

**City of Fort Lauderdale
 Infrastructure Task Force Committee
 May 7, 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	A	12	1
Ed Kwoka	P	11	2
Ralph Zeltman	P	13	0
Keith Cobb	A	8	5
Roosevelt Walters	P	12	1
Fred Stresau	A	11	2
Norm Ostrau	P	10	1
David Orshefsky	P	10	0

Staff Present

Meredith Shuster, Administrative Assistant
 Nancy Gassman, Assistant Public Works Director
 Raj Verma, Interim Assistant Public Works Director
 Chris Lagerbloom, Assistant City Manager
 Michael Mitchel, Prototype-Inc. recording secretary

2. **Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Kwoka advised that there was a request to move agenda item #4 so the consultant would be able to leave.

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

3. **Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes**

A. April 2, 2018

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

- Page 9, last paragraph, first line, should be ***tidal valve***.
- Page 18, third paragraph, second line, should "...he cannot be ***on*** the Committee".

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

4. General Discussion (Board Members) – 15 minutes

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if there was direction from the City Attorney about ex officio positions and the status of the City Attorney's opinion on this issue.

Mr. Verma replied not yet.

Mr. Ostrau wanted to know about Leo Hansen and mentioned that the paragraph says, "Each member will serve a term of appointment that shall expire concurrently with the termination of the Task Force".

Mr. Kwoka thought the membership requirements would come into play should a member of this Task Force resign and there is a new appointment; not that it requires they maintain the position from which they were appointed.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned Mr. Hansen's current status.

Mr. Verma clarified that Mr. Hansen is not a member of the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Verma stated that opinion came through the Attorney's office and the City Clerk's office and the Resolution reads, under Section 2, "That all members appointed to the Infrastructure Task Force Advisory Committee shall remain as members until the expiration of their respective terms or until their successors have been appointed." Mr. Verma believed the Planning and Zoning Board would replace Mr. Hansen and noted that he would get one more clarification and pass it onto the Committee.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if the Committee's responsibility lies directly to the Commission and the Mayor.

Mr. Stresau replied in terms of the deliverables they have asked for, yes.

Mr. Kwoka commented that any direction other than from the Commission and Mayor is at the discretion of this Committee.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if Mr. Hansen was told that he could not come to the meeting.

Mr. Verma replied no; there was communication between Mr. Hansen and the City Clerk's office regarding a replacement.

Mr. Kwoka suggested that a formal opinion be obtained from the City Attorney and if there was still an issue then it could be taken to the Commission.

Mr. Walters mentioned to the Commission about this Committee and another Committee he sits on and noted that they are too far down the road to bring on new people. Their response was that they understood and were going to try to keep what they have.

Mr. Verma believed there was some discussion about Jackie filling Mr. Hansen's term. It appeared that Commission Sorensen discussed this with Mr. Hansen. The term for Jackie Scott would be from June 1, 2017 to May 31, 2020. Mr. Hansen's last day on the Committee was when Jackie started and she was appointed on April 3, 2018.

Mr. Kwoka stated he would like some clarification from the Attorney and the Commission because his appointment is through the Chamber of Commerce, and they turn over leadership every year.

Mr. Verma advised that this has been validated by Rhonda Hasan, the Assistant City Attorney.

Mr. Kwoka stated the transition of Mr. Hansen may have been validated but his understanding was these appointments were for the duration of this Committee.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that if the Chamber of Commerce decided that they wanted a different voice on this Task Force it would be difficult to wear a Chamber of Commerce hat and go back to the original nominating Board and say you cannot have the voice you want on the Committee.

Mr. Verma said that Commissioner Sorenson discussed it with Mr. Hansen and that it was Mr. Hansen's decision. Mr. Kwoka thought that was a message that needed to be clear to the City and the Attorney.

Mr. Lagerbloom reported that the Commission was meeting concurrently and requested that he inform the ITF of these seven key priorities of which the first six should be done first, not in any specific order and number 7 as overall.

- 1) Stormwater,
- 2) Drinking water
- 3) Sanitary sewer
- 4) Seawalls,
- 5) Roads
- 6) Sidewalks and
- 7) Response to rising sea levels.

Parks and buildings were taken out of the mix. The Commission has asked for a deliverable; they really want information in the next budget cycle and would like to hear this at either their first meeting back from their break in August or immediately after Labor Day. In September, the Commission would like a report from the Infrastructure Task Force on the findings related to those six topics, the suggested priorities, and working with staff, any anticipated funding needs.

Mr. Orshefsky agreed and noted that this was exactly what was needed. This was not a prioritized list; it was just numerical. He questioned if this was before the TRIM notice meeting. The TRIM notice meeting would determine whether there are additional ad valorem revenues.

Mr. Lagerbloom stated it would be after.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if TRIM could be explained.

