



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

CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE MONDAY, MARCH 1, 2021 – 2:00 P.M. TO 5:00 P.M.

<u>February 2021-January 2022</u>		<u>Attendance</u>	
Marilyn Mammano, Chair	P	2	0
Gerald Angeli (arr. 2:38)	P	2	0
Shane Grabski	P	2	0
Charlie Ladd	A	1	1
Michael Marshall	P	2	0
Peter Partington	P	2	0
Jacquelyn Scott	P	2	0
Roosevelt Walters	P	2	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	2	0

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

Staff

- Aneisha Daniel, Deputy Director of Public Works
- Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works – Sustainability
- Rick Johnson, Utilities Distribution and Collection Systems Manager
- Talal Abi-Karam, Assistant Director of Public Works – Utilities
- Victor Carosi, Assistant Director of Public Works -- Engineering
- Pauline Ricketts, Senior Administrative Assistant
- Juan Rodriguez, Department of Transportation and Mobility
- Crysta Parkinson, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Angeli, that the Infrastructure Task Force Committee requests that the City Manager and City Commission use any designated CIP funds that become available as the result of surtax funding be re-purposed for other transportation projects. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Chair Mammano called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. and roll was called.

ii. Approval of Agenda

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

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes February 1, 2021

Mr. Partington noted the following corrections/clarifications:

- P.4, paragraph 3: in the final sentence, replace “they” with the Committee
- P.5, paragraph 1: add “if” after “Attorney Spence stated that...”
- P.6, paragraph 7: add the word “fees” following “impact”
- P.7, paragraph 3: remove “accounting”
- P.9, paragraph 7: clarify “It is hoped that the *new force main* project”; also, the total length of the new line is 32,130 ft.

Mr. Zeltman recommended contacting Assistant City Attorney D’Wayne Spence for clarification of his comment on p.5 regarding expert testimony.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to defer [approval of the February 1, 2021 minutes] until the next meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

2. General Discussion and Comments by Committee Members

None.

3. Public Comments (At Each Item)

None.

4. Old Business

i. Continued Discussion on Developing Moratorium

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

Chair Mammano noted that there is no additional information related to discussion of a moratorium on today’s Agenda. Deputy Director of Public Works Aneisha Daniel advised that no representative of the City Attorney’s Office is present at today’s meeting to assist with discussion of this Item.

Mr. Partington asked if there is any consensus from the Committee to bring forward a report related to the possibility of a moratorium. Chair Mammano observed that a Work Plan discussion is on today’s Agenda, and discussion of a report or consensus might be

better postponed until that Item so it can be discussed in context with other issues to be addressed by the Committee.

ii. CIP Forecast (Line Items 495 & 496)

Ms. Daniel recalled that at the February Committee meeting, there had been a suggestion that some Staff reports might be revised to make them more user-friendly. This effort will take some time, as the Public Works Department's operating and Community Investment Plan (CIP) budgets are due in March and currently take priority. She provided the Committee with a working document used in budget development, which includes information on the next tranche of bond funding.

The draft budget document provided to the Committee reflects the next tranche of water and sewer bond funds, including approximately \$38 to \$39 million for the City's central region. Ms. Daniel emphasized that this is a work in progress used toward the development of the next five-year CIP, which extends from fiscal year (FY) 2022 to FY 2026. The document is subject to change after meetings with the City's Budget Office and City Manager.

Chair Mammano asked for clarification of transferable funds. Ms. Daniel advised that there are eligible expenditures on projects in the water and sewer fund, as well as in the central region, for which City enterprise fund dollars were used; however, these projects are eligible for use of bond funds. Once a transfer is approved, the City may transfer bond dollars into the enterprise funds and use them for other projects.

Mr. Walters emphasized the importance of retaining full transparency throughout the process of moving money from one fund to another and ensuring that the Committee and other interested parties understand what is involved with this process. Ms. Daniel explained that Staff must identify each eligible project on which bond funds are used, and the bond council must approve the use in order to make the transfer. When this transfer is complete, the City will meet its requirement of 85% expenditure, or \$174 million, of the tranche of bond funds.

