

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Infrastructure Task Force Committee
March 5, 2018
2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.
8th Floor City Commission Room – City Hall
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

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

MEMBERS		PRESENT	ABSENT
Marilyn Mammano	P	11	0
Ed Kwoka	P	9	2
Ralph Zeltman	P	11	0
Keith Cobb	P	8	3
Leo Hansen	P	10	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	10	1
Fred Stresau	A	9	2
Norm Ostrau	P	8	1
David Orshefsky	P	8	0

Staff Present

Lee Feldman, City Manager
Chris Lagerbloom, Assistant City Manager
Laura Reece, Budget Manager
John Herbst, City Auditor
Raj Verma, Interim Assistant Public Works Director
Nancy Gassman, Assistant Public Works Director
Talal Abi-Karam, Assistant Public Works Director
Diana Alarcon, Director of Transportation and Mobility
Enrique Sanchez, Deputy Director Parks and Recreation
Meredith Shuster, Administrative Assistant
Michael Mitchel, Prototype-Inc. recording secretary

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Orshefsky requested modifying the agenda prior to approval. Mr. Orshefsky requested moving Item #7 following Item #4 so Laura Reece and any other staff could do their presentations.

Motion made by Mr. Kwoka, seconded by Mr. Walters, to approve the agenda as amended. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

A. February 5, 2018

Mr. Orshefsky made the following corrections, additions, and deletions:

- Page 12; there was a reference to the general enterprise fund. It was believed that the intent of Paragraph 8, middle of the page, "Chair Mammano questioned the \$200 million bond." This was where we were discussing whether the bond issue was going to replace CIP monies and the problem was it was all caps, which makes it a defined term. He believed it should be, "The enterprise fund into which the \$200 million bond is going". There is a general revenue capital fund but he did not believe that was what was being discussed. There were several references to the general enterprise fund and requested those be cleaned up. It was believed that Chair Mammano meant the enterprise fund, which in this instance, would be water or sewer.
- Mr. Zeltman thought the paraphrasing of the minutes of the last agenda was very well done. The only thing noticed over several months was that under staff present, John Herbst, City Auditor, has been excluded and he has been here for most of the meetings. Since that has no bearing on the information discussed, perhaps Mr. Herbst could be added to the meetings he attended.

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Zeltman, to approve the February 5, 2018 meeting as amended. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

4. General Discussion (Board Members) – 15 minutes

Chair Mammano referenced a list to commit to various public meetings and noted that Mr. Kwoka, Mr. Walters, and herself were down for all four meetings; additional participation is needed.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that he would be out of town. Mr. Orshefsky mentioned informational items that did not need discussion but he wanted to be sure they did not fall off the table in terms of questions that were asked.

- #1: The 40-year inspection.
- #2: The timing of the storm water issue and the storm water rate study.
- #3: Citywide Outreach meetings.
- #4: CIP versus bond funding. In last month's minutes there was a discussion about what percentage bond funding would replace or substitute for some existing CIP funding.

Ms. Reece indicated that bond funds would be spent first so existing water and sewer projects that can be done and are ready to go would be done with bond funds. The City wants to spend the bond funds within two years; therefore, timing of projects and moving funds will be looked at so all eligible projects that are ready and can spend bond funds will do so.

Mr. Orshefsky asked if bond funds were replacing CIP funds and what projects would the CIP funds be reallocated. If 60% of the I/I is used from bond funds, I/I dollars that were allocated under the CIP are now free and would be reallocated.

Ms. Reece advised that was not correct. With the bond there was a list of \$200 million in new projects so the intent is to do the \$200 million in new projects but it could be through spending bond funds on whatever is moving first.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned where a list of new projects could be found.

Ms. Reece stated when approval was received to go forward with the bond there was a list attached, but it was a draft list and could change over time.

Chair Mammano remembered the draft list and questioned if a final list was available.

Mr. Verma advised that they are still finalizing. Once the list is finalized it will be shared.

Mr. Cobb questioned whether the two-year requirement was a legal restriction or if it was something negotiated.

Ms. Reece stated there is Federal Law that says you must spend the money.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that perhaps the answer is to come back next month with the final listing and what the anticipated first two years' worth of reallocated CIP funding would be so the Committee could get some sort of order of magnitude.

Mr. Verma advised that information would be provided once it is final.

Mr. Walters noticed there were several completed projects and questioned if those projects were included in the total amount of the bond were expected to be issued or if the money came from the general fund or some other fund.

Ms. Reece indicated that all projects that were water sewer and central region related would be funded through bonds.

Mr. Walters questioned if that money would be replaced once the bond money was received.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned as an example, Fiveash, and questioned where the bond money fits in the prioritization.

Ms. Reece stated that she has not seen the final list; she saw the draft list everyone else saw. It was believed that staff was looking at refining estimates and getting more specifics before appropriating the bond funds.

Mr. Walters commented that there are sections of Las Olas Boulevard and Sistrunk Boulevard that have been completed. Now that those projects have been completed it is unknown what amount should be taken from the bond to replace whatever fund the money was taken from.

Mr. Feldman mentioned that some projects had to be abandoned and money was taken from those projects that were not happening and moved to projects that had to be done. The City has contemplated, under the bond, to put the money back into those projects the money was taken from so those projects could continue as originally planned.

Mr. Kwoka stated that process terminates the project in the interim. When the project is technically abandoned so funds could be reallocated, the project must go back in front of the Commission to be reapproved.

Mr. Feldman indicated, that as part of the budget amendment the money would be put back into the project. The budget amendment is being prepared to take the \$200 million and put it into specific projects.

Mr. Walters mentioned that he would like to see a total of all the projects and as projects get completed, what effect that has on the budget.

Mr. Feldman advised as they spend down on a monthly basis a report is run to show what is left in the project account. There are times a project is finished and there is money left over, at which time the project is closed and the balance is reallocated to other projects. A report could be provided on a periodic basis that would show what is left in each project.

