



**MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MONDAY, October 4, 2021 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.**

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

February 2021-January 2022

Attendance

Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	8	0
Gerald Angeli	P	8	0
Shane Grabski (arr. 2:21)	P	8	0
Charlie Ladd (2:11-3:30)	P	6	2
Michael Marshall	P	7	1
Peter Partington	P	8	0
Jacquelyn Scott (arr. 2:21)	P	7	1
Roosevelt Walters (by phone)	P	7	1
Ralph Zeltman	P	8	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
- Alan Dodd, Director of Public Works
- Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works – Engineering
- Omar Castellon, Chief Engineer
- Kymerly Holcombe, Business Operations Manager
- Diane Lichtenstein, Assistant Budget Manager
- Michael Dudley, Management Analyst
- Raymond Nazaire, Senior Project Manager
- Jamie Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Mr. Partington, that we understand the Commission’s interest in having us to extend our term, and we would like to confirm it and to confirm specifically how long that term would be. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. and roll was called.

ii. Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Mr. Zeltman, seconded by Mr. Angeli, to approve the Agenda. [The Agenda was approved by consent.]

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes August 30, 2021

Mr. Zeltman addressed the following:

- P. 12, paragraph 4: he requested that language be changed from “a helistop above a parking garage” to “the helistop vehicle at a garage”

It was also noted that Assistant Director of Public Works (Utilities) Talal Abi-Karam had recommended the following changes:

- P. 3, paragraph 5: remove the word “same” from sentence 3
- P. 6, paragraph 5: change language of sentences 2 and 3

Chair Mammano pointed out that the existing language of p.6, paragraph 5 was already consistent with the requested change, and no modification would be made.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve. [The minutes were approved by consent.]

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

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

ii. Follow up on Joint Workshop with the Commission

Chair Mammano characterized the joint workshop between the Infrastructure Task Force Committee (ITFC) and the City Commission as excellent, as both parties were engaged and concerned. She requested input from the members on their impressions of the meeting. Mr. Partington agreed that while the meeting did not end in the outcome he had personally wanted, he was confident that the Commission is familiar with the issue of infrastructure condition. He was less confident, however, that future Commissions may be similarly well-informed.

Mr. Ladd arrived at 2:11 p.m.

Mr. Walters also felt the meeting went well, and that the Mayor and City Commissioners are moving in the right direction to carry out what the Committee has recommended. Mr. Ladd also spoke positively of the meeting, stating that he felt the Commission appreciated what the Committee is trying to do in the interest of the City. He noted that the discussion of infrastructure condition had become “bogged down.”

Mr. Angeli commented that he was surprised that it is not possible to stop a developer or builder from building due to the condition of the infrastructure, when the solution seemed to be to fix the infrastructure. Mr. Zeltman agreed, stating that the Commission had seemed to gloss over the importance of the condition of water and wastewater infrastructure. Aside from this, he felt the Commission approved of the Committee's work, and it would be up to them to determine how they wish the Committee to proceed.

Mr. Grabski and Ms. Scott arrived at 2:21 p.m. Mr. Grabski described the joint workshop with the City Commission as enlightening. Ms. Scott agreed that it had gone well, but added that the Commission may not have yet decided what the Committee will do going forward.

1. Review and comment on P3 projects

Chair Mammano recalled that City Commissioner Heather Moraitis had wanted input from the Committee on public-private partnership (P3) projects, specifically including the water treatment plant once this proposal has emerged from the quiet period. The Commissioner had specifically requested the Committee's feedback on the funding of this proposed project.

Mr. Zeltman commented that Commissioner Moraitis had seen issues occur with previous P3 projects, including one such agreement regarding Lockhart Stadium. He felt the success of P3s is predicated upon the type of agreement between parties, particularly when investors are not given the upper hand to dictate processing components. Successful P3s require careful preparation of legal agreements as well as the work of project managers and contract administrators. Chair Mammano agreed that the Committee may discuss financial aspects of P3s in the future.

i. Introduction of new Public Works Director Alan Dodd

New Public Works Director Alan Dodd introduced himself to the Committee at this time. He noted that the City's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is very ambitious over the next five years and will require initiative to keep its projects on schedule and within budget.

2. Engage on potential changes to the 40-year inspection

Chair Mammano recalled that this issue was raised directly by the Mayor, who had not indicated whether or not he meant to discuss only City-owned properties or all properties of this age.

Mr. Zeltman stated that the City is responsible for the inspection of its own buildings, as one government agency cannot inspect properties owned by another government agency. He noted that there are 20- and 40-year inspections of these properties, followed by subsequent inspections every 10 years afterward. The recent condominium

collapse in Surfside, Florida has made it apparent that there may be problems with these buildings' foundations and structures.

