

**City of Fort Lauderdale  
Infrastructure Task Force Committee  
May 15, 2017 – 3:00 P.M.  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Commission Room – City Hall  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

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

<b>MEMBERS</b>		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Marilyn Mammano	P	2	0
Ed Kwoka	P	1	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	2	0
Keith Cobb	P	1	0
Leo Hansen	A	0	2
Roosevelt Walters	P	1	0
Fred Stresau	P	2	0
June Page	A	1	1

**Staff Present**

Meredith Shuster

Alan Dodd

Lee Feldman, City Manager

Aricka Johnson

Laura Reece

2. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**
- **April 17, 2017**

**Motion by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Stresau, to approve the April 17, 2017 minutes. Motion carried by unanimous voice vote.**

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. Mammano advised that the agenda is sent to all members of the Committee prior to the meeting and it also gets posted. Since members cannot talk to each other in the interim via the Sunshine situation, she and Mr. Dodd put together an agenda that reflects the continuation of discussions. She wants members to know, that upon looking at the agenda, if anything is left out or if there anything they want to add to feel free to bring it up at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned that three members were not properly noticed for the last meeting; therefore, it was requested that the attendance be adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Walters suggested that approval of the agenda be placed under approval of the minutes that way any additions or deletions can be done at that time.

Ms. Mammano believed Mr. Walters was correct and noted that could be added as an item so everyone knows that option is available.

### **3. Old Business**

- **Selection of Vice-Chairperson**

**Mr. Kwoka volunteered to be Vice-Chairperson. Nominations were closed. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.**

Mr. Kwoka has a background in management consulting in a multitude of industries including aviation. He recently did a project for the Transportation Management Association. In addition, he is Chair for the Aviation Advisory Board.

Mr. Cobb has a background in finance. He spent 32 years with KPMG, an accounting firm, in a financial capacity. Subsequent to that he was the CEO of Alamo Rent A Car and for the last 15 years he has been doing Corporate Board work. He has served on a number of Advisory Boards for the City in the last several years.

### **4. New Business**

#### **A. Rescheduling of the July 3, 2017 meeting**

Mr. Dodd indicated that this was put on the agenda because it is right before the holiday and a couple of members stated they may not be available on that date. If the Committee would like to consider an alternate date that can be identified at this time.

Ms. Schuster advised that the eighth floor is available on June 26, 2017; that would be the last Monday in the month of June. The next available date would be the last Monday in the month of July.

There was a consensus to schedule the next meeting to June 26, 2017.

Ms. Schuster clarified the meeting will be from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. on the eighth floor of City Hall.

**Note:** Item B was switched with Item C.

#### **B. Neighbor Survey Results Presentation, Aricka Johnson, Senior Performance Analyst, Structural Innovation Division**

Ms. Mammano asked Mr. Dodd to bring all the Master Plan documents so the Committee could physically see all the time and energy that has been devoted to analyzing these particular problems. We are taking a higher level look rather than going through each particular Master Plan. She wanted to focus on the relationship between

those Master Plans and the CIP because one is the needs and the wants and the other is what we have to spend. The two need to be reconciled or understood enough to articulate the problems.

Mr. Dodd brought the Water and Sewer Comprehensive Master Plan and noted that they were provided to the members on a thumb drive. As far as the neighborhood survey, it was recently briefed to the Community Building Leadership Team a few weeks; therefore, he did not know how much has been put out to the public.

Arica Johnson, Senior Performance Analyst with the Structural Innovation Division, was present. She noted that this was not done internally; this was consultant work with the ETC Institute, so she is presenting on their findings. She provided a Power Point presentation with a brief explanation as follows:

- The purpose of the survey was to identify how the neighbors perceive and how much they are satisfied with the quality of our services and our City in general and in an objective manner.
- This information can be used to adjust and influence our budget and from there to gauge how well we are going along with the Master and Vision Plans.

Ms. Mammano stated that she thinks the Committee is aware of how the neighborhood survey is done and what it is.

Ms. Johnson mentioned the downward trend over the last three to five years with regard to how well citizens are satisfied with how the City is preparing for the future; how well the City is planning for growth, whether the City is moving in the right direction; satisfaction of maintenance of streets, sidewalks, infrastructure; the overall flow of traffic; how well citizens agree with readiness as a City; if the City is moving in the right direction; how well the City is prepared for disasters; whether residents are satisfied with the quality of drinking water; whether residents are satisfied with sewer and wastewater services; and the prevention of flooding. It was noted that the quality of drinking water has decreased since last year. Again, it is the perception of the quality of drinking water. The mean average was neutral. With regards to water and sanitation services, the top three items that should receive emphasis over the next two years, per neighbors, were prevention of flooding, the overall quality of drinking water, and the cleanliness of waterways near their homes. Neighbors said the most important improvements were Capital improvements, stormwater and drainage. Water and sewer was a close second.

Mr. Kwoka questioned how much satisfaction equates to uninformed or unaware. He is not sure he would accept these at face value.

Mr. Walters questioned why residents were not as satisfied as they were in 2014.

Ms. Johnson stated that one of the things considered was that this survey was done in November/December. There were several major infrastructure issues around that time and politics were quite divisive. The consulting company, ETC, mentioned this was across the Board and that a lot of the Cities they were looking at had similar trends. That is one thing they are looking at but beyond that they have not gotten to that point.

Ms. Mammano believes the neighborhood survey is a good place to start in terms of the public's perception. She has always liked the neighborhood survey because it gives the pulse of the community. She does not think it is as pertinent to their discussion as an analysis of the needs and the possibilities.

Mr. Stresau mentioned the Traffic Flow graphics on Page 46. It shows the rating of the public based on their perception and the overall flow of traffic ended up being #1. He questioned whether there is an ability to break it down further as to how people perceive the traffic problems.

Ms. Johnson advised that it could be narrowed down to Districts. She would have to talk to the Transportation Mobility.

Mr. Stresau questioned how much is left with regards to the miles of City streets if the troubled spots are separated that belong to the County Traffic Plan.

**C. Community Investment Plan Overview, Laura Aker Reece, Budget Manager, Budget/CIP and Grants Division**

Ms. Mammano mentioned that at the end of the last meeting it was agreed that this was homework and everyone was going to study this.

Mr. Walters commented that rearranging the agenda is called Reordering and it needs to be voted on.

**Motion by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Kwoka, to Reorder the agenda to replace Item B with Item C. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.**

Laura Reece, City Budget Manager, was present.