Mr. Walters noted that he would like to see the report broken down by different infrastructure they look at so what is left in those particular line items is known.

Mr. Feldman stated that could be done. CIPs are reviewed every month and the report can be provided quarterly. It looks like the CIP schedule that has all five years updated with the balance.

Mr. Cobb commented that is also needed in the aggregate not just by project so the capital cash flow would be known for the next five years.

Chair Mammano pointed out that she and Mr. Verma had a meeting to set up this meeting and discussed putting together the work program and the forty-year reports, would be in April. Chair Mammano questioned if perhaps the storm water could be done in May.

Mr. Orshefsky stated his last informational item was with respect to the Reiss Report. To the extent there was overlap between the work now required by the Consent Agreement and that which was also recommended under Reiss Report. The question was in terms of the priority once there was a final listing under the \$200 million bond, which percentage of the \$200 million was responding to the priorities as set by the Consent decree and how much was left under the Reiss Report.

Mr. Kwoka stated it would probably be helpful to understand if time or budget is running over or under just to see some trending analysis as to where the projects are.

Mr. Verma stated that they have that information but it could be refined.

Mr. Kwoka requested a general idea as to where the Committee was at.

Mr. Verma indicated that staff has had discussions to write the staff report and he thought there was some discussion that could be copied to see where the critical projects were.

Chair Mammano mentioned bond funds and noted not only were there physical things that had to be done, but there were several studies required to be initiated. It was questioned if any of those studies were initiated.

Mr. Verma advised that they are working on developing the scope of services. There was an asset management component and a capacity analysis component so those are the two major things they are working to finalize.

Chair Mammano commented that those studies must be produced within a specific timeframe as they are almost more important than the actual immediate projects that need to get done because they speak to the future.

Mr. Verma believed staff has been focusing on the most critical elements such as the force main issues and the major projects, which have been completed. There are many issues running simultaneously, I/I, lift stations, forcemains, RFP's. As discussed earlier, there is a deadline to spend the money if the City does not want to get stuck with the arbitrage.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned the discussion of lining the sewage lines and the timetable for the completion of the entire City, which could not be done in a ten-year timeframe. There was also an acknowledgement that the lining only extends the timetable by 10 to 15 years and once the lining is complete it would not be able to be relined again.

Mr. Verma was not sure but he knew many of the lines do last more than ten years; it depends on what type of material and technology is being used. According to his information, it is definitely more than ten years; otherwise, they would not be doing the work.

Mr. Kwoka stated that his concern was that replacement should happen somewhere in parallel with repair for some of the projects; otherwise, they would get to the other end and the same options would not be available for repair.

Mr. Verma stated that the City will take the correct steps to ensure there is enough return on the work being done. In addition, other alternatives are being addressed.

Mr. Orshefsky believed Mr. Verma was talking about long-term planning pursuant to the Consent decrees. Pictures would be taken and studies would be done so capital requirements necessary could be budgeted to replace or make repairs. Case by case projects would come up and nothing could be done. In terms of structure, the outline in the Consent Agreement makes the only sense that could be undertaken at this point.

Mr. Verma advised that in terms of the collection system, there are three major components; pipes, manholes, and lift station. We need to make sure all three components are analyzed in its entirety and whatever needs to be done must be done correctly so whatever capacity is wanted is delivered.

Mr. Zeltman added that the I/I study would give, based on the interpretation of each one of the failures, a better handle on what is constituting most of the damage.

Mr. Hansen questioned if the City has a dig once policy for all these projects.

Mr. Abi-Karam stated that when projects are done, whether it is roadway, transportation, or utilities, if any other projects have been assigned in the same time-period all improvements are incorporated at the same time.

Mr. Hansen mentioned that the idea was to see if everything that needs to be done can be done at the same time. Redundancy was seen in some of the projects and he has seen something dug up and then something dug up a couple years later. It was suspected there is not a dig once policy and if not, Mr. Hansen questioned why not.

Mr. Kwoka referenced the thousands of feet of 30-inch main that were just replaced and questioned what other infrastructure was in close proximity.

Mr. Hansen advised that it may not be critical but in Fort Lauderdale, where traffic is an issue, if there is a 75% or 60% chance of failure, it cannot be ignored. There should be a policy that those streets are not disturbed for years on end.

Mr. Abi-Karem mentioned that much of the work has been done by directional drilling and has minimal impact on the streets. The approach for executing the projects in the \$200 million bond in the Consent Order pipeline project is to utilize similar methodology. He also stated that FDOT and the County also have projects that the City may not know about until the last minute. With pipelines, they are going into new technology and new methods.

Mr. Orshesky stated that the Task Force was straying into operational policy and did not think this was part of what the Committee was supposed to be doing.

Mr. Verma put the conversation to rest that anywhere there is an opportunity to do what is called an open cut and trench, they coordinate and make sure exactly what is being discussed. The City instills in the project managers, to identify anything that could be done, providing the funding is there, so they do not have to come back and do it again.

Chair Mammano questioned if everyone received the email she sent out with a resource the Committee should be looking at, Urban 3. The data is graphically displayed; it is called data visualization.

Mr. Kwoka suggested determining if the City is currently using data visualization tools.

Mr. Orshesky stated that they are but it may not be this source.

Chair Mammano commented that the work she has seen the City do with visualization is pie charts, etc., which is not very sophisticated. This is 3D visualization; they can visualize which project paid impact fees and which ones are in the pipeline to pay impact fees and they can actually physically locate it. It is very easy to understand. Chair Mammano requested the City, when the Committee gets to the point that something has to be produced, make sure they have looked to see if some of these more advanced graphic technologies could be used to make it easier for people.

Mr. Kwoka stated it is not as simple as deciding to put together a pie chart. These visualization tools are very powerful but not super expensive anymore. The project with visualization on this type of data is that the data needs to be normalized and situated in such a way. If there is a shortage of any one skill set in an industry, it is the people who do the data normalization and analytical visualization. He doubted that the City has the level of talent available nor the budget to do what is being presented. Mr. Kwoka believed the City could present other visualization but did not think it was realistic to ask them to provide for this Task Force only that level of visualization because it is a monumental task to get to.

