

**City of Fort Lauderdale  
Infrastructure Task Force Committee  
April 2 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**

<b>MEMBERS</b>		<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>
Marilyn Mammano	P	12	0
Ed Kwoka	P	10	2
Ralph Zeltman	P	12	0
Keith Cobb	A	8	4
Leo Hansen	P	11	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	11	1
Fred Stresau	A	10	2
Norm Ostrau	P	9	1
David Orshefsky	P	9	0

**Staff Present**

Ben Sorensen, Vice Mayor – Commissioner District IV  
 Nancy Gassman, Assistant Public Works Director  
 Raj Verma, Interim Assistant Public Works Director  
 John Herbst, City Auditor  
 Talal Abi-Karam, Assistant Public Works Director  
 Laura Reece, Budget Manager  
 Diana Alarcon, Director of Transportation and Mobility  
 Meredith Shuster, Administrative Assistant  
 Michael Mitchel, Prototype-Inc. recording secretary

2. **Approval of Agenda**

**Motion** made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Orshefsky, to approve the agenda. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

3. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**

**A. March 5, 2018**

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

- Page 13: last line, should be **\$26 million.**
- Page 18; Paragraph 5; Line 3; EBO Bonds should be **General Obligation.**

- Page 20; Paragraph 1; second to last line; “Seawalls are also an important infrastructure element and recommended taxes, etc. **Remove “and” between infrastructure and element.**

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

#### **4. General Discussion (Board Members) – 15 minutes**

Mr. Ostrau questioned if a discussion could be scheduled for the next meeting regarding reports; when, what, and how.

Mr. Orshefsky had the same concern. The Committee was given priorities and “marching orders” by the previous Mayor and there was also some feedback from Commissioner Roberts, the Vice Mayor. Perhaps the Committee should take some direction from the new Commission and the new Mayor.

Chair Mammano thought as a general discussion item it would be very important to set deadlines for this work. Chair Mammano believed there should not be a citywide meeting until there is a document that encompasses all this material, not just a handout.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned a copy of a simplistic schedule sent by Ms. Shuster and noted that it is a good tracking mechanism.

Mr. Orshefsky expressed concern and commented on the nature or type of recommendation being thought about for the City Commission. Mr. Orshefsky questioned if it was as simple as funding more infrastructure out of general revenue or to consider an ad valorem tax raise or a much more specific set of criteria, which he would argue against. Mr. Orshefsky believed it would be appropriate to create a document for the public but it would be a completely different document than the reports being sent to the Commission.

Chair Mammano agreed.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that as deliverables are discussed and the types of recommendations that will be made to the City Commission, there needs to be some sort of consensus as to how that is going to happen. In reviewing the previous minutes, there was some significant discussion with respect to seawalls, which does not have an enterprise fund behind it. Mr. Orshefsky would like to know where the Committee is going in terms of the types of recommendations likely to be made to the Commission.

Mr. Ostrau believed there should be a what, where, and how, but they should be interim reports and disagreed with Mr. Orshefsky. The Committee is under a Resolution. Mr. Ostrau stated that if the Commission wants to change the mandate let them change the Resolution and make it a different mandate. Mr. Ostrau is ready to move forward and

an interim report on some of the issues that are available could be put out at the next meeting.

Mr. Kwoka agreed and thought the Committee has come far enough that some preliminary recommendations with regard to trip fees and considering some of the additional funding mechanisms that have been presented, prioritizations and things of that nature could be made. Mr. Kwoka felt comfortable that an interim report could be put together and it should be done before meeting with the Commission. A separate Workshop to develop the framework of that report was proposed.

Chair Mammano questioned how everyone's schedule looks for the May meeting and questioned if there was a consensus to start doing the planning of an interim report together at the next meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if this was going to be a Workshop or if it was going to be during the next scheduled meeting.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if there would be a Workshop in addition to the discussion.

Chair Mammano did not think two meetings were needed. There will be discussion for two hours without other presentations.

Mr. Kwoka clarified that the next meeting would be called a Workshop.

There was a consensus.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that the 40-year inspection report was being bumped. The presentation for the 40-year report was set for May.

Mr. Verma believed that the presentation was good for May.