Mr. Zeltman continued that he had provided suggestions to both Broward County and the state of Florida, both of which had given him positive feedback. These included:

- Requiring inspection of buildings within the first two years after construction in order to identify any design or structural issues while the builder's liability insurance is still applicable
- Requiring five- or ten-year inspections in coastal areas rather than waiting a full 20 years before conducting the first inspection
- Undertake more intense testing to determine where issues may occur

Ms. Scott asked what improvements Staff might recommend for the 40-year building inspections. Mr. Dodd replied that this inspection applies primarily to private buildings, although the City must also adhere to these requirements. Public Works is not involved in the inspection process unless they are tasked with contracting a 40-year inspection: the Department of Sustainable Development oversees this process. He recommended that representatives of that Department be invited to attend future Committee meetings if the members wished to hear their recommendations.

Mr. Partington observed that the 40-year inspection is a Broward County requirement, and the County has a working group that is looking further into this inspection process. He proposed reaching out to that group for their minutes so the Committee can see what they have discussed. Chair Mammano suggested that a member of the working group could also be invited to address the ITFC. She felt the Committee may also be able to provide comments or recommendations to this working group. She concluded that additional guidance from the Mayor may be necessary before they take any further action.

Mr. Angeli commented that the 40-year time frame for inspections is arbitrary: the key issue is fixing a problem once it has been identified. He pointed out that there are already multiple inspections prior to issuance of a CO, but afterward, there are typically no such efforts until the required 40-year inspection unless a concern is reported. The members also discussed the City authorities to whom issues are reported when they are seen, with Mr. Ladd citing an example in which he reached out to a former Director of Public Works to advise him of a problem he had noticed. Chair Mammano observed that the City may be less responsive, however, to reports from individual citizens with whom they are less familiar. There may also be more caution in a response when the problem reported could be very expensive to fix.

3. How to consider condition, not in the Ordinance but administratively

Chair Mammano advised that the Committee has reached the conclusion that changes are not planned for the Ordinance; however, the City Commission seems to feel that condition should be taken into consideration in some way during the approval process.

Mr. Ladd suggested that one option could be to encourage Staff to create a report of issues that have already been identified. He cited the Victoria Park neighborhood as an example of an area where the City already knows work needs to be done. A report could be created to identify which kinds of challenges exist within various neighborhoods or districts. This would give policymakers an overview of what needs to be done and where.

Mr. Grabski cited water service taps as an example: this test is either performed by the City or by a contractor with a City inspector observing the process. Cutouts from pipes provide information about the pipes' condition. This is done whenever a tap is installed for new development.

Ms. Scott advised that she had raised the issue of condition at a recent Planning and Zoning Board meeting but had not received the information she had requested. She emphasized the importance of continuing to bring up condition of infrastructure at subsequent meetings until the City realizes that it should be a key consideration, although she acknowledged that a project cannot be approved or denied based on condition under the current Ordinance.

Chair Mammano noted that two Commissioners had indicated they use the infrastructure maps provided by consultant Hazen and Sawyer, which show the condition of infrastructure in terms of its risk of failure. She asked Mr. Dodd if it may be possible to institutionalize a form of reporting or monitoring condition so this information can be generally incorporated into the approval process.

Mr. Dodd explained that once infrastructure has been put into the ground, it is more difficult to see and/or evaluate from that point forward. The Reiss report, which provided a comprehensive utilities strategic master plan, identified high-risk areas based on empirical factors, such as the age of the infrastructure. In the future, the City hopes to move toward an asset management system including a map of existing infrastructure, how that infrastructure has been maintained, and reports of new installation, which will help identify which projects should be prioritized so the worst issues are addressed first.

Mr. Partington stated that during the joint workshop with the Commission, the City Attorney had indicated he did not want any report on condition to explicitly accompany development applications. He expressed concern that the Staff members tasked with reviewing development applications are separate from the Staff members who see reports on the risk status of existing infrastructure.

Chair Mammano asserted that while she is in favor of the asset management program, the program's success is dependent upon long-term commitment to funding and

maintaining it. She suggested that the Committee recommend the Commission see a presentation on this program each year, including any new information the program has uncovered. This would not be in connection to a specific project, but intended to provide a general understanding of the system. It would provide the Commission with information on the condition of infrastructure and show the importance of continued funding of the asset management program.