Mr. Verma commented that Ms. Reece, her team, and his team, have all made monumental efforts to put this presentation together. It may not be complete but it is their best understanding. It has been a struggle to meet the budget deadlines and prepare this and he apologized if anything is lacking.

5. Old Business

A. Outreach Meetings

Chair Mammano advised that Dr. Gassman, herself, and staff worked on a proposed methodology for the meetings. The proposal was that neighbors come in and sign in, they will be given three dots, invited to have a seat, and await instructions. She suggested that it be done that way rather than immediately putting dots on the board because no one has been introduced and the purpose of the meeting has not been announced. The Committee could then introduce themselves and state what they were hoping to accomplish. Once everyone settles down, they will get up and do their dots. They will put their dots according to the layout agreed upon; infrastructure, drinking water, sanitary sewer, storm water, roads, bridges, sidewalks, parks and open space, City buildings, and other. There would not be a caption for other but in order to accommodate there would be a flip chart board in addition to the topics board. If someone comes up with something it will be put on the flip chart board.

Chair Mammano stated that once the priorities were identified the discussion would start. The public would have three minutes to speak, which would be strictly enforced.

Board members should arrive around 7:00 p.m. Chair Mammano indicated that Committee members would be leaving at 9:00 p.m.

Chair Mammano is going to send the Save the Dates to all the Civic Associations and the City is also going to send it through its social media. Flyers were given out at Neighbor Support Night.

Chair Mammano was looking at this as an opening dialogue. There is not a report or anything for the people to react to. She questioned whether a Commissioner from the district should be invited.

Mr. Kwoka replied no.

Chair Mammano questioned if there was anything else that could be done to encourage people to attend.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if the Resolution could be amended to provide a special membership category for Mr. Cobb to continue.

Mr. Kwoka suggested adding another seat to let Mr. Cobb stay on the Committee. Mr. Cobb has a lot to offer and it was recommended to leave it alone. If it becomes an issue it will be brought to attention.

Mr. Cobb stated that he is happy to contribute if he can and the reason he would drop off is because he feels very uncomfortable agreeing to do something and then not being able to make the meetings.

Mr. Kwoka advised that Mr. Cobb's concerns were duly-noted and dismissed from his position.

Chair Mammano distributed the latest list of Consent Order projects and the breakdown.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that he would rather have the information electronically if possible.

Chair Mammano questioned if this adds up to \$2 million.

Mr. Kwoka replied yes.

B. Information Document for Incoming Commission - None

6. Board Member Comments – None.

7. New Business

A. CIP Presentation – Laura Reece, Budget Manager

Ms. Reece provided a brief presentation and noted that some things were left out because there was not a lot of clarity on what the Committee was looking for. Mr. Hansen was looking for cashflow where he was specifically asking how much was in the fund, how much was appropriated, and how much was left at the end. For CIP, that was not as meaningful as what it was for operational funds because capital funds are separate from operating funds so money is transferred when capital projects are done every year. At the end of the year, what is left are projects that were closed generally or interest that was earned in that fund. The fund does not normally generate funds in itself with the exception of impact fees that are deposited right into the capital funds. The rest are captured in the reports.

Mr. Zeltman commented that he was used to having a project plan that shows the timeframe of the project and funding. Usually, there was a project schedule showing both the time element.

Mr. Kwoka stated that was the efficiency measures he was asking about.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned how to keep track of what has been spent and what was remaining to be spent.

Ms. Reece advised that there are monthly meetings with the City Manager to review all open projects in a summary format where it has a project description, how much was appropriated to date, how much was spent by fund and then there are some high-level

measures with design and schedules from this date to that date. Each year a five-year Community Investment Plan is adopted. Projects for the plan are developed based on needs assessment; the criteria is \$50,000 or more and it must have a useful life of at least ten years. It is considered capital once it meets the threshold if it becomes a City's asset. A lot of master plans and studies are done and normally consultants are hired to do those. Funding prioritization for non-general funds, such as airport fund, parking fund, can be funded based on availability in that fund; a lot of times it is rate supported. Many revenues are generated based on leases that are at the property. Plans and strategies are also prioritization and there is also professional expertise.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the general funds include CRA's.

Ms. Reece replied that CRA's are a non-general fund but they have a separate process; they have different goals and plans where the CRA's set different measurements eliminating slum and blight and different things, depending on the CRA. For general fund prioritization, there is a two-step process; a Commission ranking and then a CIP project review, which is also used to drive applications.

Chair Mammano thought only certain things were funded under the enterprise funds and under the general revenue sources.

Ms. Reece stated that once it has been determined that this project would need to come out of general resources, which is taxes, fees, etc., it would have to go through this process to determine the highest priority. For the other funds, many times it is based on funding availability and the highest priority of those funds.

Chair Mammano did not understand why Community Investment Plan funding was on the slide. If this is the prioritization for general fund revenue sources, what does it have to do with the CIP?

Mr. Orshefsky indicated this is the confusion the Committee has constantly had. CIP funding comes out of multiple sources of funds. These are the non-general revenue funds; in other words, the enterprise funds, the CRA and all of the other funds. The next slide was to allow the City Commission to prioritize with allocated CIP funds they are willing to allocate out of general revenue.

Chairman Mammano commented that it is not CIP funds, it is what funds the general fund is willing to put into the CIP.

Ms. Reece advised there was a separate CIP fund for water and sewer from the operating fund. Once staff determines how much can be put into capital, a study generates the highest priority projects. For the CIP and general fund, there is a lot of priorities; parks and public safety, so there is a more formal ranking process.

Mr. Kwoka questioned what criteria the Commission uses for ranking.