Chair Mammano indicated the purpose of working on the interim report is actually to send out an outline of framework and additional things could be added along the way.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that could be added to the May agenda as an additional bullet item; however, he did not want to lose the substance while the Committee is busy dealing with the framework.

Mr. Verma indicated that the meeting was scheduled in April but because the consultant could not attend it was moved to May.

Chair Mammano mentioned the 40-year report and questioned how long the presentation would take.

Mr. Verma stated it will be a quick overview. If the desire is to have a brief presentation the number of slides could probably be minimized.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if it would be possible for Committee members to get a draft or a finalized version ahead of time so the presentation could be more of a Question and Answer.

Mr. Verma replied yes.

Chair Mammano clarified that the 40-year report update would be given in May as well as a discussion of the framework for the interim report.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that a lot of material was forwarded relating to that as well as the April 3, 2018 memo from the City Manager to the City Commission about water and sewer bonds.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if electronic versions of those documents could be forwarded after this meeting. The four documents requested are the April 3, 2018 memo, Ms. Shuster's comments on the Outreach meetings, Mr. Stresau's comments on the Outreach meetings, and a one-page from Chair Mammano regarding the Outreach meetings.

Mr. Kwoka would like to have communication from the Commission and the new Mayor as to what their sense is of this Committee.

Chair Mammano suggested making a recommendation at the next Commission meeting that the Committee meet with the Commission.

Mr. Kwoka indicated he would appreciate something that says the Committee is on target and the Commission supports this initiative.

Vice-Mayor Sorensen thanked the Committee for their work, which he believed to be important and valuable. If the Committee agrees, his position would be to continue moving forward.

Mr. Kwoka believed there are things that were brought up for discussion that have been dismissed and now with a new Commission it would probably be appropriate to re-engage in those discussions and maybe reconsider presenting those recommendations. For example, the trip fee funding mechanism.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that the most useful mechanism he has found since the Committee started was the working lunch with the Commissioners. Feedback was very useful from the Commission because there were certain priorities and emphases that were worked out between the Committee and the Commission and it was very instructive in terms of how the Commission wanted the Committee to set priorities.

Chair Mammano emphasized that a Workshop must be done through the Commission and there is a staff person able to do that.

Mr. Kwoka believed that would be more valuable before having a Workshop to prepare the interim report.

Mr. Stresau commented that the Workshop is good but it should not stop the Committee from thinking about the interim report. The interim report should be done and it is not necessary to wait.

Chair Mammano stated that they could move on multiple fronts; putting together the next available time when the Commission could have a working meeting, the 40-year report at the next meeting, plus a discussion on the interim report.

Chair Mammano would like to have all the material that has been put together in a report format so citizens can read it.

Mr. Kwoka believed that once all the information was assembled as a deliverable for the last meeting that it would be appropriate to have one of the members provide a short slide presentation as to where the Committee started, came from, and where they are at.

Mr. Verma questioned if the document should be prepared based on the four meetings the Committee had so far or if they should wait until the fifth and final meeting takes place.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the substance of the summaries could be discussed prior to that.

## **5. Old Business**

### **A. Outreach Meeting Review**

#### **i. Citywide meeting**

Chair Mammano handed out the observations she put together along with notes and a graph..

Mr. Orshefsky questioned how the percentages were derived.

Ms. Shuster replied by the number of dots per topic divided by the total of dots placed.

Chair Mammano believed that there needs to be a lot of education; making information available in a form that people can understand. The educational component should be part of this document.

Mr. Stresau commented that there were only 70 to 80 people and that did not really represent the citizens.

Chair Mammano stated that is part of what the report should communicate.

Mr. Ostrau advised that a lot of people who spoke were Presidents of their Associations.

Mr. Kwoka disagreed with the educational piece and felt that the Committee's energy should be focused on gathering, aggregating, and making recommendations to the Commission and to the City; there is no time or capacity to become educators.