Mr. Dodd indicated that this is part of the discussion about funding versus future year funding categories and how to read this book. It is a short overview of how it is organized.

Ms. Reece provided a Power Point presentation of the CIP as follows:

- The variety of funding sources matter in the CIP.
- The General Fund is the most basic fund of the government. It comes from taxes and fees they are allowed to charge.

- There are Debt Service funds, which are special obligation debt or general obligation debt that is issued.
- With regards to Special Revenue funds, the one that is most key to the CIP is the CRA funds and the building funds.
- There are Internal Service funds so there are a few services in the City where there is Information Technology, City insurances, and a vehicle rental fund, which is the fleet. Those funds are funded through service charges paid by other funds.
- Fiduciary funds are Arts and Science, Cemetery and Police fund.
- Proprietary funds are the Enterprise funds, which are used to account for operations that provide a service to citizens financed primarily by user charge where the periodic measurement of net income is deemed appropriate for Capital Maintenance, public policy, management control, accountability, or other purposes.

It is Ms. Reece's understanding that this Committee will be focusing on the Proprietary funds, specifically Enterprise funds.

- The schedule breaks down the Community Investment Plan for the next five fiscal years. They are currently working with staff to develop fiscal year 18, which will initiate the next five years so it is a rolling average.
- The schedule summary tells you by fund what has been funded and has unspent balances and what is planned for the future.
- Enterprise funds are driven by the funding source so the rates are fees and with the General fund, there is a prioritization process with the Commission where projects are ranked and that is what determines what gets into the Community Investment Plan.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that the Committee is concerned with the General and Enterprise funds, not the other funds.

Ms. Reece indicated that it was her understanding that the focus of this Committee was primarily on the water, sewer, stormwater, and those sort of infrastructure needs.

Ms. Mammano noticed, while going through the material, that items that have their own dedicated funds seem to be doing fine. She believes the Committee needs to prioritize.

Mr. Walters commented that in reviewing the material, it showed that over the past years the City has siphoned monies that should have been used for infrastructure. He questioned if there is a plan to replace any of that money.

Ms. Reece advised that is a policy decision. This has to do with the Return on Investment.

Mr. Walters clarified that he was talking about monies that should have been used to stabilize the replacement of the infrastructure, whether it be highways, bridges, etc. each year. He believes it was in the amount between \$10 million to \$12 million and each year it was siphoned and not put back into the source from which it came. The City is in a shortfall and he questioned whether funds will continue to be siphoned that should be used for infrastructure or other purposes and if not, where the funds will come from to make up the shortfall.

Lee Feldman, City Manager, was present. He explained that what Mr. Walters is talking about is called the Return on Investment charged to the water and sewer utility and to the other Enterprise funds. The City has always had a Return on Investment but it was called different things over the years. That money goes into the General fund and is used for other expenses, some of which are Capital, such as fixing bridges, paving roads, and dealing with other infrastructure needs. He believes this is normal and customary for utilities. As far as taking out the right amount or too much, that is a policy decision. He does not think they have been taking out too much. As additional data is received, they will look at it or other ways to fund the utility. Ultimately, if money is taken out of the General fund by keeping the money in utilities, there will be other gaps that have to be made whole and those are going to affect other infrastructure such as bridge construction, road construction, etc. He will not say it is a solution but it is the one he has been using for the last six years and he is going to recommend that we continue down that track in this upcoming budget. When getting into more infrastructure discussion and looking at the Master Plan and reports, he thinks there needs to be a serious discussion about how those gaps are going to be met and how to propose doing that. As the Committee moves on, they will engage in a conversation about the alternatives. One of those alternatives may be to reduce the Return on Investment but he is not going to say that he will be the one recommending it.

Mr. Walters questioned the options when the Committee attempts to determine the infrastructure throughout the City and across all boundaries. It does not make sense to take it from somewhere else because that makes the City even shorter.

Mr. Stresau questioned the percentage of water or charges sold to other Cities as opposed to what is consumed.

Mr. Feldman did not know if he could convert it into percentage at this time. He stated that a population of 180,000 is served and the total population for the water and sewer system is about 300,000. Other things have to be factored in other than just population.

Mr. Stresau mentioned the budget meetings and believes that 5% was being added each year, raising the percentage.

Mr. Feldman indicated that in 2012, when there was a rate increase of 6.75%, it was determined that they would need to raise rates 5% per year. An automatic increase of 5% per year on water, sewer, and stormwater rates was built into the Ordinance and

has been in effect since 2012. The Commission was concerned about building up too much cash in the utilities so they put in either a four or five prong test to avoid a build-up of cash reserves. If there is too much they would issue a rebate or refund to the current rate payers of the system.

Ms. Mammano mentioned an article in the Sun Sentinel, which focused specifically on this issue. It was well articulated and she believes everyone pretty much understands it. There may be a disagreement about it but she thinks the Committee can move on. She suggested making a mental note that this is a big item to discuss.

Mr. Feldman announced that he was leaving the meeting due to briefings with the Commission.

Mr. Kwoka commented that part of the challenge is separating the fact from the fiction. Where it is appropriate, please continue to point out where things are normal and customary that the Committee might not be aware of.

Mr. Feldman stated that he did not know whether he would come to the same conclusions as mentioned in the article based upon what he knows of the City versus the average reader. When looking at the Master Plans, there is a difference between needs and wants. The 839 pages is a combination of both. It might be nice to do some things; however, it is not necessary to do all things. Staff needs to sort through the needs and wants list, with the assistance of the Committee, to discuss what the philosophy needs to be and what they should be concentrating on.

#### **D. Infrastructure Program Presentation, Alan Dodd, Deputy Director, Public Works Department**

Mr. Dodd indicated that it is very important to look at the budget because that shows where the Commission has set priorities in the past with three sources. The neighborhood survey is a very important part that informs them as they are making decisions. He stated that a large part of what this Committee will be doing is attempting to look at a little more of the data and trying to drive that discussion where the priorities should be and help them to make informed decisions. The challenge is trying to predict the future 15 to 30 years from now. There is also a challenge in Fort Lauderdale with regards to road structure, as it is not solely under their control and they should coordinate with the County or State because they own the roads. The most important part is trying to predict the future working with the Department of Sustainable Development and others; they want to take into account sustainability requirements. They want to build things so they are more energy efficient and will better protect the environment using the most current technology available so it will last and provide more capacity to the City. All this must be done with available funding and trying to balance the budget. This comes down to trying to help the Committee lead the discussion as to where we need to go within all the infrastructure areas. There are only so many people

on staff so they must balance all their resources, people, and money in order to accomplish all the goals and objectives.