Mr. Orshefsky stated the TRIM notice is the establishment of the maximum ad valorem tax rate for the upcoming fiscal year. Last year, at the TRIM notice meeting, when the rate was set, it was not raised from the previous year so there was no room as an ad valorem matter to add any additional infrastructure costs into the budget coming out of new ad valorem revenues. Mr. Orshefsky commented that he was going to make the same set of points to the BAB at their next meeting. If there is a shift in priorities, one of the first determinants is going to be what the ad valorem rate is going to be set for this year. Priorities and why they should be funded are set as well as dollar values but if it is believed that some of the funding should come out of new sources of revenue, whether ad valorem or other, some sort of communication needs to be sent to the City Commission before the TRIM notice meeting.

Mr. Walters believed the Committee's request to the City Attorney and staff would be monumental. He has no idea of the total task, what has been done, the amount of money that has been spent, what needs to be done, and the money that is short. In order for the Committee to do what the Commission has requested, he believed that information was necessary.

Mr. Stresau suggested taking it in two parts. Let's take the prioritization of the six items and whatever is involved and decide how to rank everything without discussing the budget.

Mr. Kwoka stated they could start by saying that water and sewer, at the very least, sanitary sewer, has been prioritized by the Consent Order. It may not be at the top of the Committee's agenda only because there is an agenda they have no control over. In Mr. Kwoka's opinion, he thought it would rank stormwater, water, seawall, sewer, road, and sidewalks.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned as a matter of public safety and public health, funding priority, or what.

Mr. Kwoka believed that each one of these is reviewed and if there is discussion about sidewalks, decisions have to be made about the quantity and quality of sidewalks that are going to be repaired, replaced, or added to the City.

Mr. Stresau stated that there are seven districts that have current studies with regard to stormwater and when the Committee got to the Community Discussion and Outreach, there were other communities that were not included in those districts that should be considered.

Mr. Kwoka's point was that the last ten months have been spent talking primarily about sewer

and there is a Consent Order. He did not know what kind of traction there would be with regard to sanitary sewer that has not already been mandated.

Mr. Orshefsky stated except for Phases 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Reiss Report.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that none of that can be evaluated until the Consent Agreement is 18 months into its evaluation. Part of the Consent Order required an evaluation of other systems to determine possible issues.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that \$200 million has already been spent that had already been funded by "Wall Street" and funded the first five years of Reiss Report including the Consent Order because they overlap. Mr. Orshefsky questioned how much of the existing CIP dollars were freed up because of the \$200 million in bond funds. There is \$200 million in the bank to deal with the Consent Order. For example, \$15 million or \$20 million was not put back for Fiveash; that solved part of the water issue and was the same source of funding. Without raising ad valorem dollars, the \$200 million that came in has released x amount from these projects; what is that amount and what are those projects? It was questioned if the stormwater issue and the rate study were going to be addressed between now and then.

Mr. Kwoka said now that there is a new Commission it would be appropriate to reintroduce that recommendation.

Mr. Lagerbloom believed the Commission would have a good healthy discussion as to where they are as far as rate structure and this whole trip methodology versus a blended model.

Mr. Ostrau commented that the TRIM was needed because he did not want to take the ad valorem off the table.

Mr. Kwoka stated that should be the first priority.

Mr. Lagerbloom stated that the TRIM meeting date would be after the July 10, 2018 Commission meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the Committee wanted to make recommendations in time for the TRIM notice on each of the six or seven items.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned roads and questioned if the Commission meant physical roads or traffic.

Mr. Lagerbloom replied physical roads.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if that could be called "asphalt."

Mr. Lagerbloom advised that it could. When talking about traffic, it was called "mobility," so if there is a distinction between roads and mobility this would be asphalt.

Mr. Stresau questioned if the road includes bridges.

Mr. Lagerbloom replied correct. It is believed that bridges are satisfactorily accounted for in the near term with some projects that already exist.

Mr. Kwoka stated with the intent to get something together for a recommendation prior to the TRIM, the one that has the work most complete is stormwater and the rate structure; therefore, it is believed that is where the focus should be. Sanitary sewer is important for the long-term. Mr. Kwoka believed that Mr. Orshefsky was correct and the budget needs to be reviewed.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that if the recommendation was going to be don't worry about short-term infrastructure for sewer, it is because it has been funded under the Consent Agreement. A notation can be made; however, the Consent Agreement says once 18 months of investigation has been done; they will have to come back and there may be more items to be brought into compliance. The \$200 million has been spent it needs to be planned when the first set of CCTV of the pipes come in and shows there are other pipes potentially at risk.

Mr. Kwoka questioned the meaningful items that should be focused on, which should be addressed for the TRIM.

Mr. Stresau questioned if a list of other Public Works sewer concerns should be considered if all the Consent items are going to get repaired with the money that has presumably been taken out.

Mr. Verma stated that staff would do their best based on the Reiss Report.

Mr. Stresau commented there are a few other things in the mix other than what the Consent Order is going to repair that should be considered.