Mr. Hansen believed there was a presumptive attitude towards things that are visible such as sewer and stormwater and he thought it was not presumptive when it came to roads. The minimum that should be taken out of this is that the sewer, stormwater, sidewalks, roads, and traffic, are the number one concern. How projects are done and how they affect the roads is a major issue and should not be ignored. The priority of the people who are doing these projects is not to interrupt the daily lives of people on a daily basis, instead of how it is convenient for them to get the project done. The number one priority should be what is the least amount of inconvenience to the public. The public cares about getting from Point A to Point B.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that a lot of things in the notes are operational; traffic signalization and who does curb cuts. The City has major jurisdictional issues with both the County and the State and this Committee does not have control over 80% of what happens on those roads. Stating his sense of roads, he distinguished between operational and infrastructure issues. He thought the Committee was supposed to be directing capital dollars. The operational things are up to an operating entity; it is not capital infrastructure. Mr. Orshefsky's recommendation would be that the Committee not make operational recommendations.

Mr. Walters thought that education was not the Committee's job; the Committee did Outreach and City staff needs to do in-reach.

Mr. Ostrau indicated that part of the mandate is that if the Committee does not think roads should be built then it should be said not to build the roads, operational situations need to be done and that will solve the problem operationally.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned Ms. Shuster's document, Page 1, under the Beach Community Center; third bullet; that is an operational element. This kind of thing where the traffic backs up behind the bridges and causes frustration is not something the Committee can do. [Bridge openings too slow and during peak traffic hours]

Chair Mammano mentioned the 17<sup>th</sup> Street Mobility Task Force and stated that one of their suggestions of getting more people off 17<sup>th</sup> Street was to coordinate with the Coast

Guard and the traffic signals. It was operational and a decision that makes the capacity of the existing road better.

Mr. Hansen commented that not all solutions require money.

Chair Mammano believed when a report is summarized and prepared based upon input from the public that it should not editorialized.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned the 26% for roads in the pie chart were not infrastructure. They should be separated as to whether it is traffic related or operational or structural.

Vice-Mayor Sorensen thought the feedback from the Outreach meetings was very helpful. He has been working with different stake holders downtown in an attempt to convene better coordination of construction and road closures. As a Commission, he and the different stakeholders could take and run with some of the operational coordination pieces.

Mr. Kwoka questioned who would be included in Vice-Mayor Sorensen's definition of stakeholders.

Vice-Mayor Sorensen indicated that he has been talking to the DDA (Downtown Development Authority) leadership, residents in the area, and developers with future or current projects, as well as City staff.

Mr. Kwoka stated the scope of stakeholders could be broadened and provide more relevant information. Mr. Kwoka thought it may feed into some of the concern that some of the community feels they have not been heard. He wants to make sure when taking the feedback that the stakeholders include an adequate representation from other than those that might have a one-sided or a narrower view of where this should go.

Vice-Mayor Sorensen indicated there would be strong resident representation as well.

Mr. Kwoka did not see any problem in an overlap in effort in a common direction between the Commission and the Committee. As long as there is a bidirectional sharing of information he was all right.

Vice-Mayor Sorensen agreed.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned the first statement under the Beach Community Center notes about the access of emergency vehicles and questioned if a statement could be obtained from Fire Rescue regarding the pick upon Ocean Drive between Sunrise Boulevard and 19<sup>th</sup> Street.

Chair Mammano commented that becomes a problem because a lot of staff time has been used. This was a concern expressed by an individual and as well as a concern everywhere because traffic is so bad and Rescue would not be able to get there.

Ms. Alarcon indicated that the design on A1A was based on the input from the area and community. There are some challenges and there has been conversation with the Fire Department about how it can be improved. The only place that is a challenge for the Fire Department is in the section in front of Birch State Park where there are a lot of medians. The City is looking at breaking up the medians so it will assist the Fire Department. They are not having any issues but some improvements need to happen in front of Birch State Park. They are working on the design and talking with FDOT for funding because A1A is their road.

Mr. Orshefsky was surprised to hear both the positive and the absence of the negative. The positive was in a park situation when there was discussion about increasing funding for parks and if the public would vote for a bond to support additional park facilities and the answer came back yes. Mr. Orshefsky did not hear that taxes are too high. The popular support for increased funding was much higher than he thought it would be; therefore, it was believed that should be incorporated in the recommendation. Judgements can be made about how to fund.