Mr. Dodd provided a Power Point presentation as follows:

- The General fund has \$331 million in revenue; ~~\$360~~ \$316.5 million of that was devoted towards operating costs and \$14.4 million went into the Community Investment Program.
- It reflects a \$71 million fund balance, which they try to hold in reserve in case of emergencies. The intent is not to use that unless they absolutely must.
- In 2012 and 2013, they fell below their desired minimum fund balance but have been looking healthy over the last three years, which provided some flexibility.
- Regarding the seawalls, Fort Lauderdale has 200 miles of seawalls and 4.8 miles of those are City owned. Most were built in the 60's through 80's and a lot of the private ones have been upgraded and/or repaired along the way. The City seawalls are in the 30 to 40-year lifespan.
- There has been a lot of issues with flooding in areas due to water overtopping the seawalls. Last year they were advised to put a minimum height for seawalls and allow people to go higher than what they were currently authorized.
- There is a lot of concern with neighbors because as they were trying to do improvements they were required to do a substantial improvement to make the seawalls higher. The only way to deal with the impacts of climate change and sea level rise is by systematically raising the seawalls to accommodate the increase in sea level, particularly during King Tides and high tide events.
- For the last year and a half, they have been working on a Seawall Master Plan and currently have a draft of the final product. They anticipate that it will be completed this summer. That will identify all City owned seawalls, which ones should be prioritized for repair and which ones need to be replaced. A road map will be put together to help with cost estimates.

Ms. Mammano mentioned the unfunded number of \$33 million+ and questioned if that is the best estimate the Master Plan will show.

Mr. Dodd replied yes.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- That estimate is based on the new Ordinance, which requires them to raise just about every seawall the City. Some need to be done right now and others can be put off into later years.
- In looking at the CIP, there is \$7.3 million currently programmed within the five-year CIP budget.
- Seawalls are tracked two ways; through the seawall program as part of their storm water program and by addressing some of the seawalls because bringing

them up to standard directly impacts their ability to provide storm water protection to the neighbors. Seawalls are funded by the General fund category.

- Cordova Road is about a \$5 million requirement they are pushing for to get funded as soon as possible because that is probably the worst place where City owned seawalls are having over-washing events. It is currently not in the five-year plan.
- The issue is resiliency. As a coastal City, they have to overcome their current infrastructure. They have to raise the seawalls to protect what is coming from the ocean side but it also requires them to change infrastructure on the landward side to protect the houses. If seawalls are raised there is another problem when it rains because the water is caught in a bowl and will flood the property if the drainage infrastructure is not changed so the water can run out when the ocean is lower. That is part of the stormwater program.
- While talking about repairing the seawalls they must also incorporate a storm water aspect so they do not cause flooding of private properties.
- With regards to Transportation and Mobility, transportation is one of the biggest challenges, not only building or improvement the transportation infrastructure for cars but also trying to improve the capacity for bikes, pedestrians and other modes of travel.
- As far as traffic flow and traffic problems, there is a tremendous shortfall in the amount of funding available for the infrastructure improvements they would like to see going forward. A big part of this is vision zero, where they are trying to reduce the number of fatalities and accidents and trying to improve the safety aspects of the roads and sidewalks.

Ms. Mammano commented that all the projects noted under this particular category have no road capacity increases. All of these projects are deemed at increasing the ability of non-motorized people to use these streets. All of the projects are focused on the pedestrians and bicyclists and not on increasing the capacity of the roads in any way.

Mr. Dodd stated that is correct from his understanding of the projects. A lot of the projects listed are targeted towards the multi modal aspects of transportation.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned that a lot of projects are reducing the number of lanes instead of increasing them such as the beach north of Sunrise Boulevard. The proposal of Las Olas Boulevard reduces it to two lanes.

Mr. Dodd stated that he is not a transportation engineer and does not do the traffic studies. He has been in several presentations where people have talked about changing the way traffic flows. Even though the number of lanes are reduced, there will be more constant flow of traffic, it does improve traffic ability. That is something staff would need to discuss.

Mr. Zeltman compared it to a water distribution system, as the smaller reduced roadways or smaller diameter water mains would have less flow. He believes the goal may be to have less volume.

Mr. Walters referenced Sistrunk Boulevard and mentioned that every time a bus stops traffic stops. He has a hard time agreeing with reducing the number of lanes to improve traffic ability.

Mr. Dodd commented that there are several studies that show, in some cases, that it helps improve traffic flow.

Ms. Mammano suggested moving onto the roads. Besides the pedestrian, bicycles, and transit improvements, there is a plan for repairing the City roads, which is the next category.

~~Mr. Kwoka~~ Mr. Stresau mentioned while at the Transportation seminar, Scott Brunnar (sic), the Director of Traffic for Broward County, said there is a host of people sitting in a building somewhere watching cameras. They are tracking traffic jams on at least three or four of the major thoroughfares; Oakland Park and Sunrise, and they change the traffic signals to green when they see something piling up. As far as the County roads are concerned, they do not have cameras on all the roads but he was astounded to see that they are manually changing the lights to make the traffic flow better.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- In looking at the condition of the roads, in 2013 they did a pavement condition evaluation of all roads within the City. It was determined that out of approximately 525 miles of roadway 40% of the roads are in good condition, 19% are in fair condition, and 128 miles are in fair or poor condition.
- In looking at the CIP program for each year, an assessment is used with computer software to tell which roads should be prioritized and repaved during the upcoming fiscal year.
- Roads degrade every year they have not been done and the goal is for the roads in poor or failing condition to have all the asphalt torn up, milled, and repaved. That is significantly more expensive than using micro-surfacing, which is the second approach they take.
- The goal they have been working on since 2013 is to split evenly how much they are trying to get up to a good standard by tearing it up, completely repaving it and maintaining it by doing the micro-surfacing. The problem with micro-surfacing is it does not work on all roads. Micro-surfacing does not work on some heavy traffic roads with heavy trucks so that approach must be changed. Some roads have to be repaved.
- Micro-surfacing can be used on the lesser traveled roads to provide a wearing surface and not use the more expensive approach of mill and repaving.

