommended asking if the Commission feels the City should have a permanent infrastructure board. She also strongly recommended that the Committee's questions be written down so they are asked in the appropriate manner, and that the Committee should seek clear answers from the Commission.

VII. Adjournment

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

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

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