Mr. Kwoka understands and appreciates the value of open space while dealing with other critical issues. During the Outreach he went to two places he was not aware of in the City and was astonished how many people were utilizing that space.

Mr. Stresau stated that one thing that stood out was that 80% of what is there does not affect what he thought was supposed to be done at this table. There are questions that go to Ms. Alarcon and to Parks that are operational. The most salient thing was Scott Strawbridge, who said when it comes to spending money on transportation, the people who need the transportation are the people on Sistrunk Boulevard and the northwest section and they are not going to get a dime. Mr. Stresau was dumbfounded to find out about some of the flooding in parts of the City he did not know flooded and they are not part of the seven districts the Committee is supposed to be looking at.

Mr. Hansen commented that the nine pages of items could probably be cut into some generalities, not specifics, and made as part of the recommendation to the City Commission.

Mr. Kwoka stated what is important to recognize is that the Committee gathered valuable information that needs to be passed on. Mr. Kwoka questioned if the City has a mechanism where the average citizen can provide this information without having to wait for a Committee to provide other than making a phone call to the Commission or to the City or to the appropriate department.

Mr. Verma advised there are two distinct issues. One is about the infrastructure, the capital projects and the long-term, which is the basic responsibility of the Resolution. The intent of good working and sound infrastructure should translate into many good operational mechanisms; therefore, it would be okay to take or isolate operational issues that need not be a part of this Committee. That should be something that should be established. The bridge issues, coordinating with FDOT, and Broward County and making sure the relationship is good, are operational issues and should not consume the Committee's time. Time should be spent looking at the \$3 billion to \$5 billion projects that may or may not have come out of these meetings but should continue to be the focus with the emphasis to the staff to do the job.

Mr. Kwoka indicated this Committee should be looking more carefully at some P3 partnerships, private public partnerships to some of these bigger problems. Mr. Kwoka thought it would be irresponsible not to look at some venues outside of just consultants coming to the City, making recommendations. There are other avenues; there are other communities that are making a difference with partnerships in the public private sector that are doing it faster and more efficiently.

Mr. Verma stated that typically the P3's are usually tied to bigger infrastructure projects.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that P3's were discussed; the jail was considered as a colocation with other facilities in the P3; the redevelopment of both the County and City offices and main buildings were set up as a potential P3. It is not as if the mechanism is unknown, it just has not been implemented.

Mr. Stresau questioned if anyone has done a public private partnership on things like stormwater or sewer and water. They produce funding so people can make a profit on that.

Mr. Kwoka thought it was forwarded to this Committee very early in the process.

Alec Bogdanoff, citizen, stated that one of the traditional ideas in terms of P3 was the idea the city gives them land, a building, someone else owns it, and you get a return. Passing some of the cost onto the developer for redevelopment of land might be another option of a P3 type of idea. Seawalls are another potential option. Cities tend to have broad authority for special taxing districts and that is one way to address seawalls. Because all property owners benefit, even those that do not have seawalls, the special taxing districts spread the costs across all those who will benefit. He thought there were three special taxing districts in the State of Florida that address seawalls; Punta Gorda is probably the most notable. The question is whether the financial side wants to take that risk.

Ms. Alarcon advised that the City's original tidal valve installation on Riviera Isles was a public private partnership between the HOA and the City. It was not set up as a profit margin, it was set up as there was a problem, the HOA was willing to put the money up

front, if it solved the problem would the City pay them back. When the performance metrics were met the City paid Riviera Isles back for the infrastructure. There are lots of different kinds of public private partnerships and not all of them are for profit.

**B. Information Document for Incoming Commission – None**

**C. Work Plan – None.**

**6. Board Member Comments – None.**

**7. New Business**

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

Chair Mammano indicated that this was not the regular survey. This was a special . She questioned its purpose.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that it was developed under the City Manager's direction to focus and receive public input on three specific issues; traffic, homelessness, and education. The education entailed the quality of our schools; homelessness was how the problem was perceived, and what should be done about it; most of the responses came back saying the City should be doing more. The City should be writing more grants to non-profit organizations. Because we have known from neighborhood surveys that traffic is a huge issue there is a specific sub-module in this survey that deals with traffic.