Ms. Daniel noted that while 15% of bond funds will remain unspent after the transfer, the City has been given additional time in which to expend these dollars.

Mr. Angeli joined the meeting at 2:38 p.m.

Mr. Partington asked if there are any Consent Order projects listed on the spreadsheet for the second tranche of \$200 million. Ms. Daniel advised that she would update the Committee on this at the next scheduled meeting after Staff further reviews the CIP budget. She reiterated that after Public Works submits its CIP and operating budgets on March 3, multiple meetings will be held throughout the budget process until the budget is adopted in September 2021.

Ms. Daniel recalled that a question had been asked at the February Committee meeting regarding a list of developments that have paid impact fees. She has requested a copy of this list from the Department of Sustainable Development (DSD) and will forward it to the Committee members when it is available. While the City's methodology ensures that these dollars are used toward eligible projects, there is no one-to-one accounting that breaks down how much of a given impact fee goes to any one specific project in the CIP.

Mr. Partington observed that there should be an easier way to trace the use of these funds. Ms. Daniel replied that Staff plans to meet with the City's Budget Office, as well as the Finance Director and Auditor, to determine if the process should be modified to more easily demonstrate compliance.

iii. Hazen & Sawyer Infrastructure Risk Map and Sewer Breaks

Ms. Daniel advised that consultant Hazen and Sawyer has created an overlay map of pipe breaks onto their risk analysis map. While the current map covers only 2019, the City will be able to provide an overlay of 2020 breaks at a later date.

The Committee discussed the overlay, noting a cluster of breaks in an area identified as having a high likelihood of failure. Patricia Carney, representing Hazen and Sawyer, stated that north and south sections of redundant lines are located in this area. She identified projects in this area that have been added to the Consent Order and are either underway or complete.

Ms. Carney continued that in addition to the 2019 breaks shown on the overlay, the current Consent Order is also dealing with a number of breaks that occurred prior to 2019, on which construction may be either underway or pending. She noted that Hazen and Sawyer's data goes back to 2016, and may be used to update the map so it is more comprehensive. Ms. Daniel added that CIP projects can also be added to the overlay to provide a fuller picture of projects that correspond to areas with breaks and high likelihood of failure.

Chair Mammano suggested that the overlay could also show projects that are and are not currently funded. Mr. Partington proposed regular updates of the map in order to show any clusters of breaks that may be developing.

5. New Business

i. Transportation Surtax Project

Chair Mammano recalled that when the Committee was created, it was provided with a list of the infrastructure elements it was tasked with reviewing. While the list began with water, stormwater, and sewer projects, it did not originally include a transportation element; however, there have been significant changes since that time, including adoption

of the Broward County transportation surtax as a dedicated source of funding for roads, transit, and other transportation-related projects.

Juan Rodriguez of the Department of Transportation and Mobility explained that he serves as a point of contact between Fort Lauderdale and the Broward County surtax team. The surtax was passed by referendum in 2018. In September 2020, the City entered into an inter-local agreement with Broward County that allows it to participate and receive funding for surtax-eligible projects. The City submitted over 100 applications for various transportation-related needs throughout the City, including repairs to bridges, roads, sidewalks.

The Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in conjunction with Broward County, ranked and evaluated all applications for surtax funding that were submitted by the 31 Broward municipalities. After this ranking was complete, Fort Lauderdale was awarded funding for eight projects totaling \$18 million over the next five years. These included both new construction and repair/maintenance projects.

Since these projects were awarded funding, Broward County has amended its inter-local agreement to stipulate what the surtax program will look like in the future for municipalities that receive funding. The Fort Lauderdale City Commission approved this amendment in January 2021. The amendment outlines when the City can anticipate additional funding, further clarification of annual applications, eligibility criteria, identification of ineligible items, and other specifics of the surtax program as a whole.

Since this amendment was passed by the City Commission, the City may now begin submitting documentation to the County, including final cost estimates and scope for the eight projects, as well as a draft solicitation. Once the County has reviewed these materials, it will prepare a funding agreement for each individual project. When these agreements have been approved by the City Commission as well, the City will receive funding for and may begin work on the eight projects. A list of these projects is included in the Committee members' backup materials.