Ms. Reece stated there are ten sets of categories; the first five are more raw based, meaning Federal, State, or Legal requirements, project feasibility, cost and sources of funds, performance measures, and the consistency of existing plans. The next five are related to the strategic plan. For each of the categories each Commissioner will rank each and say the important ones getting five points and the least important ones getting one point. The next set of five develops at the end an average ranking. The next step is getting a Community Investment Plan Review Team together to look at all the individual applications submitted by departments. The Review Team is appointed by the City Manager and Chris Lagerbloom chairs the meeting as the Assistant City Manager from the operating side.

Mr. Walters questioned who makes the final decision on the ranking.

Ms. Reece commented that this is intended to be an analytical process with Commission prioritization. After making a recommendation the Commission can still fund whatever they want. The Committee is supposed to follow a guideline as the ethic projects are explained and as they review the applications to give a score according to guidelines.

Chair Mammano questioned how staff weighs their score against the Commission's score.

Ms. Reece explained that the average weight of the Commission is added to each point. If the Commission determines a category is most important and the Commission gives it a weight of 4.8., every time a project in that category gets a one, it would get 4.8 points because that was the most important to the Commission. Once the results are received, the relative weights are listed and it is like an excel spreadsheet. There might be a total score of 20 from her and if Mr. Lagerbloom gave 15, the total would be 17.5 if they were the only two raters. At the end, they would know the total points each project has in order to make recommendations. The recommendations are then taken back to the Commission. It was a way to refine what would be recommended. In the end, there is a list of projects beginning with the highest priority. The amount of funding available is determined and the list of projects are recommended until one reaches the breaking point where the funding is depleted and that is the line that can be recommended.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned how much the total CIP budget was for FY18 order of magnitude.

Ms. Reece replied \$65 million.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned of the \$65 million how much came out of general revenue.

Ms. Reece replied \$25 million. She advised it was more than normal this year because there was a one-time property sale. Generally, it is about \$10 – 13 Million.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned the complicated ranking process and noted that maybe 15% of the entire CIP and the rest of the money was coming out of the non-general revenue funds, enterprise funds, CRA's and a bunch of others. In his opinion, the \$15 million was out a much larger number. To the extent this Committee wants to try to stay at a higher level, the focus should be on the master plans and how those plans get funded and implemented. There was some meaningful direction since there is a Reiss Report and a Consent Agreement and a decision has to be made as to how to spend the money. In terms of the overall CIP, this was less material than the balance of the CIP budget.

Chair Mammano always thought that was the case but this is proof. The amount of the money coming out of the general fund for CIP is modest for infrastructure.

Mr. Orshefsky stated it is by design because the rest are being paid for by the rate payers.

Ms. Reece commented that the Committee understands how the projects get developed and how they end up in the CIP. Handouts were distributed. Categories were created; airport, bridge projects, canal dredging. The handouts show how much has been spent as of February 2, 2018, how much was unspent and how much was planned in the CIP, for 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022. There were unidentified needs and there was no funding identified to fund it and the master plans were identifying for fiscal years 2023 through 2027.

Mr. Walters stated that he looked at 2023 through 2027. Ms. Reece said approximately \$15 million was needed but there is no idea where the money is coming from.

Ms. Reece indicated that a CIP is not done for that many years so the departments disclose what they would need during that period of time. Funding sources projected out that far have not been looked at.

Chair Mammano suggested taking bridges instead of the airport.

Mr. Orshefsky referenced storm water. Mr. Walters asked earlier how much was left or what still needed to be spent.

Chair Mammano mentioned the unspent balance as of February 2, 2018, which is a half-billion dollars. She questioned if that meant there was a half-billion dollars in the bank.

Ms. Reece replied yes and noted that the chart also tells the funding source on the next page.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that all those dollars are allocated.

Mr. Kwoka stated that money that is allocated cannot be spent.

Chair Mammano advised that they just did that; they abandoned something and spent the money on an emergency and now they have to put the money back.

Mr. Kwoka commented that cannot always be done. It is restricted but there are places where there are joint participation agreements. In order to get this 85% they need 15% available.

Chair Mammano stated there are limited opportunities to doing that but it has been used when needed.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that there is \$200 million in anticipated bond funding for FY2019 for storm water and that is the whole trip methodology but there is still at least \$200 million outstanding for out years.

Ms. Reece advised that the department identified that as the next neighborhood. They are saying if five projects are done now they would be looking at the next five. That is a round number estimate similar to the first five.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if mobility is \$150 million out of funding.

Mr. Walters did not understand the \$4 million unfunded.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that an important component is that we just got \$200 million. The City cannot spend the \$200 million. If they are going to pull \$200 million in FY2019 it would take all that time to spend the money and the City would be in the same boat with the \$200 million in storm water.

Ms. Reece stated that the \$200 million shown was put at the fund level of water and sewer even though it was an unspent balance.

Mr. Hansen questioned other types of projects under the City facility.

Ms. Reece did a spreadsheet for every category. There was a spreadsheet that would tell by funding by source, categories and projects. The sheet also lists prioritizations and the funds appropriated.

Chair Mammano referenced water and sewer and the unspent balance as of February was \$26,000,000. It was questioned if that includes the bond funds.

Ms. Reece replied yes.

Chair Mammano stated if the bond funds were not included the unspent balance would only be \$60 million.

Ms. Reece advised that was correct.

Chair Mammano mentioned when getting into FY2019 she sees \$203 million and questioned if that was anticipated funds.

Ms. Reece replied yes. Everything in 2019 and beyond has not been appropriated. The unspent column is real money and everything else is planned.

Chair Mammano commented that in FY2019 the City was planning to spend \$271 million.

Ms. Reece stated that included \$200 million for water bonds.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that would not all be spent in the fiscal year but as an accounting matter it all goes into the fund when the bonds are sold.

Ms. Reece indicated that way you always have a large unspent balance that rolls over. The next one is by funding source so it shows different ways of showing the same information. These are the funds that are funding those types. The final one gives it all in one document.

Mr. Cobb mentioned that this is the same \$491 million on the other page.

Ms. Reece replied yes.