Chair Mammano questioned what additional information the Committee was seeking that was not seen in the regular survey.

Ms. Alarcon stated that this survey was broken down to what streets were a concern and what the issues were. This gave a better idea of where to put the focus and what needed to be prioritized.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned distracted drivers, panhandlers, poorly timed traffic signals and noted that poorly timed traffic signals are an infrastructure issue. One approach was to go to the County, write a big check, and take over traffic signalization on those roads that the City is willing to take responsibility for. When the recommendation gets to that level and the Committee wants to deal with the jurisdictional issues, fine, that recommendation can be made.

Ms. Alarcon stated that the month of April is "Distracted Driving Month" and this is the month the City is working with the Police Department on awareness as well as the Federal Highway Administration. Distracted driving is the #2 cause when it comes to the number of crashes occurring on the roadways.

Ms. Alarcon advised road construction and maintenance of new development go hand in hand because when a road closure is requested in a new development that affects the ability toward movement of traffic. They are tying that all in right now and working with the Department of Sustainable Development because they manage the revocable license that goes to Commission for approval of any road closures.

Chair Mammano commented that when people say new development they do not mean streets get closed while there is development, they mean there are too many cars.

Mr. Orshefsky stated no, it is construction.

Ms. Alarcon indicated this was specific to traffic not necessarily the cars. Most of the new development occurring in downtown are not generating that many more trips, they are generating traffic because the roadways are being closed. Flagler Village was used as an example. A lot of those residents walk and stay within their complex. If something were going to affect that it would be the ability to have those people move safely away from U.S. 1. Currently, U.S. 1 is becoming a very dangerous street to cross because there is development occurring on both sides and people go back and forth to use the different establishments. They are working closely with FDOT about putting in mid-walk crossing. The City wants them to be able to cross at 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> and not have to go to 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Kwoka stated that from an infrastructure standpoint, the problem is that no one took adequate time when this was being planned to consider that people were going to cross from here to there. He mentioned pedestrian bridges and questioned what other types of things are available.

Ms. Alarcon believed the timing signal plays an important role and it can be set so the light does not turn right away. FDOT is currently doing an analysis to see how that can be done without having the reduction and experience for the driver on the roadway. There will be some sort of impact if this moves forward. Ms. Alarcon thought the City should provide some of those solutions and recommendations. They are not there yet but are working toward those solutions and have been for over three years.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned new development and stated if developers cannot stage on their property and close public right-of-way they should pay for that; there should be an impact fee for closing public right-of-way. On A1A, where the overage is, they close one lane all the time and they should pay for the privilege to do that.

Ms. Alarcon believed that is a recommendation this Committee should bring up.

Mr. Kwoka referenced River Walk and stated there were conditions they had to meet for the privilege to stage on that property.

Mr. Hansen advised that it is part of infrastructure.

Ms. Alarcon stated it is being done. LauderStreet is an app the City created, which is now tracking all the management of traffic. In the past two months, she has said no, this will not go before Commission until a certain date. Five projects were not allowed to move forward because the City cannot affect the traffic any more than what they already have. Public Works projects will take priority over development. A few things have slipped through by FDOT and Broward County. They are currently sitting on four MOT's (Maintenance of Traffic). [LauderStreet - City Website-Home Page](#)

Mr. Orshefsky commented that ultimately, the most effective recommendation that can be made with regard to traffic is writing a bigger check on an annual basis to do traffic signals on the roads.

Ms. Alarcon stated that the City is looking into that and hopes to have that completed by September of this year.

Mr. Kwoka questioned how many of these projects they are planning are going to fall into that. There was \$800 million in the last meeting that were projects slated for FDOT or traffic transportation but there is no money.