Mr. Rodriguez further clarified that most of the projects are construction-ready and their funding is available in the current year. Future funding is available for projects that are in the planning or design phases.

Chair Mammano noted that two of the projects listed are bridges for which she understood CIP funding has been set aside. She asked what would become of these funds now that surtax funding will be used instead. Mr. Rodriguez advised that as the surtax projects are funded, the City can reevaluate the funds attributed to that project and allocate them toward other prioritized projects.

Mr. Partington commented that because a number of the City's bridges have been rated structurally deficient, any CIP funds which have been replaced by surtax funds should be used toward transportation projects, such as bridges, within the CIP.

Mr. Walters again emphasized the importance of transparency, and asked if some of the funds returned to the City could be used toward projects that were given lower priority by the City.

Mr. Zeltman recalled that at an earlier time, the Committee had been surprised to learn that monies from the Enterprise Fund were being allocated to non-utilities-related projects, as this was not how enterprise dollars were intended to be used. He hoped to see these monies refunded to the Enterprise Fund now that they have been replaced with Broward County surtax dollars.

Mr. Angeli asked how a given transportation project makes the surtax project list. Mr. Rodriguez explained that the recent amendment passed in January 2021 details the ranking criteria for the annual surtax project application process. Two major criteria address the following:

- Alleviation of traffic congestion
- Creation of new connections, including sidewalks and bicycle lanes

Each application cycle, the City will submit its greatest priorities; however, they do not know in advance how these priorities will rank among submissions by other municipalities.

Chair Mammano noted that Broward County also directly funds a number of transportation projects that are physically located in Fort Lauderdale, which were not submitted by the City. She requested a list or map of County projects.

Mr. Zeltman added that there may be state projects located within the City as well. Mr. Rodriguez explained that of the surtax projects funded each year, only 10% of surtax revenue goes directly to municipality-managed projects. This is why Fort Lauderdale has only eight funded projects rather than several more. Another allocation of surtax funds go toward transit operations across the county, such as community shuttle programs. He estimated that the County will manage 11 to 12 projects within Fort Lauderdale city limits over the next two years. The Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) is a separate entity and has its own work program and funding, which are not related to County surtax dollars or priorities.

Chair Mammano observed that a comprehensive view of how much money is being spent by the City, County, and state could be helpful in developing any recommendations the Committee may wish to make to the City Commission.

Mr. Marshall commented that he would like to learn more about City projects that are currently in the queue to receive surtax funding, as well as more about the prioritization process and how it is consistent with the City's planning documents, including the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Mammano noted that the City has had a number of Master Plans in the past, but has never had a comprehensive plan addressing traffic and transportation.

Motion made by Mr. Partington, seconded by Mr. Angeli, that the ITF requests that the City Manager and City Commission use any designated CIP funds that become available as the result of surtax funding be re-purposed for other transportation projects, particularly bridges.

Mr. Partington added that he would like his **motion** to be sent as a communication to the City Commission so it may be considered during budget deliberations.

Chair Mammano suggested that the **motion** not recommend alternate use of CIP funding specifically for bridges, as there may be other transportation projects of equal importance. Mr. Partington **amended** his **motion** to remove the specific reference to bridges.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously (as amended).

Mr. Partington asked which entity ultimately makes decisions on use of surtax dollars for Fort Lauderdale projects. Mr. Rodriguez explained that the Broward MPO provides a list of evaluated and ranked projects to the Transportation Surtax Oversight Board, which reviews the list and then sends the projects on to the Broward County Board of County Commissioners. These officials have the final decision after a project has gone through the evaluation and ranking period.

ii. **Stormwater Master Plan Funding Alternative**

Dr. Nancy Gassman, Assistant Director of Public Works (Sustainability), showed a presentation on the City's \$200 million Stormwater Master Plan implementation, which is seeking funding from the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) Water, Infrastructure, Finance, and Innovation Act (WIFIA) funding program. This program may consider funding up to \$98 million, or 49%, of the total \$200 million through a special low-interest loan. It is considered a better alternative than the bond market, which would apply a higher interest rate and closing costs. The remaining \$102 million would go out to the revenue bond market.