- As they look at the CIP budget, there is \$3.7 million in the five-year program. By the end of 2017, they have micro-paved 69 out of the 98 miles in the fair rating category, which will extend them for approximately seven years. 15 out of 30 miles were in the poor category that were milled and resurfaced and that brought them up to a good category.

Ms. Mammano commented that there is \$169,000 in the bank and every year \$710,000 is spent milling or repairing. At the end of five years, \$3,719,000 will have been spent. Some of these categories have been given an unfunded number and some have not. She questioned the unfunded amount needed to bring everything up to a good standard if \$3.7 million has been spent at the end of five years. Never mind new roads, wider roads, or better roads. She mentioned that it is a rolling number. In order to do any planning, you should know if there is a lot of progress or if you are just making do.

Mr. Dodd did not have that number. He stated that the roads not getting the service are also degrading in quality.

Mr. Dodd advised that a lot of progress has been made with 15 out of 30 miles on the poor roads. They have been brought up to a good standard and hopefully the more expensive method will not have to be done and more of the micro-surfacing can be used to maintain those roads. That is the goal; to get everything up to fair so micro-surfacing can be done.

Ms. Mammano indicated that if everything is brought up to a good standard, then on a rolling basis, all that has to be done is micro-surfacing until it reaches a point that it has to be done again.

Mr. Dodd replied yes, except with the roads where it did not work.

Mr. Zeltman commented that it seems a lot of governmental agencies make a mistake by putting in new roads and then the Utility Division comes and cuts into it with water or sewer. Coordination would be a great ingredient to mix in the planning part of this instead of having a new road cut and restored.

Mr. Dodd mentioned that they do not do that enough these days. The County and FDOT put a moratorium in place after they do any type of paving on their roads. We have looked at their five-year program to see what things we would want to do under the ground and getting it in prior to paving. While looking at the stormwater program, which is a very big program coming up over the next five years, they are looking at what road improvements need to happen after roads are torn up to put stormwater infrastructure in place. A lot of paving is being done on the condition assessment but the long-term goal is to do a more holistic approach and tackle all the infrastructure areas at one time and then pave. If they can get to a level where they are not having failures or significant shortcomings they have the ability to do so.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- They are looking at roads that have pavers for aesthetic purposes in the intersections and how to deal with those. A lot of them are not level and even though they are on a County road it is the City's responsibility to maintain them. They are looking at different methods that are not as expensive to maintain them using some type of stamped concrete or stamped asphalt. That will reduce maintenance costs for the intersections as well as improve the quality issue driving through them.
- The City owns 51 bridges, some go back as far as the 1920's when they were constructed. There are a lot of challenges with the bridges, although, they do have a Master Plan that is driving the CIP budget. On occasion, FDOT conducted periodic inspections and found that the bridges were in worse condition than what was identified a few years ago. There are two bridges that will be getting pushed into the upcoming CIP for replacement based on the estimated costs for doing emergency repairs versus the cost to put a new bridge in place. It is estimated at approximately \$35 million in order to do all the maintenance and repair replacement required in the Master Plan looking out over the next 20 years.

Ms. Mammano stated that the unfunded balance would be approximately \$35 million. These Master Plans are long term plans. The CIP is only a five-year plan. It looks like the CIP plan is doing the repairs; however, there has to be another way to anticipate the unfunded portion.

Mr. Dodd indicated that they plan for the regular annual maintenance each year. As they see the bridges, they know which ones are scheduled for replacement in years five through ten of the Master Plan and they try programming \$2 million or \$3 million for a bridge replacement.

Mr. Walters mentioned when looking at the Master Plan and the five-year adopted plan, the CIP is a rolling document year by year. When you say five years, you are talking from 2017 to 2022 and next year it is from 2018 to 2023.

Mr. Dodd stated in this year's budget they had \$14.4 million in General fund CIP expenditures they were planning for. As a new requirement was identified, something had to come out in order for the \$2 million requirement to go in. Based on the urgency, investments for the upcoming years must be reprioritized.

Mr. Kwoka commented that this goes back to old infrastructure that is beginning to fail in mass. It keeps getting moved back because the money has not been taken to do a mass improvement all at one shot. The CIP is a five-year plan and the Master Plans are living documents but at what point is someone going to look at it as a point of crisis.

Mr. Dodd indicated that a lot of issues deal with saltwater, concrete, and rebar, which does not do well with the salt water environment, as it causes them to corrode much faster than they like to see. Modifications must be made to bridges due to sea level rise. On 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue, where the bridge that spins is located, there is a challenge based on higher water coming higher that is putting the gear box at risk. They are looking at how to raise the bridge so the electrical portions are not under water.

Ms. Mammano noted the bridge is a landmark.

Mr. Dodd stated that puts a whole other level of complexity on it.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- With regard to sidewalks, this is very similar to the road program, where an assessment was done in an attempt to categorize the type of damage. Most of the sidewalks are the responsibility of the adjacent homeowner to maintain and repair; however, the City does have responsibility for sidewalks that are adjacent to City owned property or when there are issues when City owned trees or swales have caused damage to the sidewalk.
- As they did the assessment for sidewalks, there is 469 miles and they found 106 miles, about 20%, in need of some type of repair. The total cost for repairs is about \$15 million. A portion is the responsibility of the adjacent homeowner. They did fund \$3.2 million from the Risk Management funds in order to address the City owned sidewalks and the ones they had responsibility due to the trees. That was put into a contract about a year ago and more than 50% of those sidewalks have been repaired out of that \$3.2 million.

Mr. Zeltman stated that he is involved with the Homeowner's Association and one of the things that came up with broken sidewalks was that the State Statute says the homeowner is not responsible for the sidewalk because it is considered an improvement within the municipalities right-of-way. If the homeowner breaks it or their tree on their property destroys it the homeowner is responsible. Generally, the sidewalk is considered an improvement just like the roadway and the municipality is responsible for it.

Mr. Dodd advised that is not the way the City Ordinance reads. That is one of the things on the list to be revisited. The City Ordinance is not working too well when there are trip hazards and it may need a revision to have the City take on that responsibility. They have to figure out how to pay for all those repairs.

Mr. Stresau questioned the percentage of liability suits that have been paid in the last year. He read something that had to do with millions of dollars of legal.

Mr. Dodd stated that when he came onboard the program was already in place where they were using the Risk Assessment funds in order to reduce the risk in high

pedestrian areas. He could not say how much was paid out or what the percentage was.

Mr. Stresau stated that he would like to know that because he thinks it might have something to do with the Committee deciding on priorities.