Ms. Alarcon did not think there was enough information and she did not know what impact it would have on a regional approach. A full-blown study is being conducted to get all the details needed to understand the impact and then provide the pros and cons. The City is working closely with Broward County and FDOT. There are dollars that are programmed. The City started planning for traffic signalization five years ago. FDOT and the County do everything on a five-year budget just like the City. Many of the dollars the County looks at come through either the Broward MPO or FDOT. The City has started working on a lot of these initiatives trying to improve the traffic signalization so they can get it moving forward. The 17<sup>th</sup> Street Blue Toads are one of the initiatives to understand origin and destination; where people are going. Blue Toad is a technology that sits on the side of the road and talks to your car; it captures a lot of data such as speed, where you are going, where you end. Data is being used to try to help understand where traffic is going, moving, and where the needs are. It also tells the average speed in which a car is traveling to understand what the traffic signaling needs to be. From that, it can be programmed. FDOT is also purchasing software that changes the traffic signals, especially along their corridors. As they do their projects they are putting in this infrastructure.

Mr. Ostrau questioned the legal framework for the signalization in the County.

Ms. Alarcon advised that there is an Interlocal Agreement and it has a 30-day cancellation.

Chair Mammano questioned if it would be better for the City to take it over.

Mr. Orshefsky stated it is a function of control. Either you want to have traffic signalization work, in which case you have to take control of the process and write the checks, or give it to someone else and it does not work.

Chair Mammano reminded everyone that at an outreach meeting the thought was that signalization was the number one issue and when asked, everyone raised their hands and photographs were taken.

Ms. Alarcon used the drawbridge and trains as an example. They are working with the Coast Guard on these initiatives so the signals can be better timed at peak and non-peak times. They are also working with the Marina Association about what can be done.

Chair Mammano mentioned that the County buses near the hotels take up a whole lane of traffic; they are taking up road capacity.

Ms. Alarcon advised that conversation was started with them last Thursday; if it is driven by the Convention Center.

Ms. Alarcon mentioned that District 3 felt very strongly that the City did not do a good job maintaining the roads while the rest felt like it was maintained. The actual Downtown Master Plan was designed for what is going on today and that was done in the 90's. 28% felt like FDOT was responsible for the traffic signals, 22% did not know, 30% said the City is responsible, and 20% said it was the County. Some education needs to be done and more sharing of information. The City takes a lot of pride in giving the best service to their neighbors.

Mr. Hansen commented that if this Committee were to make a recommendation to the City Commission about the issue, one of the things would be giving City employees more power at the County. One thing he heard was using new technology to try to better the situation and that is how that would affect this Committee. If the Committee could say money could be spent on the latest and greatest technology that is something they could recommend.

Ms. Alarcon stated that the 17<sup>th</sup> Street Task Team meets once a month with the District Commissioner. That has been such an effective Task Team because they have this prioritized and have given a road map of what they want to execute. One of the things she spoke about was the Blue Toads; FDOT would love to have a lot more of those but it is not being prioritized in their program to be done. The City has requested a cost estimate of what it would be to add some of that to get better Origin and Destination to understand where traffic is going to and from so we can better time the signalization to better move the traffic.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the Blue Toads stay permanently on 17<sup>th</sup> Street.

Ms. Alarcon replied they do. There are two types; one can be temporary that gets moved around and one is permanent. The idea with the permanent is to collect the data historically.

Mr. Ostrau questioned FDOT's responsibility on the signalization.

Ms. Alarcon advised that 17<sup>th</sup> Street is a State road and the State has an Interlocal Agreement with Broward County for all of the signals that are on that road.

Mr. Ostrau questioned what division in the County has the authority.

Ms. Alarcon replied Traffic Engineering, which is a division within their Public Works Department.

Mr. Hansen commented that if it were said that a certain amount of money was needed to expand this beyond 17<sup>th</sup> Street to other streets and requested a recommendation he thought the Committee would be all over it.

Ms. Alarcon indicated that the City is looking at other technology that is believed will help the way people and cars are moved. They are currently working on that and what that would entail and cost. They are also having that conversation with partner agencies.

Mr. Orshefsky thought there were some points about walkability and bike lanes. That is ultimately what is done with the right-of-way and the trunk of A1A is the perfect example. Specific roadways were referenced in the presentation.

Ms. Alarcon advised that there are specific roadways they need to focus on and all of them are either State or County roads.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that there are alternatives to congestion that do not involve more asphalt.