Dr. Gassman advised that the WIFIA program began in 2014. The City has funded other allowable costs through this program in the past and was invited to apply in the current year for WIFIA funding specifically for the Stormwater Master Plan.

Dr. Gassman continued that the City has been innovative in its address of the needs of its stormwater program. They have adopted a hybrid methodology to generate additional funds, which included:

- Moving costs from monthly utility bills to the annual property tax bills
- Beginning the first two of seven projects using a \$70 million line of credit, which will be repaid once the City has secured bonds

- Applying to the state for \$10 million to provide potential funding for the Durrs neighborhood
- Seeking additional grant opportunities

If the City can secure the \$10 million grant for the Durrs neighborhood, this would free up \$10 million in City dollars that can then be reconsidered for other stormwater-related projects.

Mr. Walters requested clarification of the amount the City would seek in bond funding to meet the expectations of its neighborhoods. Dr. Gassman clarified that the \$200 million to which she referred would be specific to stormwater needs, which is a different \$200 million than the second tranche of bond funding previously discussed by the Committee under the CIP budget and infrastructure Agenda Items. The expectation is that within a few years, the City would go out for a second \$200 million bond specifically for stormwater in order to undertake the second phase of the Stormwater Master Planning program, which would target another seven neighborhoods for improvements.

Ms. Daniel further clarified that the City's Finance Director and Staff have been diligent in working with the City's bond council to seek different funding opportunities. If other forms of revenue are available, this Staff will inform the City of these alternatives.

Mr. Partington noted that the needs of the Melrose Park and Melrose Manors neighborhoods were recently brought to the forefront, and asked if securing loan and grant funding would create the opportunity to undertake projects in these areas using stormwater bond funds. Dr. Gassman replied that the City has done an extensive amount of work to address concerns with the existing infrastructure in Melrose Park, and its stormwater engineering group is pursuing a design for improvements in Melrose Manors. While Melrose Manors was intended to be part of the second phase of the Stormwater Master Planning program, the design work for this location is being accelerated in response to recent events.

Dr. Gassman continued that the most up-to-date projections for the seven neighborhoods currently addressed in the Stormwater Master Plan come to roughly \$196 million. Should these programs move forward at a cost less than this projection, some bond funds would be left on the table for potential use to provide improvements in Melrose Manors. If no funds remain, this neighborhood would be included either in the next tranche of bond funding or another source of money would need to be identified, such as the potential freeing up of \$10 million dollars if the City receives this amount in grant funding for the Durrs neighborhood.

Mr. Partington asked if obtaining a lower-interest loan would open the door to the possibility of increasing the size of the \$200 million bond. Dr. Gassman advised that while this is correct, the City has not yet done design work for Melrose Manors and cannot make a reasonable prediction of this neighborhood's costs.

iii. Work Plan Discussion

Chair Mammano recalled that at the February 1, 2021 meeting, she had prepared a proposed outline for a report on the Committee's work. Mr. Zeltman had suggested that this report take the form of a work program, which would show what has been completed in one part of the document and items yet to be completed in another. The proposed work plan shows categories that the Committee has addressed, such as potable water, sewers, stormwater, seawalls, City facilities, and other items included within their mission statement.

Chair Mammano showed the draft work plan document, pointing out that its timeline extends from March 2017 to February 2022, which is the expected lifespan of the Committee. Their mission statement includes consideration of the overall funding of infrastructure in Fort Lauderdale. Items that have already been discussed include:

- Elimination of ROI
- Assessment of stormwater fees
- Grants, loans, federal programs, and other potential funding options
- County surtax capital budget substitutions
- Review of impact fees for water and sewer use
- Consideration of public input

Chair Mammano noted that some of the items listed above were discussed earlier in today's meeting.