Ms. Mammano thought it was about \$1.3 million and it was cheaper to replace the sidewalks than it was to pay out. That may be a policy issue that needs to be articulated and brought to the floor. She noted that these are only existing sidewalks, not where sidewalks are needed.

Mr. Dodd advised that the Transportation and Mobility Division has done some assessments as to where new sidewalks could go; however, there is currently not any significant funding within the CIP for constructing new sidewalks.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that there are Master Plans, proposals, and ideas for things that should be done but they are not in the CIP because there is no funding.

Mr. Dodd stated that the Transportation Mobility Master Plan is for different parts of the City and it identifies requirements for additional sidewalks within the Connect the Blocks program. That is probably the main document that identifies where additional sidewalks should be built. Like everything else, it is not fully funded at this time.

Ms. Mammano indicated that it is not funded or reflected at all.

Mr. Dodd believed Ms. Mammano was correct. He knows that no new sidewalks are being constructed at this time.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- The City has 100 miles of canal waterways, 55 miles are City owned and the rest are either part of the South Florida Water Management District or the State or the County.
- Recently a survey was completed of all the canals that are under their control and it was determined that 13.5 miles of them need to be dredged. Currently, there is no funding for that type of dredging.
- Over the last year they have been working on a rate study to try to determine how much it would cost to go in and dredge all of those on a regular basis and what the funding mechanism would be in order to provide that type of funding.

Mr. Walters mentioned that this is based on a 2011 study. He questioned what it would be today.

Mr. Dodd stated that the 2011 meeting with the Marine Advisory Board was to come up with the standard we want canals to be held at. The surveying was conducted in 2013

and 2014 and completed this last year to determine the need. He believes there are between four and five canals that are below mean low water level. It is approximately \$8 million to conduct the dredging needs they know of right now. They are trying to determine the appropriate means to either do an assessment or to raise the money in order to conduct the dredging.

Ms. Mammano commented that according to this document, the City is not intending to allocate any money towards that project.

Mr. Dodd advised that it is currently unfunded as far as doing any of the actual dredging. The rate study presented to the City Commission about a month ago provides a methodology in order to assess homeowners along the canals where the dredging would occur.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that the City used to have a rolling fund and every year there was a list of a canal or two that would be dredged with City funds and they are rethinking how they would pay for that. That is a policy decision the City has made.

Mr. Dodd stated that in 2011 the Marine Advisory Board determined a profile, a depth for all canals to be maintained to. He believes it is four feet below mean low water level.

Mr. Stresau questioned if that is required in the Land Development Code and if that is an Ordinance. He also questioned whether the depth of the canals affect the storm water drainage program.

Mr. Dodd indicated that it is probably somewhere in there. He advised there are two different types of canals. There are navigable canals, which are based on the four-foot agreement or standard set with the Marine Advisory Board and there are drainage canals, which are strictly built to provide outflow capacity for storm water. Those are based on the hydraulic requirement, not on a navigable depth.

Mr. Stresau believes that is another answer the Committee needs; where the canals are specifically.

Mr. Dodd stated that a map was used while doing the rate study and as they prepared the needs assessment for canals. The storm water portion, which are the ones only for getting water out, would be funded through the storm water program as part of the storm water.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned that the navigable waterways are in the area of the U.S. Corp of Engineers. He questioned if there is any way to get them to take care of their jurisdiction.

Mr. Dodd indicated that the navigable canals are City owned canals that are maintained by the City. The only canal that is operated and maintained by the Corp of Engineers is

the Intracoastal Waterway. There are also some canals that are County or Water Management District. He did not know if there is any means in place for them to conduct dredging.

Mr. Zeltman wanted to determine their area of responsibility.

Mr. Dodd stated that to do dredging in any of these canals requires permitting through the Corp of Engineers and Florida DEP because they have to look at essential fish habitat, endangered species, etc.

In response to Mr. Kwoka, Mr. Dodd advised that the New River is under County control. The Corp of Engineers only does not the north/south on the Intracoastal just westward of the barrier islands.

Ms. Mammano questioned whether the New River needs to be kept at a certain dredged level in order to accommodate storm water. She sees a lot of out-folds going into the New River.

Mr. Dodd did not know if there is any requirement to maintain it to a certain depth.

Ms. Mammano questioned whether the impact of maintenance on the New River Canal to continue to take the drainage is in our Storm Water Master Plan.

Mr. Dodd stated that it has the capacity to move the water; that is not a concern. The concern is any place there are out-falls where there is sedimentation build up and maintaining them. That gets more towards the drainage canals versus the navigable ones and that is why it is part of the storm water program.

Ms. Mammano mentioned there should be some discussion on the Storm Water Management Plan of the New River and who is responsible for keeping that water flowing in that canal.

Mr. Dodd believed that is correct. He reiterated that it is not a City responsibility and it is more coordination with the applicable entities that maintain any of the other waterways not under their control.

Ms. Mammano stated that one of the challenges is to make this system work is having coordination between various levels of government. If we get the water flowing and it goes into the New River and clogs, no progress is being made.

Mr. Dodd did not think from a storm water aspect that there are any issues with the New River.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- With regards to facilities, the City has 150 buildings and 104 parks. Many of these are older buildings and there are a lot of maintenance requirements associated with them.
- One of the big things is a requirement known as a 40-year inspection where a consultant has been hired to do a very systematic evaluation of our buildings to determine what needs to be done in order to continue living in them and working out of them. In some cases, it will require bringing them up to code or to correct any deficiencies identified. The evaluation has to be done and then a remedy plan has to be done to repair it over the course of the next year.

Ms. Mammano questioned how many buildings have already been inspected.

Mr. Dodd stated that none of the 40-year inspections have been conducted that he is aware of for at least the last 15 to 20 years. There are ten on the list they are starting to work through.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- Within the Parks Master Plan, because they are the ones who operate and maintain the buildings and facilities, there is \$59 million in unfunded infrastructure needs in the Parks Master Plan for the next ten years and \$10 million of that between now and 2020.

Ms. Mammano commented that when looking at this document she did not see Parks because it is Facilities. The Parks Department is the maintainer of all the City facilities. She suggested that be broken down so people can see there is a Parks Master Plan and the City owned Facilities Plan. It would be a little clearer.

Mr. Dodd believed it was about \$150 million in projected requirements while looking at future Parks needs over the next 20 years within their Master Plan. That is to provide more green space, more soccer fields, lacrosse fields, and other requirements. It is both acquisition and construction. That is contained within the Master Plan and is another 900 pages document.