Mr. Verma stated that the previous slide was based on the projects and this is the funding source. The same information can be provided depending on what the Committee is looking for.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned Mr. Cobb if this was close to the cash flow he was looking for.

Mr. Cobb replied yes, it was a similar concept.

Ms. Reece indicated that the rest of the presentation goes through more specifics. For Parks there is a master plan and they can use grant funds, general funds, and park impact funds to fund these sort of projects. The projects currently funded are partially funded through the CRA, the \$2.9 million. There is around \$9 million in the general fund and about \$1 million in park impact fees. There is \$101 million that has been identified for 2023 to 2027 as needs in the Parks Master Plan for fields and parks. Also, under Parks and Recreation Department, is facilities. There are unspent balances in a variety of funds, depending on who has ownership of the City facility and then the plan can be seen from 2019 through 2022 and unfunded is around \$122 million with an additional \$82 million they would like to plan for 2022 through 2027.

Mr. Cobb suggested looking at the parking fund and noted there were no funding sources in the next five years. He questioned where the \$14.9 million came from.

Ms. Reece stated the facility assessment study was a ten-year plan so a consultant was hired to look at everything that needed to be done in the facilities. There are facilities owned by parking that had needs identified in that time period that have not yet been budgeted.

Mr. Cobb commented that we don't even know what that is; it is just a number.

Ms. Reece advised that they know. Enrique Sanchez from Parks and Recreation is the person who manages those data sets. She was trying to provide high level information. Every number has a variety of backup.

Chair Mammano questioned why nothing is happening in five years.

Mr. Sanchez stated it would be in the CIP. He was not exactly sure what projects were funded in the CIP or how the dates were set.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned the new facility being built on Las Olas Boulevard, which is being partially funded as he understands, and questioned if there are other major capital parking structures or facilities that are likely to be funded in the out years where empty cells are seen. He also questioned if the CRA was funding in there too.

Ms. Reece advised that CRA funding was categorized as a facility.

Ms. Alarcon indicated there is always discussion of additional parking facilities being built but there is nothing set and planned for them to be projecting out. They are always looking at that and as master plans are done those are things they continue to look at.

Mr. Cobb stated this is the very reason this information is needed.

Mr. Kwoka believed part of the problem was that they have consultants from everywhere and they all pull together plans where their needs are projected. He believed there was a lot of supporting data behind but it could not all be shown.

Mr. Cobb thought it was showing that nothing was happening; it was \$3.85 million. There is nothing happening for years and somewhere there is a \$14 million project.

Ms. Reece advised that the CIP changes every year.

Mr. Verma suggested letting staff come back with additional information rather than saying the data is not complete. Let this become an informational item they will try to fill the data as much as possible.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned the importance of moving in the right direction.

Mr. Hansen commented on the number of projects and questioned if that was going to create a demand and if, in five years from now, they would be playing catch up versus planning for the future and trying to put that into the next couple of years so the problems are addressed as we go.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that could be turned into a recommendation if that was the sense. One of the infrastructure elements the Committee was not focusing enough attention on was the parking facilities. At the point staff may try to fill in the empty cells and that may be something this Committee wants to recommend.

Mr. Kwoka believed some of the problem is that the Committee is asking staff the forecast on things they may not necessarily know because they cannot predict what the FAA or what this government agency is going to give.

Mr. Hansen indicated that they know what was on the books, what has been planned, and what has approvals. All those are generating trips, especially in the downtown area where parking is exempt. All those are generating trips and parking spaces they may or may not have.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that in this years' general capital projects fund, that is ad valorem, which is general revenue. The \$13 million was the sale of that piece of dirt that was busy funding a lot of things.

Ms. Reece replied no, not specifically; it happened to be the same amount. The money, over time, has accumulated and is unspent.

Mr. Orshefsky referenced the \$1.3 million and the \$1.1 million and noted that the projections were anticipated dollars coming out of general revenue. That says there was \$13 million worth of general revenue this year and next year the projected amount is \$1.1 million.

Ms. Reece clarified that \$1.1 million unspent could be from multiple years; all of this ties to the CIP. This reconciles to the Community Investment Plan that was adopted and may change if specific projects are identified for parking over the next five years in this Community Investment Plan. It is a work in progress every year.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if there was a parking master plan upon which to base capital funding.

Ms. Reece believed the facilities plan was used for what is considered City facilities.

Mr. Orshefsky went back to the 30,000-foot view and thought this pointed to money in the bank; there is a half-billion dollars in the bank that is not being executed quickly.

Mr. Walters questioned why the unfunded amount was not being looked at while going along.

Ms. Reece advised that the funds have not been identified to fund those projects. Each year a forecast is done for ten years to say what is believed would be brought in for revenues, what would be spent in expenses, and based on that, there would be a CIP that could be funded over the next five years.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that the out years, FY 2019 through 2022, coming out of the general capital project fund, which is a policy decision about money coming out of ad valorem monies the City was planning to put into capital. If more money is needed, taxes or bonds could be raised and more could be allocated to capital facilities. This was all that was anticipated to be allocated out of tax revenue for capital facilities.

Ms. Reece advised that is what they think their current rates could support. If an increase to ad valorem was recommended, they certainly have more needs that could be found.

Mr. Walters questioned how people are told that the amount of money allocated or spent is not all the money needed to maintain what the City wants.

Ms. Reece stated that Parks has said for years that they could use more facilities, etc. If the Commission is not supportive of raising a millage rate then they are not going to raise other revenues. A balanced budget always has to be recommended.

Mr. Walters questioned how there is a balanced budget and a zero-unfunded project.

Ms. Reece advised that dealt with the unfunded column, which are needs that have been identified as needs within the next five years that they do not have a way to fund.

Mr. Walters questioned if the \$120 million is want, a need, or a combination.

Ms. Reece indicated most was for the Police Headquarters and the rest was needs generated from the facilities assessment study.

Chair Mammano commented but not from the 40-year study. Unspent balances mean there is \$53 million in the bank and many ongoing projects are already funded. Next year another \$1,492,000 would be needed and it was questioned where that money would come from.