Mr. Dodd stated that the asset management program does not work unless it includes accurate data that is actively used by Staff. There is consideration of committing dedicated Staff members to running the program's software, providing reports, and supplying regular updates. This data will serve as a basis for the recommendation of specific CIP projects before the Commission.

Mr. Dodd continued that there are three employees who work full-time on issues regarding water, wastewater, and stormwater. Before every City Commission meeting, they discuss projects and capacity analysis with the Public Works Director. This information is shared to ensure it is considered in relation to future development. It provides a "science and statistics-based reason" to make recommendations to the Commission on where investments should be made.

Ms. Scott asked how close the asset management program is to completion. Mr. Castellon stated that the wastewater portion of this program is considered part of the Consent Order. Cataloguing of this infrastructure has already begun.

Chair Mammano recalled that City Commissioner Ben Sorensen had raised this issue at the workshop, asking for information on the catalogue of water system infrastructure. She asked how close the City is to beginning this program for water. Mr. Castellon replied that the deadline for the mapping of water infrastructure is consistent with the deadline for the water Consent Order in 2023.

Ms. Scott commented that the public should be able to have confidence that the City is aware of the condition of its systems. Chair Mammano noted that regular presentation of the asset management plan to the Commission would be a way to show that this is under consideration by the City.

4. Discussion of the Proposed (& subsequently approved) CIP – Office of Management & Budget

Chair Mammano recalled that Mr. Walters had asked, at a previous meeting, what is done with the funds intended for a project if that project is abandoned or completed. She referred the members to a document in their backup materials, "The Proposed FY 2022 Community Investment Plan," dated May 7, 2021. This document identifies projects taken out of the budget and what was done with the money that would have funded them, as well as projects that were included in the budget.

Assistant Budget Manager Diane Lichtenstein reviewed the document, explaining that there is a difference between unspent and available dollars. Some projects have encumbrances, which means those funds are not available for other use. Grant funds are considered new items that are added to the budget; if one of these projects is removed, these funds are struck through on the document.

Mr. Walters requested clarification of a line item addressing seawalls. Ms. Lichtenstein pointed out that funds were removed from the Seawall Maintenance line item and moved into the Seawall Restore/Replace line item. This represents a change in the type of project to be done.

Mr. Walters also asked for further clarification of where monies go when a project is cancelled and removed from the list. Chair Mammano offered the example of a project that was removed from the budget because the City received County funds for it rather than using their own dollars. Ms. Lichtenstein replied that these dollars are moved back into the fund balance, from where they can be allocated to a different project through a budget amendment. Chair Mammano added that funds can also be moved from one project directly to another by Resolution.

5. Support for the BAB on line items for capital projects in the General Funds Budget

Chair Mammano recalled that the ITFC had recommended there be a line item in the City's regular budget dedicated specifically to infrastructure. At the Commission workshop, the chair of the City's Budget Advisory Board (BAB) had explained this more clearly by suggesting that infrastructure be a line item in the City's ad valorem tax bill, along with stormwater, bonds, and other expenses. The line item would clarify how much of the taxes would go toward infrastructure costs. She had requested that the BAB chair clarify this in writing so the ITFC can discuss it and modify their previous request for a line item so it is more consistent with what the BAB has proposed.

Ms. Scott noted that the Committee is currently expected to sunset as of February 2022, and asked if it was possible this time might be extended. She pointed out that there is little use in the Committee's ongoing work if the Commission has not made a commitment to keep them going. Chair Mammano agreed that the Committee cannot realistically expand its discussions to include new topics, such as the 40-year inspection process, if they are expected to sunset in February.

Ms. Scott recommended sending a communication to the City Commission requesting that they clarify whether or not they plan to extend the life of the Committee. Chair Mammano recommended that the Committee members reach out to the Commissioners who appointed them to ask this question.

Mr. Ladd pointed out that at the joint workshop, the Commission had already indicated they would like the Committee to continue. He felt the more appropriate communication

would be to ask the Commission to confirm this decision and clarify the length of the extended term.

Motion made by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Mr. Partington, that we understand the Commission's interest in having us to extend our term, and we would like to confirm it and so confirm specifically how long that term would be. In a roll call vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

It was clarified that this **motion** would be sent as a communication to the City Commission.

Mr. Ladd left the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

3. Public Comments (at Each Item)

4. Old Business

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

Mr. Castellon stated that there are two pilot studies: one at Prospect Wellfield and a separate study at the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant. Both studies are still with the City's Legal Department and cannot be discussed at this time. There are sections in both reports which discuss specific locations, and these must be redacted before the studies are provided for public discussion.