Ms. Mammano questioned the unfunded balance under Facilities.

Mr. Dodd indicated that it is possible to get a number on projected facility requirements. Currently, they are working on a price of a new Police Station, which is somewhere in the range of \$90 million. It will require a new maintenance facility for their fleet, which is approximately \$20 million. It is in the unfunded portion of the CIP. At some point and time they are also looking at City Hall and some of the other buildings as far as determining whether it is better to maintain and repair them or build new facilities. There are discussions on what should be done as far as repair and maintenance versus constructing new. He does not think they have a final answer. The Police Station is at the top of the list on facilities that need to be constructed.

Mr. Stresau questioned whether the City Commission said that was not going to be part of the Committee's responsibility to consider.

Mr. Dodd has not officially heard any change in the Charter as to what the Committee is to look at.

Mr. Stresau would like to know for sure whether the replacement of the Police Station is part of the Committee's responsibility or not.

Ms. Mammano commented that there is not a consistency in this report and for good reasons, not every category has the bottom line.

Mr. Dodd advised that they are moving forward with the parking garage near the beach; however, he is not familiar with that portion to provide any detail.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- The airport has a lot of projects and a Master Plan but there are no issues as far as the airport is concerned. The projects are fully funded.

Ms. Mammano mentioned the next part is Stormwater.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- There is \$11.9 million in 2017 revenues with approximately \$6.5 million going into the current CIP projects.
- When looking at the stormwater infrastructure most people have no idea what is under the ground. It is more than 170 miles of piping, 2,300 manholes, and more than 8,000 catch basins.
- They have a large program they are currently going through in order to develop a revised Stormwater Master Plan. They have already had engagements with several communities and are going through with preliminary plans to tackle the neighborhoods on a basis, basically treating it like one system, looking at all the infrastructure in the ground and what is needed to build it in order to deal with rainfall, tidal issues, etc., within the neighborhood as one construction project.
- They have done an overhead survey flown by a plane that provides very accurate heights and elevations on a one-foot basis throughout the entire City.
- Survey crews have gone and out and surveyed every manhole and every piece of piping and have put it into a model. Based on that they are coming up with those plans and plan on going into a very large construction project over the course of the next five years.

Mr. Stresau questioned how that affects anything the Committee might decide.

Mr. Dodd stated that they have already gone down the path of capturing what the needs are; however, they need to determine how much they can afford to pay and how they are going to pay. He believes the City is moving towards a Bond for payment. Additional information will be available by December this year. Currently, estimates are between \$150 million and \$200 million, which will be the first portion of construction for seven neighborhoods within Fort Lauderdale. There will probably be a lot of meetings with people on the budget side to determine how much they can Bond and how much can be absorbed as far as construction over a five-year period. The overall stormwater problem within Fort Lauderdale is probably in the range of \$1 billion if you look at the entire City and where there are flooding issues.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that the stormwater fund says the revenues are \$11 million, operating is \$7 million, and community investment plan is \$6.5 million, which is 87% of the operating expenses. She requested an explanation as to how they got to 87% of the operating expenses. She noticed that the CIP is a percent of the operating expenses.

Mr. Dodd advised that it is operating versus the Capital expansion improvements portion. They are trying to build up reserve funds in order to provide a greater bonding capacity as they get ready to Bond out the larger project.

Ms. Mammano commented that there would be a greater bonding capacity if the money were kept in the fund used for the General fund. That is a policy issue.

Mr. Dodd stated within the stormwater fund there is no Return on Investment.

Mr. Zeltman questioned how much the water works program was in 2007.

Mr. Dodd responded approximately \$7 million.

Mr. Dodd indicated that it was \$700 million and this year we are looking at \$150 million to \$200 million for seven neighborhoods. It is called Phase 2. The estimate is when you start looking at the Greater Fort Lauderdale beyond the seven neighborhoods and what they have for projections. It will cost more than \$1 billion to completely rebuild all the stormwater infrastructure within the City where there is insufficient capacity or it does not exist at all.

Mr. ~~Zeltman~~Stresau questioned if that takes a whole new group of people to manage that like it did the water works.

Mr. Dodd stated they are looking at different ways for staffing and construction management of it. As they build up the program they will also build up the staffing within the stormwater team in order to accommodate the extra workload. Currently, they are in the planning phase. They have a number of smaller projects to do that is within the \$6.5 million they are constructing each year but when they start getting into the

\$150 million to \$200 million-dollar range they will have to take a different approach as to how they manage those contracts, probably involving more CEI type services and other ways of managing the workload.

Ms. Mammano questioned the difference between the Stormwater fund and the Stormwater utility.

Mr. Dodd advised they are basically the same. The fund is the revenue portion and the utility is capturing the real value of the assets in the ground as well as the income and expenditures.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- The \$148 million Revenue Bond in 2019 is a projected program coming out of the Master Plan that will take approximately five years to build.

Mr. Zeltman distinguished between the two types of catch basins. Most people do not know there is one kind that is basically what is called a positive drainage that drains based on a hydraulic grade so it does not flood up and goes out to an outfall into a canal. Another type that is more prevalent in the coastal regions are the French drains or exfiltration tray that will collect the stormwater and exfiltrate it back into the ground locally where the catch basin site is to help recharge the ground water, which in turn helps to slow down the saltwater intrusion that is coming in from the coast that represents a potential threat to our raw water wells that provide treated water for drinking water.

Mr. Dodd indicated that one of the problems they are having is that that there is sea level rise and the ground water is basically rising higher and when it rains there is less capacity within the soil to absorb the water and more frequently, instead of just getting absorbed into the soil, it is flowing out onto the roads and into public spaces. That gets into a host of aspects dealing with base flood elevations on houses, storage capacity of the ground, and how the model is being done. It is a huge challenge. The saltwater wedge and impact on wellfields and others gets into a completely other aspect of how all these pieces are inner-related, not only to keep the roads dry, but protecting water sources, infrastructure, people's homes and their property.

Ms. Mammano commented that we are not a good candidate for Natural Stormwater Management in this area. That is very sustainable in most places.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- The newspaper article had a lot of information from the Utilities Master Plan; however, that document is very complex and you cannot just pull out bits and pieces without understanding the overall program and what has been accomplished over the past 15 years.