The City Commission has requested that the Committee accomplish three goals:

- Opine on whether or not a public-private partnership (P3) was a good idea for the replacement of the Fiveash Water Treatment Plant
- Determine whether or not the City should participate in the C-51 allocation for additional water sources
- Decide whether or not a moratorium on development is necessary

The first two items have already been addressed by the Committee.

Chair Mammano continued that other topics and/or subcategories the Committee has previously discussed include:

- Sewers, including gravity sewers, force mains, and pump stations
- The City's Inflow and Infiltration (I&I) work program
- The Hazen and Sawyer report
- Update of the Reiss report
- The City's asset management plan
- Use of CIP, loan, or bond funds for replacement and rehabilitation of infrastructure
- Storm sewers, including replacement of gravity lines and relining of pipes
- Bond for replacement of the Police station
- Parks funding

- Roads and bridges

Items that have not been comprehensively discussed to date include:

- Seawalls
- Whether the I&I program reduces impact on treatment plants
- Outflows into the Intracoastal Waterway
- Limited study of City buildings and systems
- Replacement of City Hall with a new government center
- Sidewalks and trails

Chair Mammano concluded that any items the Committee has not discussed so far should be addressed between now and February 2022. She reiterated that the draft work program is only for the consideration of the Committee members. Her recommendation was that within the next six months, the Committee should be able to show the City Commission an analysis of what they have discussed, what should continue, and whether or not they have accomplished the goals set for them in their mandate, as well as where to go from here.

The Committee members discussed the draft work plan, with Ms. Scott requesting that further discussion and resolution of the issue of a moratorium be made a priority. Mr. Zeltman noted that a number of items which have already been discussed may require further consideration, and recommended that the members review these items and determine whether previous discussion of them was sufficient or they should be revisited.

Chair Mammano recalled that while roads have been discussed to a degree, the Committee has not addressed other mobility issues, such as alternative modes of transportation. Mr. Marshall advised that he felt these issues were all part of the same transportation infrastructure discussion. Mr. Angeli suggested that the Committee further discuss transportation as a full system, in a similar manner to their previous discussions of water and sewer systems, rather than consideration of roads, bridges, or other individual aspects of the system.

Mr. Partington agreed with Ms. Scott's proposal to further discuss a moratorium on development, pointing out that the current City Commission has emphasized the importance of this decision. He also addressed transportation, noting that many of the City's systems are under the control of other organizations, such as FDOT and Broward County. This limits what the City may be able to accomplish regarding this infrastructure.

Mr. Partington also recommended that the Committee consider providing a summary of the City's infrastructure funding needs across different categories over the next 20 years.

Chair Mammano concluded that the Committee's next meeting will address:

- Review of what has been discussed so far regarding the moratorium, ensuring the Committee has all the information it will need on this topic, and working toward a decision and recommendation

- Scheduling a workshop between the Committee and the City Commission to present the Committee's recommendation on a moratorium, as well as the interim report that Mr. Partington had proposed regarding long-term funding needs

It was determined that the Committee's goal would be to schedule a workshop meeting with the Commission in June 2020.

6. Public Works Update

i. Water & Sewer Breaks Report 2021 w/Mapping

Ms. Daniel recalled that this report provides a list of ongoing water and sewer breaks as they arise. The current report reflects two breaks in the water system in January 2021. There were no wastewater breaks during that time period.

Chair Mammano noted that this report was requested in relation to the Committee's discussion of the plan for water mains, including the areas in which they are breaking and whether these locations should be prioritized for repair/replacement. Ms. Daniel advised that her recollection was that the Committee had wished to see a collective list of all the water and sewer breaks on a month-to-month basis. This had originally been reflected in a spreadsheet, but was later transferred to a map in order to reflect whether patterns of breakage existed in some areas. The next month's report and map will show breaks that occurred in February 2021.

7. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting TBA

Ms. Daniel advised that a virtual City training session for advisory board and committee members is scheduled for Tuesday, March 30, 2021 at 6 p.m. Any members wishing to participate are asked to RSVP no later than March 22 at 828-5288.

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:28 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.]