Mr. Zeltman requested general synopses of both studies. Mr. Castellon referred to the scope of services for each pilot study, which mention to the types of tests to be included in those studies. He concluded that the studies are expected to have been redacted and released from the Legal Department prior to the next Committee meeting.

ii. Unfunded Capital Projects – PW List

Chair Mammano requested clarification of what is included on the Public Works list of unfunded capital projects. Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering) Victor Carosi explained that the City Commission has seen a presentation on this list of unfunded projects, which are not included on the CIP spreadsheets discussed earlier in the meeting. The Committee reviewed the list, with Mr. Castellon pointing out that while these unfunded projects are not listed with accompanying costs, these are still important projects for the City.

Mr. Carosi characterized the CIP as "a balancing act" between the amount of money that can be provided in a year and the most pressing needs for the community. At any given time, there may be new information or other changes that require the reevaluation of priorities.

iii. Bridge Master Plan

Mr. Partington asked how many of the City's bridges are rated as structurally deficient by the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT). Mr. Carosi explained that in 2014, the City Commission contracted with a consultant to evaluate Fort Lauderdale's bridges. At present, six of the City's 53 bridges are structurally deficient, while 22 of the 53 are functionally obsolete.

Mr. Partington asked if the six structurally deficient bridges are top priorities for the City. Mr. Carosi confirmed this, noting that in addition to this City-funded 2014 study, FDOT conducts a biennial inspection of all City bridges and provides the City with the information from these inspections.

Chair Mammano asked if all six of the structurally deficient bridges are funded for repair. Mr. Carosi replied that work on the Coconut Isle bridge has been completed, while the South Ocean Drive bridge is currently funded in the Broward County surtax program. The City is applying for surtax money for the West Lake bridge as well. He did not have information on the remaining three bridges at this time.

Mr. Zeltman requested clarification of the term "structurally deficient." Mr. Carosi explained that bridges are evaluated in different categories, with structural adequacy and safety given the most weight. Other categories include serviceability and functional obsolescence. The ratings given a bridge in each category are incorporated into a formula used to determine whether a bridge should be repaired or replaced.

Mr. Partington asked if any of the six bridges currently have weight restrictions. He asserted that if this is the case, it should make the restricted bridges a priority, as it is nearly impossible to enforce weight restrictions. Mr. Zeltman advised that the structural deterioration of some bridges means that they are no longer capable of bearing their intended weight limit, which means the limit may be reduced or truck traffic may be restricted from using them.

Mr. Carosi stated that Staff has not brought any load reduction ratings to his attention, so he could not directly answer Mr. Partington's question. Raymond Nazaire, Senior Project Manager, clarified that there are no load reduction ratings for these bridges. A load rating analysis is performed every two years, which is how the weight limits posted on bridges are determined.

Mr. Partington noted that if there are weight restrictions on certain bridges, some construction vehicles will inevitably exceed this restriction. Mr. Carosi noted that the City's annual budget includes funding for bridge repairs and contracts are assigned for annual bridge maintenance, so the City can respond to needs that arise throughout the year, based upon inspections. This line item is part of the operating budget.

Mr. Carosi continued that the report prepared in 2014 broke down the types of bridge repairs into different categories and projected a schedule for these repairs/replacements. This schedule is still being followed, to the extent that it is practical, with funds that become available.

Mr. Zeltman asked if this prioritization took the effects of climate change, such as rising water levels, into account when a bridge must be replaced. Mr. Carosi acknowledged that this is a challenge. The City tries to increase the height of bridges when feasible.

Chair Mammano noted that the documents provided state that between 2014 and 2019, the City spent approximately \$4 million on repair and replacement of bridges. She asked if repair and replacement could be separated. Mr. Carosi confirmed that this can be clarified in the future. He emphasized the dynamic nature of budgeting as new needs arise.

Mr. Carosi continued that a chart showing projects planned from 2032 to 2036 included replacement of the Castle Harbor Isle and NE 41st Street bridges. At present, the Castle Harbor Isle bridge has a lane restriction due to a structural deficiency, which resulted in its being designed for replacement rather than repair. He pointed out that while charts represent snapshots of facilities in time, Staff constantly reevaluates and reexamines these reports. Chair Mammano requested that these charts be updated and brought back to a subsequent meeting.

5. New Business

i. Sidewalk Program

6. Public Works Update

i. Water & Sewer Breaks 2021 w/Mapping

ii. CIP Financial Report

iii. Impact Fees – Usage

Chair Mammano recommended that in the interest of time, Items 5 and 6 be deferred to the next scheduled meeting. The Committee agreed to this by consensus.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:01 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.]