- There is \$111 million in 2017 revenue in the Water and Sewer fund. Approximately \$16 million is going into the Community Investment Plan.
- There is a separate fund, the Central Region Wastewater Fund, primarily dealing with the services provided to other Cities. That has \$27 million in fiscal year 17 revenues, approximately \$7.8 million of that is going into the current year CIP. That is dealing strictly with the wastewater portion of the system compared to the Water and Sewer Fund, which deals with both the wastewater and the water portion.

Mr. Walters questioned whether that is sufficient.

Mr. Dodd indicated that they are still trying to look at the leg structure and what they are accomplishing within the program and what they want to accomplish in the long run. In his opinion, yes, they have a backlog of funds that are already dedicated to projects they have not been able to expend. They are necessary projects. In looking at the Utilities Master Plan, one of the numbers quoted was \$1.4 billion in requirements. He would say that is not all urgent immediate requirements. In looking at the categories, they are very good goals but the question is how much of those they choose to pay for. Not everything is a must do, some things are nice to do and that is a decision to make.

Ms. Mammano commented that in the water utility there is a number for the unfunded. She assumed the unfunded number of \$43 million represents the things that must be done, not the things they would like to do.

Mr. Dodd stated that it is felt that those projects identified in the program should be done. It is replacing pipes that are coming of age, increasing capacity of systems, etc. These are projects that have been identified in the previous Master Plan that were put into the program; however, as they tried to balance the revenues and available funding they were not fundable within the first five-year period. They are carried as an identified project but there is no funding within those five years to accomplish the work that needs to be done.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that the work could be accomplished in year seven, eight or nine as they roll the whole program.

Mr. Dodd replied yes.

Ms. Mammano indicated that the way she is reading the plans regarding the \$43 million of unfunded projects for water, there is enough water supply. There are not enough pipes and capacity to push that supply to the current population and we need to plan for future population.

Mr. Dodd stated that is correct. They will start at the wellfields where they take the water out to see how much water capacity they have coming out of the ground then they look at the water plan, the capacity of how much it can produce for water each day and if it is

able to produce sufficient water to meet current requirements looking at the next 20 years. Then you get into the distribution network, where issues are seen with old pipes and there are challenges with some of the dead-ends. Those are some improvements that need to be made and will be programmed out over the course of 20 years. Some need to be done right now and those are in the CIP; some are funded and under designed or in construction. Some are programmed for future years. He stated there is a Capital Expansion Fee that is assessed as part of the project and it is paid to the City and goes into the Water and Sewer Fund so necessary capacity improvements can be done.

Ms. Mammano questioned whether there is an accounting of how much money has been put in within the last five years.

Mr. Dodd stated that within the budget system it is all tracked.

Ms. Mammano commented that it is not all funded by the General fund. She had no idea there is a fund with money going into it from the developers. If that could be broken out as part of this discussion it would be very helpful. She sees the Committee's role as making information available to people to understand this process as well.

In response to Mr. Stresau, Mr. Dodd advised that the funds are restricted to Capital Expansion of the system. It cannot be spent on general projects; it has to be directly related to increasing the capacity of a lift station, water pump, or something along those lines. There are improvements that need to be done on the water treatment plant. They have a \$30 million project they are pushing through the permitting process to do a lot of the upgrades on that as well.

Mr. Dodd continued as follows:

- The sewer utility is where a lot of news has been seen about sewage pipe breaks and issues. This is a challenge with aging infrastructure. One of the main purposes of the Water Works Program in 2011 was directly focused on getting people off septic tanks and using the wastewater systems. The reason for environmental purposes to keep the water cleaner. That took a huge amount of resources and they were not replacing aging pipes because there were different priorities at that time.
- They are seeing a number of pipes are breaking because of age. Part of this report helped them identify where the high risk pipes based on the types of materials, flows and pressures, and they have put together a program with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection to prioritize doing a physical assessment of the pipes and either repairing or replacing them based on what the condition assessment tells them. They have been working on that for approximately six to eight months with DEP.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that they seem to have a significant amount of money in the bank, the \$38 million, which has already been allocated for some of the projects. They will be spending \$21 million every year for the next five years and still have an unfunded balance of \$61 million.

Mr. Dodd stated that is correct. These numbers were produced prior to the completion of this report. They are still analyzing what is contained as far as dollars associated with projects that are being recommended. They will prioritize those projects in order to decide the sewer portion should they have a change in priorities.

Ms. Mammano commented that when adding up all the CIP projects, it does not come out to all this money; it comes out to less. She questioned where the other projects are.

Mr. Dodd indicated that the CIP portion is representative of a couple of the projects. They have in the range of 150 or 160 projects within the Water and Sewer Program. There is a listing of all the projects in the CIP book. In addition, there are other projects that were programmed for the out years that are not yet in the CIP. Mr. Zeltman previously mentioned the inflow and infiltration; the I & I program. They have approximately \$15 million for that project this year. There are sewage pipes with leaks and water flows into the pipes from the ground water coming through gaps and that is contributing as much as 50% of the flow being processed out the sewage treatment plant every day. Where there are very high ground water levels because of King Tides, other reasons, or a lot of rain, they see an increase. If they can reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration going into the pipes it increases the capacity of the plant to support the community.

Mr. Zeltman stated that it also reduces the lift station pump station energy costs for having to pump that excess ground water.

Mr. Dodd advised that it has sufficient capacity but they have to control the I & I issues and it gets to repairing leaks in the pipes and the gravity system of the pipes.

Mr. Walters mentioned wants versus needs. He questioned whether the \$61 million of projects are needs or wants.

Mr. Dodd reiterated that there are a lot of needs when it comes to certain portions; however, some are needed but not today. Everything does not need to be replaced right now but over the course of 20 years, certain infrastructure needs to be replaced. When it comes to infrastructure, they need reliable and dependable infrastructure but they need to have a long-term outlook as they are constructing it and they need to use resources wisely, which means they need to look at sustainability, resiliency and make the best use of their resources to invest every dollar wisely. In time, they will make up for a lot of the shortfalls in the system.

Ms. Mammano believed the Committee should have some discussion

Mr. Walters commented that was a lot of information. He learned a lot but needs some time to think about this as to how to separate the needs from the wants and how to separate today from tomorrow. That is going to be a major challenge.

Mr. Stresau stated that he somehow got into the Commission Annual Action Plan for 2017 and it did not seem to address as much as what was discussed during this meeting. He wonders whether the Commission, in trying to develop their Action Plan, listened to staff and got the kind of input that was given at this meeting.