Mr. Kwoka stated that is the allocation from taxes.

Chair Mammano commented that is up to 2022 and then \$18 million has to be funded out of ad valorem taxes to do this plan.

Ms. Reece indicated it would be about \$5 million more; the \$11 million is already there.

Mr. Kwoka requested clarification of the footnote that says \$13 million for repairs, \$81 million in the same timeframe.

Ms. Reece advised both would not be done. If the decision was to replace the Police Headquarters, they would likely hold off on as many repairs possible until it is replaced.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if that was fundamentally where we went wrong; we kept it until there was no choice but to replace it. He questioned if the Police Station could really make it to 2023.

Ms. Reece indicated that is why it is in the five-year plan. Police Headquarters has been identified as something they would like to do before the five-year plan but they probably would have to have a General Obligation bond. With regard to seawalls, some have been funded; there is currently around \$9 million in the bank and another \$4 million planned for 2021 based on resources available that they know of. The unfunded is almost \$45 million.

Mr. Ostrau questioned why they are waiting until 2021.

Ms. Reece stated that was based on the highest priority needs in the ranking process. It was based on current resources they think are available and their CIP ranking methodology where the highest needs are prioritized.

Mr. Verma advised it would be a combination of what Ms. Reece said and the priorities and how long it would take to spend the unspent monies.

Chair Mammano understood time is needed to spend the money already in the bank but while doing that shouldn't more money be added?

Ms. Reece stated that is what they did this year.

Mr. Walters commented that this money was to deal with the City owned and he questioned how to make maximum use of the money spent by the City if everyone was not improving their seawalls.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned if you are required as a homeowner to do the seawall and adjacent is City property, when are they required to do theirs?

Mr. Kwoka found and read an interesting report that Fort Lauderdale has used as a case study with Texas or New Orleans.

Dr. Gassman advised that the screen showed the prioritization of found money because the City was able to sell a property and divide an infusion of funds into the general fund that were prioritized or a number of seawalls they felt were the City's most urgent seawalls in order to repair or replace. As Ms. Reece said, when looking at seawalls in last year and the years before CIP, they said money needed to be allocated for seawalls out of the general fund budget and there would be money in 2021 to allocate to seawalls.

Mr. Walters questioned where that money was coming from.

Dr. Gassman stated it was essentially what was extra in the plan. Essentially \$13 million worth of general funding that is available each year based on when they looked at it and put it in for the allocation. They said in FY2021 we have only allocated \$9 million worth of projects and it was believed this was important enough that they wanted to allocate the remainder of those funds for seawalls. This is a plan and recommendation; it does not mean that is exactly the way it is going to happen. With regard to Mr. Walter's question about the City raising their seawall and if he has to raise his as well, the way the seawall ordinance works is that no one is compelled to raise their seawall unless they are causing a problem on the public right-of-way. If the City raises their seawall and they are adjacent to you, as long as water is not coming over your seawall and causing flooding in the street you will not be compelled to raise your seawall.

Mr. Walters indicated that the reason the City is raising their seawall is the anticipation of the sea level raise. If the water is not coming over today it would be coming over tomorrow so what's the difference?

Dr. Gassman advised that the way the seawall master plan is devised, it says, "Given the rate of sea level rise over the next 50 years and given the current elevation and condition of our various seawalls when would we have to raise which seawall in order to deal with sea level rise." The seawalls that have a particularly low elevation are prioritized to do first and over time as sea level rises they will have to address the next one. As of right now, seawall B is not being overtopped during high tide but seawall A is; therefore, seawall A is prioritized for funding. When they get to the projection where seawall B is closer to that projected height of sea level then they will prioritize funding for seawall B. Currently seawall A is the one they are worried about because seawall B is high enough to deal with the current sea level but in 10, 20, or 30 years it won't be and it will need to be raised. Getting back to the question of getting cited for a seawall and having to raise it when the City is not raising theirs; goes back to the \$9 million. The \$9 million is to target those prioritized areas where they know the City's seawall is allowing flooding into the public right-of-way. All of the City seawalls are adjacent to a public right-of-way so if any of them are too low the first place that floods is not their backyard, it is the right-of-way. That is why this is funded and tiered the way it is to

address the seawalls that are currently adjacent to City rights-of-way that we are seeing frequent flooding due to high tide events over those walls.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the seawall issue has been rehashed several times and the political reality is the seawall ordinance was argued at multiple public meetings and is on the books now and that is the way it is going to go. Is there an opportunity for the Committee to recommend that we should accelerate seawall repairs or we should otherwise fund special assessment districts for private seawalls; yes, there are. At this point we cannot fight the budget, this is the budget. This now shows there is a \$45 million unfunded need and the Committee can come up with a recommendation and say seawalls are also an important infrastructure element and recommend taxes are raised to fix them.

Chair Mammano believed it was worse than that because the FY2021 is a projection. The only money in the bank is \$9 million. If you want to take a position you might want to point out how striking it is and that is the only money available and this amount of money is needed.

Mr. Cobb believed the issue was trying to address the methodology of funding and projecting the cost.

Ms. Reece continued with the presentation; bridges and sidewalks. Sewer and storm water were lumped together so the regional wastewater was included as well as the water and sewer because the studies were done together.

Mr. Orshefsky stated where there is something like the Consent Agreement or the Reiss Report that get you to level of designs where a calculator can be run so you can see the holes in the cells. There is an unfunded amount at the tail end but in the meantime there are dollars coming in from the rate base or the bonds and what has happened is between the rate base, bonds, and the needs that have been identified in the Reece study analysis are funded so there is only \$2 million unfunded and nothing in 2023 to 2027. It looks like we need \$400 million more in bonds.

Ms. Reece advised that was the estimate in the Reiss Report that was left but not funded. She believed the unfunded column could be disregarded. Some of the unfunded were likely funded through the bond projects; however, she did not know which ones without going through project by project. The unfunded number will change once there is a new CIP.