Mr. Walters mentioned access to bicycles. Ms. Alarcon replied They partner with quite a few bicycle companies who give away bikes and make sure safe education on how to use them, as well as the proper bicycle equipment such as lock, helmet, reflectors and lights.

Ms. Alarcon advised that when the study was started in 2012, 2% used a bicycle as transportation and this year we are up to 7%. An increase has been seen in bicycle use as a mode of transportation. In asking why there was an increase it was because safer paths were created.

Mr. Hansen indicated that could somehow be coordinated with the people in the Planning Department.

Ms. Alarcon stated that they are in the process of updating their Downtown Master Plan and are working very close about where bike lanes are identified. In 2012, *Connecting the Block* was done, which identified where the City wanted to have the bicycle facilities. The City is now in the process of updating it so it is more inline of what is being used.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if there is a reason Bike Share has not taken off.

Ms. Alarcon advised that Bike Share in Fort Lauderdale is off the chart. Fort Lauderdale is the only City that is running it unbelievably crazy. There have been increases year over year.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned that it did not look like there was anything along Federal Highway or in the residential neighborhoods.

Ms. Alarcon stated that dockless is the next step; this is where technology is coming in place. Currently there are docking ride sharing programs where the bike stops and locks automatically. Riders must be members and have to unlock the bike through an app. The City is coordinating with them because they have to make sure there is a place to put the bikes because they do not want the bikes on the sidewalks.

Chair Mammano mentioned this was the first time there was discussion about roads, road capacity, mass transit, and alternatives.

Ms. Alarcon commented that everyone is a great fan of Uber and Lyft but they are part of the traffic congestion issue. The City is working closely and testing this on Las Olas Boulevard and creating ride sharing zones, asking Uber and Lyft to only pull up and pick up and deliver. It is part of the six-month Las Olas study. If there is good success they will look at evolving it more citywide. The other big issue is A1A.

Chair Mammano stated that it seems that the things being worked on are to increase the capacity of the existing system; new roadways are not being discussed.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned that reducing density is not being mentioned. In order to make traffic better there needs to be less cars.

Ms. Alarcon advised that the City is trying to improve with less single occupied vehicles. They are working towards car sharing and car pool programs and encouraging the multi-pool use versus single occupancy because that is what creates traffic congestion. The City is working with South Florida Commuter Service on creating a Broward Countywide car pool sharing program. That has been in a pilot study since last September.

Ms. Alarcon stated that the City is trying to partner with Waze; however, the truck companies use Waze to move the trucks and they do not want the trucks in the

neighborhood. The City was selected and had a contract and the City Attorney declined to allow them to move it forward. Now that there is a change, they are having that conversation again. As part of their budget, the City is putting together all of the initiatives they have been working on and moving cars. Everyone thinks their focus has just been on bikes and pads, it has not, it has been on transportation as a whole. Once it is fine-tuned she will share the information.

Chair Mammano mentioned that if that is the focus then let's spend whatever money needs to be spent to increase the capacity of our system.

Mr. Kwoka thought that made a lot of sense. As opposed to building a pedestrian overpass it is a drop in the bucket.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if the roundabout is a solution to anything.

Mr. Kwoka stated that T-bone accidents at intersections are a very high fatality and the circle creates more of a side-swipe action, which reduces fatalities.

Ms. Alarcon advised that roundabouts are a solution when it makes sense. Not every place works with a roundabout. Roundabouts are also a traffic calming; they also provide continued traffic movement.

Mr. Walters referenced traffic problems. When people leave the meeting, they leave the main street and go through the neighborhood, which is what Waze would do.

Chair Mammano commented that people were complaining about they want to accelerate Riverland Road complete streets.

Ms. Alarcon assured that Riverland Road is not getting a traffic circle. Traffic is already cutting thru and the City has to determine what needs to be done to deter the cut thru. There is also a problem with Waze in that area.

## **B. Reschedule September 3rd meeting Date (Labor Day)**

Chair Mammano mentioned that the September 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting needs to be rescheduled because it is Labor Day.

Ms. Shuster provided the following options:

- Tuesday, September 4<sup>th</sup>, which is the normal Commission day. In the past the Commission has moved that meeting to Wednesday.
- Monday, September 10<sup>th</sup>.