Mr. Dodd advised that they had this exact same conversation with the Commissioners in January with almost the same slides and the discussion was about priorities and needs versus wants and where we should be investing. He thinks that is what drove the decision to create this Task Force. He noted that a lot of what drives their Action Plans goes back to the neighborhood survey.

Mr. Stresau indicated that he had a problem with the neighborhood survey. The Committee's responsibility seems to be more public safety as far as what they drink and flush and not necessarily the parks. He focused on the parks and as a Landscape Architect, he went through some of the park information and it is a wish list that does not fall into the category of need. That is why he wanted to focus on the Police Department too because that is an important item and apparently, that is not part of this Committee's responsibility. He thinks Mr. Dodd needs to check into that.

Mr. Kwoka agreed with the comment about the neighborhood survey. He does not know how much faith he would put in that study. He also concurred with Mr. Walters' comment that this was a lot of information and he would like some time to digest it further rather than make statements he would not want recorded.

Mr. Zeltman commented that prioritizing the need should be based on safety and health such as the Police Department, which we all depend on, and health based on the efficient and coordinated efforts in taking out the failing sanitary sewer gravity lines and efficiently replacing them with a larger size to accommodate the current and future needs of our population. We need to make sure the water systems are able to provide water and fire protection. We also need to be sure the well water wellfields are not going to be endangered from saltwater intrusion or any other contaminants that may be coming in.

Mr. Cobb questioned the survey. He thinks most surveys are influenced by lobbyists and community activists and do not necessarily represent what has been presented here today. There is a trend in that survey of a decreasing satisfaction that maybe that is something that should be considered.

Ms. Mammano mentioned that she was overwhelmed by the amount of information. She does not see it as the Committee's role to revisit any of this. She thinks this Committee should focus on what she perceives to be the problem in this document. They are trying to make up for longstanding disinvestment in the infrastructure and are spending a lot of money trying to keep ahead of everything. She believes that discussion is what communities want to hear. She agrees with her colleagues that they are going to need to think about this and how it is articulated and presented to the public. This is the kind of information we are going to have to make people aware of; otherwise, they will be talking about things they do not understand. She questioned what additional information is needed and where we are going. There will be an ability for the members of the community to adjust the agenda when the meeting starts.

Mr. Kowka appreciates all the information that was given but the phrase "Analysis Paralysis" comes to mind. While it is important to look at the data, he wants more time to think about it. He questioned what the real value is to what they are doing here. He would hope that valuable information like this can be obtained whenever they meet but also hopes there is more room for conversation and not being suffocated by data from Master Plans.

Ms. Mammano questioned if anyone in the public wishes to speak.

Paul Chettle, resident, was present. At the offsite Commission meeting last Wednesday, which was held at the Women's Club, the City Commission gave the Mayor consensus to arrange a meeting with this Committee at noon on either May 24 or 25, 2017, to give the mandate that the top three priorities are water and sewer, stormwater and seawalls, and resiliency. He wondered whether that meeting is scheduled yet or if that meeting is going to happen.

Mr. Dodd advised that nothing has officially been conveyed to them. He thinks they are still trying to work it out between the seventh and eighth floor.

Mr. Chettle stated that one of the suggestions was to have a calendar so the public was aware of what subject would be discussed when. Ultimately the Committee wants to look at funding and solutions and if the public is going to have any input it would be helpful to know when that is going to be. He mentioned that \$491 million is being discussed as expenditures and thinks it will be important for the public to get some sort of level of communication as to how much of that is wants versus needs. During the Commission meeting, Commissioner Rogers said they get a lot of criticism about the ROI program. He does not know if it is within the framework of this Committee, but if there is ever a discussion about that particular funding, that would be of significant interest to the public because as best he can tell, they have studied it and know what it is and according to the Mayor, they do not.

Mr. Kwoka commented that this has become a topic not only at this level but recently it was in the Sun Sentinel with regards to the airport administering a similar return on

investment program. He agreed with Mr. Chettle that it should be a separate discussion.

Mr. Walters mentioned that having calendar events with items to be discussed could get hectic because things change and people who showed up for a certain event would be upset. He believes if the discussion were put out a week in advance that would give the average person plenty of time and that should be on the City website.

Nancy Gassman, resident, was present. She noted that Mr. Stresau asked the question, "Why isn't infrastructure part of the Commission's current Annual Action Plan?" In looking back over the last several years and reviewing the Commission Action Plans, one of the major forces they wanted to move forward was related to the inflow and infiltration issue. They made it a priority for a year and once they felt the program was in place and making progress it dropped off their priority list because they felt that adequate progress was being made. They choose new sets of priorities every year. She noted that the City's wellfields are substantially to the west and some are outside of the City to the west. Modeling them by Broward County is demonstrating that the City of Fort Lauderdale's wellfields are relatively safe from saltwater intrusion for at least the next several decades.

Mr. Stresau stated that a major portion of the Resolution is public input. He indicated that the agenda did not get out until Friday. His point is that no one in the public even knows this meeting is going on. It is the Commissions desire that the public have an opportunity to give public opinion and he does not want to get into November and find the public saying they did not have a chance because they did not know about the meeting. He has no clue on funding and told the City Manager that he thought one of the earlier meetings should cover what kind of funding they are talking about. The Committee needs to have an understanding of what might be available, including ad valorum taxes being raised in order to pay for everything.

Mr. Zeltman advised that during the last meeting he raised the question that the City is trying to get a good amount of the trillion dollars the Feds have for infrastructure work that needs to be done. That should be part of the equation for funding resources, as well as looking at other areas where the money can be drawn from. Current prices of construction are going to be needed, as a realistic figure on the dollar amount will be needed. As they project in the future, they better have that properly amount inflated as best as possible.

Ms. Mammano did not believe any money would be received from the Federal Government to do any infrastructure in the City of Fort Lauderdale. If anything, they will defund it. The problem is that the City has not taken the responsibility of raising the millage rate to pay for everything needed. That has been a political decision and the Budget Advisory Board has said this for the last five years. That is why \$20 million was taken out or there would have been a \$20 million hole in the budget, which would have necessitated raising the taxes. She is not a big proponent of raising taxes. Financing is

something that needs to be on the table. Perhaps one of the agenda items should be devoted to financing.

Mr. Stresau commented that they have been supported by increasing property values.

**E. Priorities for Future Meetings – None.**

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:34 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 C. Guifarro, Prototype, Inc.]