Mr. Kwoka stated the problem he had at a much higher level was that if they don't get to the root of why they keep ending up with unfunded this would continuously be the solution.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that taxes have not gone up in ten years; that is the policy issue. Water and sewer rates are already going up 5%; the bottom line is we need

more money. He believed that is what the Commission was looking for from this Committee. Where do we recommend the money come from?

Mr. Kwoka stated that was back to what they said. They continue to pull money from the enterprise funds from water and sewer into the general fund, leaving that with a deficiency of about what is needed to fill in gaps in the general budget.

Chair Mammano mentioned that was what was anticipated. If the ROI wasn't done and the \$20 million was in the fund, the number could be \$26 million.

Mr. Orshefsky noted that the \$200 million out year bond requirement would be lower.

Mr. Kwoka stated if they could accelerate the projects the repair fees and maintenance fees should go down substantially.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if that was recommended already.

Chair Mammano questioned if there was a reason why water could not be separated from sewer.

Ms. Reece stated she would not be able to show the water sewer bond funds in the future years needs because the study was done with both systems together.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that water and sewer was one enterprise fund and central regional was another separate enterprise fund. They are just following the enterprise funds in the accounting.

Chair Mammano never understood why the central regional wastewater fund was different.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that it was a different rate base.

Ms. Reece noted it has to follow different laws. State law sets up how those systems are developed. The R&R study drives a lot of monies other than the bond projects.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned that without the reports we are waiting over the next three years for the Consent Order; these are best estimates.

Chair Mammano stated that was why the focus needs to be on those Consent Order studies. There is a big hole in transportation and mobility. What does mobility mean?

Ms. Reece advised this type of study was to define the definitions. There are a lot of different types of projects and they categorize them into three and there is another category but it was too late to add it at the end. There are a lot of different needs and categories of projects.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if that was the total amount or the match.

Ms. Reece stated these are City funds.

Mr. Orshefsky stated complete streets are mostly funded at least currently by the Feds and the State through the MPO and there was a City match. Walkability, he assumes, was sidewalks.

Ms. Reece advised that was a different study. A walkability study was done. Transportation is unique, as a lot of other people are doing projects in our City and sometimes the City gives money to other people and helps with the match through the MPO; sometimes the City does the project. Our CIP only captures the projects the City would be doing ourselves physically.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the WAVE was in the \$150 million.

Ms. Alarcon was not 100% sure but she did not think so.

Ms. Reece indicated it would not be the City's project. There is a financial investment in it but it is not a City project or asset.

Chair Mammano questioned where it came from and what money was spent on it.

Ms. Reece stated it would be an operating expenditure so it was a contribution.

Chair Mammano questioned if that would be a hit to the general budget.

Ms. Alarcon stated that they have put in projects through the Community Investment Plan that they want to make improvements on, different roadways or mobility improvements, and those projects did not get hit to be able to be funded. It is not necessarily that the projects go away, they sit in the Community Investment Plan as unfunded. These are things that fell in under the Connecting the Block Program that the Commission adopted in 2014. Every year they look at updating those mobility projects or add new ones and unfortunately, they sit there and are unfunded. When there is an opportunity to get unfunded, that allows to have the project brought up and funded; it does not go away.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned the reason they are unfunded is because they never score high enough in terms of the Commission.

Ms. Reece stated that the categorization they did was for the Committee's purposes; it was not scientific.

Chair Mammano questioned an example of a walkability project.

Ms. Alarcon indicated that the City is partnering with Broward County on making and creating a pedestrian refuge on both Andrews Avenue and SE 3rd Avenue at SE 1st Street. Andrews Avenue and SE 3rd Avenue are actually a County road so it is under their jurisdiction. The City has been working with them for the past three and a half years to get final plans approved, which was received last week. We are now moving forward very aggressively towards construction so a lot of the \$1.9 million are two projects and then there are two additional projects; one is on SE 3rd Avenue as well that they are actually looking to do an improvement on. Those are some of the projects that have not had an opportunity to move forward as aggressively as they wanted because they wanted to do it in collaboration with the County.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that the \$500,000 is the estimate coming out of general revenue.

Ms. Alarcon replied yes. They build their projects around the \$500,000; sometimes the projects are a little more for the design engineer to construction. They do design and construct them and if there is not enough money for that year they may start the design and carry it over for the next year. There are approximately seven major projects that are currently underway under walkability.

Mr. Orshefsky noted that the construction is not yet funded.

Ms. Alarcon stated that the construction for those projects are part of that \$1.9 million so yes, it includes the design and construction.

Chair Mammano mentioned the \$500,000 in the next four to five years is what the City should be allocating to those projects.

Ms. Alarcon replied correct. That is based on Jeff Speck's walkability project that is within the downtown corridor. Again, this is being done in combination with both the Department of Transportation and Broward County so it is a lot of inner-City collaboration to get approval to get built.

Mr. Orshefsky stated they are coming to the table with money as well for construction.

Ms. Alarcon replied sometimes yes and sometimes no. If they want to do it bigger and better than what was recommended based on the walkability study Mr. Speck provided, they are having those conversations and it may become that type of project where it becomes a little more. That is what happened on SE 1st Avenue and Broward Boulevard where they are putting in a mid-block crossing and it was built into the Broward Boulevard project. We were able to remove that completely off our books and they graciously funded that.

Mr. Kwoka was still baffled by the \$150 million.

Ms. Alarcon advised when they went before Commission with the overall Connecting the Block Program, which looks at everything from sidewalks to bicycles to vehicular movement, to transient movement, it is the entire connecting of the City and all the different modes, they actually came up with 642 projects that had a total estimated engineering to construction dollar of \$810 million. They have been able to leverage a lot of those projects through private development, the Broward MPO, the Florida Department of Transportation, and even Broward County. The 642 projects are throughout the entire City, not just in the downtown corridor. It is recognizing where there are sidewalk gaps and identifies everything.

Mr. Kwoka questioned why sidewalks would be put in here when there is another fund for sidewalks.