It was noted that September 10<sup>th</sup> is Rosh Hashana.

Chair Mammano stated that last year the August meeting was cancelled because that is when the Commission takes a break.

Ms. Shuster believed the Commission would be taking an August break; however, it has not confirmed. There will be a Resolution at the April 17<sup>th</sup> meeting to determine summer recess and the September meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky suggested penciling the meeting in for September 4<sup>th</sup> and see what the Commission does.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if a different date had to be picked or if it could just be a different venue.

Ms. Shuster replied that video is only set up on the first floor and eighth floor.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned the airport and commented that as long as the meeting is legally recorded they do not have to be on video.

Chair Mammano stated that they do not want to go into the Commission Chambers because that is not conducive to discussion.

Ms. Shuster questioned if there was a consensus to hold off determining September 4<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Mammano replied yes.

### **C. Confirmation of June 4<sup>th</sup>, July 2<sup>nd</sup>, August 6<sup>th</sup> Meeting Dates**

Ms. Shuster stated that last year the August meeting was cancelled and she wanted to confirm which of the summer meetings would be cancelled.

Chair Mammano emphasized certainly not the June meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that would be decided once we know whether we are meeting in April.

Mr. Kwoka He noted that he would not be here on August 6<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Mammano clarified that June 4<sup>th</sup> and July 2<sup>nd</sup> did not depend on what the Commission does; therefore, we are keeping June 4<sup>th</sup> and July 2<sup>nd</sup> and the only question is on August 6<sup>th</sup>, which needs to be coordinated with the Commission.

Mr. Hansen advised that he would be here for the June meeting because that is when the interim report will be filed. After that, he was hoping to pass this position onto the future Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Stresau stated there is no point in trying to re-educate someone new.

Mr. Hansen believed someone from the Planning and Zoning Board should be here. Chair Mammano thought the Committee should recommend to the Planning and Zoning Board to keep Mr. Hansen on the Committee because of the continuity.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that it has to be the Chair or the designee of the Planning and Zoning Board. If Mr. Hansen is not on the Planning and Zoning Board he cannot be on the Committee.

Mr. Kwoka thought there was a ruling from the City Attorney that Mr. Hansen was the representative for the Planning and Zoning Board and that he was there for the duration. That needs to be clarified because his position is predicated as well. Chair Mammano suggested asking staff to clarify and get a legal opinion.

Mr. Kwoka commented that depending on what the opinion is, they have to consider what the impact would be on changing this body of individuals; they might need to make a change. Mr. Kwoka clarified that when this Committee was put together it required an appointee from different areas. The question is does the Commission want it to remain that way or are they satisfied with the collection of people and now that they have the diversity, do they want to remove that restriction.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the threshold issue is if Mr. Hansen's position ex-officio. If the answer is yes and Mr. Hansen wants to remain then they have to change the Resolution. The threshold issue for the City Attorney is whether or not the seats are ex-officio.

Mr. Kwoka believed 50% of the seats are yes.

Mr. Verma indicated that for the next meeting there will be a brief presentation of the 40-year report; discussion about planning the interim report; and determine when the lunch meeting/Workshop with the Commission can be scheduled.

Mr. Orshefsky commented with prior distribution of the report. He requested numbers be included if available.

Ms. Shuster asked for clarification about what report was expected.

Mr. Kwoka advised all they need is an action item, an agenda item, to work on a framework for a compilation.

Chair Mammano stated that she had asked for a compilation report on the meetings and she would work with Ms. Shuster.

Mr. Verma mentioned that there was a question about the stormwater rate study. It is currently in progress and the expected completion is the mid of May with the information being shared sometime in June or July 2018. There was a request for the list of bond and previous utility CIP's. That list has been provided and the budget amendment phase for tomorrow's Commission meeting.

Chair Mammano was tired of reading the spreadsheets and requested taking the data of the \$200 million and have a chart; how much money is being paid for existing projects, how much money is going into stormwater, how much money is going to the sewers, etc.

Mr. Verma stated the final requested item is the parking master plan. Preparation is on the way and the expected completion date is May 2018.

**8. Public Comments – None.**

**9. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting –May 7, 2018**

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

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