Ms. Alarcon stated their sidewalks are to make improvements to sidewalks already in place minus filling the gaps.

Mr. Zeltman questioned if that was ADA.

Ms. Alarcon advised if she is touching a sidewalk she is touching ADA at the same time, which is the same process in Public Works for repairs on sidewalks. As opportunities come up they leverage a lot of that being improved through private development.

Mr. Cobb questioned sidewalk connectors.

Ms. Alarcon stated they do transit as well, recognizing where improvements are needed to bus stops, creating the ADA, shelters, etc. that is built into Connecting the Blocks as well. As opportunities come up they go after grants or partner with other agencies because they know they are not going to get \$810 million. These are the projects that have been prioritized so far and have been put on the books and are part of the Community Investment Plan but they have not been funded.

Mr. Zeltman questioned if that also includes a lot of the older neighborhoods that have a three-foot wide sidewalk as opposed to a five-foot sidewalk; does that include upgrading it to meet ADA?

Ms. Alarcon replied yes.

Chair Mammano stated that perhaps the Committee needs to look at the master plan. She mentioned one more item, the NCIP projects, the projects the community is very invested in and questioned where that falls in this process.

Ms. Alarcon indicated that every year, at the Commission's direction, they put half a million dollars into the CIP and they put it in a generic project called NCIPBCIP. As the process goes through and they rank the neighborhood projects it is put into individual accounts for neighborhoods that are awarded the grants; \$35,000 would be put in,

which is the CIP portion, knowing the project is going to meet the \$50,000 threshold once the match is in place. This year the appropriation was made and the Commission was first looking at maintenance issues because a lot of communities were not maintaining their projects. There is money sitting there waiting for a cycle to open once they resolve what they are going to do or what agreements they are going to hold the neighborhoods to in terms of maintenance.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if parking is the next slide.

Ms. Alarcon replied yes. She stated that the dollars programmed for 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022 will continue out. That ten-year facility assessment was done as well as a 20-year programming as part of the bonding for the garage for maintaining the facilities, which is our City Park garage, now called River Walk Center garage, City Hall garage, and our investment we have to made on the Bridgeside garage as well as the 290 building. Also built in that \$6.3 million was the CIP projects, such as the lighting project at the River Walk Center garage and improvements for NASCHAZ, which is referred to as their North Village lot.

Mr. Orshefsky stated those are in the maintenance plan. He questioned if there is a long-term plan like the Reece plan for water and sewer that takes a look at our parking needs for the next 10 or 20 years so some capital programs can be done.

Ms. Alarcon advised there is currently a parking study in the market place. We just received first line of draft and part of that is what the needs assessment for the future of parking are.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned when that study came back.

Ms. Alarcon stated they are anticipating to have the study fully ready to bring to Commission in June.

Ms. Reece indicated that a lot of the facility maintenance are under \$50,000 so it would not meet the capital threshold and they are expensing that out of operating. It does not mean they are not doing any of the maintenance, it just means that individual repairs would be over \$50,000.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that the two criteria are \$50,000 and ten-year life.

Mr. Walters questioned if a half million goes into the NCIP yearly.

Ms. Reece replied yes, that is the general appropriation fund. The maximum appropriation is \$35,000 per neighborhood.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if there were any suggestions on improvement of the methodology.

Mr. Kwoka commented there were a lot of moving pieces.

Mr. Cobb stated that more aggregation and a broader summary of the issue is needed. This has to do largely with funding driven by funding sources and then there is unfunded and futuristic and that is the biggest challenge for this Committee.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned that the Committee was not seeing \$800,000 of things on the books that are unfunded and that thoughts are being given to.

Mr. Cobb believed it was a good step forward but as a Task Force, better projections are needed. The questioned is, "If we had the funding what would we do?". This would solve some of the crisis issues being faced today in the water and sewer fund. The Committee also has to know the funding options.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned prioritization and noted that someone was talking about water and sewer five to ten years ago and now we are looking at the Police Station for \$81 million to \$82 million. What is it really going to be?

Mr. Cobb stated that is a very much needed thing; it is a complex operation.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that part of the difficulty was that a plan for parking would not be received for six months. The data does not mesh up. He did not know if this Committee would ever get to that level of detail at the same time.

Mr. Cobb did not think it would be possible. When this Task Force goes to the Commission with a recommendation, there needs to be one-page or five pages with ten lines, not 436 lines. Mr. Cobb indicated that would be the only way to communicate to the Commission in terms they can understand.

Chair Mammano was very pleased with this. She was worried that in going big a lot of important little things would be smothered. As the numbers get bigger and the subject matter gets consolidated, she is not comfortable with everything.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned that the new Commissioners would be sworn in on March 20th and this Committee needs to suggest, through the channels available, to set up a Joint Workshop like we had in the past to let the new Commission know where we are and try to present the problems as seen so we can work as a team.

Mr. Hansen commented that if this policy is established and it says spend the money now rather than spending later and if you don't want to raise taxes then raise the millage rates, find a different solution and do it. That is a policy statement this Committee could make for the Commission to go forward.

Mr. Zeltman stated that the Committee needs to present that. The City has a constraint too because there are only so many project managers and engineers that can supervise.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that could be a recommendation.

Mr. Verma commented that as far as the presentations, he wanted to make sure everything was covered. Staff has explained methodology and how the Commissioners calculate the rates, how the numbers are driven and how the priorities are set. One member asked to have all the projects. A five-year CIP is what they work in the budget but it is not funded until the Commission approves it, which happens each year. Five years beyond are their best estimates. Staff does prepare and update reports on the status of each and every project. If there is anything they can do to add or clarify they are happy to do so.

B. Discussion of Traffic Flow Issues Identified in the ETC Institute Report

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Kwoka to deferred Item 7B to the April 2, 2018 meeting. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

8. Public Comments – None.

9. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting – April 2, 2018

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

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

Link to the video of the March 5, 2018 Infrastructure Task Force Meeting:
[March 5, 2018 Meeting](#)