Mr. Orshefsky suggested to stop going project by project because that is when nothing is accomplished. Mr. Orshefsky questioned if there was a way to generate the number of this year's CIP dollars that were freed up from the original allocation in the CIP by the money recently received. He questioned if it was \$100 million or \$70 million.

Mr. Verma did not think it would be a problem and advised that the number was not provided because staff was still working on finalizing the numbers.

Mr. Ostrau questioned how the Committee should say there needs to be room in the TRIM notice in case an ad valorem increase is recommended.

Mr. Orshefsky gave two examples. On August 14, 2018, the BAB recommended to the City Commission that a policy be established that 2.5% of the general revenue on an annual basis be allocated to CIP. At that time, it was around 1% and now it is well above 2.5%. It was suggested that the Committee would say that when making the TRIM notice to please make arrangements to be sure this amount could be funded. The other one was the ROI, which is the big issue. It was questioned if the \$20 million was being taken from general revenue or being left where it is supposed to be.

Mr. Kwoka stated that has been his position for some time. The ROI needs to cease to exist. The answer by staff has been that it has to be replaced; there is no choice other than an ad

Infrastructure Task Force Committee

May 7, 2018

Page 7

valorum increase. He indicated that the Committee already recommended 1) giving the past administration a proposed limit; 2) removing the ROI; and 3) consider the ad valorum increase. Those are three very strong recommendations. The Committee has a better idea of stormwater that might require a follow up. Going to the next level, seawalls are going to require a much broader discussion. Roads, asphalt and sidewalks are important but there is a little more time with those.

Mr. Orshefsky clarified that #1 was methodology on stormwater.

Mr. Kwoka advised that #2 was discontinuation of the ROI and #3 was an increase in the ad valorum that addresses the shortfall that was backfilled by the ROI.

Mr. Ostrau commented that if the City takes the ROI they might need in excess of that and need an ad valorum tax.

Mr. Kwoka stated that is where the Committee was going to start.

Mr. Walters mentioned replacing the 70 mills and questioned what percentage of increase was being discussed for the ad valorum.

Mr. Kwoka advised that it was 70 mills. Mr. Kwoka commented that if they were at 1% or 2% and proposing 4% that is a big difference.

Mr. Stresau stated that the Committee also said on the ROI that there was a legitimate reason to tax for services rendered.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that did not fall under ROI. There are provisions within the municipal wording that says they can bill for reimbursement, for services, and cost recovery.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned with sewer to be aware that there are additional capital requirements that may come due under the Consent Order. They have replaced Fiveash, which was on its way to being in the same state as the Police Station in terms of deferred maintenance.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the dollar values for Fiveash were increased with the money from "Wall Street".

Mr. Lagerbloom stated that the funds were refunded to the reliability project; it was about \$13 million or \$15 million to bring projects back to life.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that this was the overlap between Reiss and the "Wall Street" money because it was believed that the City did more than replace the Fiveash projects that were reallocated. Mr. Orshefsky thought they added to the maintenance or additional capital facilities for Fiveash.

Dr. Gassman mentioned there should be a project in the bond list that includes planning for a new water treatment plant.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if it has been included as one of the bond items.

5/22/2018

Dr. Gassman believed it was part of the bond items and indicated that there was a certain amount of maintenance that had to be done in order to keep the plant running. While moving forward, the idea was to put the money in the plant and keep it running appropriately but also to start planning the future as to what the next opportunity was for having regional water; clean water supply in the City.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the Committee was bouncing back and forth as to whether seawalls and capital costs would be included in the stormwater system. The City took the position that the seawalls and stormwater are pretty much the same in terms of drainage basins. Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the City wanted a recommendation from the Committee to say, "Please consider including seawalls in the rate structure for stormwater."

Dr. Gassman advised that since the last time there was a discussion, the policy decision was made that the seawalls owned by the City were almost exclusively associated with City right-of-way. Those seawalls are protection for the roadway; therefore, the seawalls will continue to ride together with road projects. In that frame, the seawalls are part of the general fund roadway projects. As part of the Stormwater Master Plan, seawall improvements were being planned that are associated with that activity because seawalls need to be improved in certain locations.

Mr. Kwoka commented that there was a cross pollination between the two categories.

Dr. Gassman replied correct. In the situation of the seawalls included in the Stormwater Master Plan, those projects will be paid out of the stormwater funding. All other seawalls will be associated as road projects and will stay within the General Fund.

Mr. Walters mentioned that during the presentation there was discussion about flooding and there were no seawalls. He questioned where the money would come from to alleviate that particular problem.

Dr. Gassman explained that in areas within the seven neighborhoods where there is flooding, the current thought process was that once the current stormwater rate study was complete in the June timeframe, there may be a discussion about methodology and increased rates. Once that is finished, the City would go out for an appropriate amount of money in order to fund those projects in the seven neighborhoods.

Mr. Walters questioned if bonds are what the Committee should be looking at as a funding mechanism.

Mr. Kwoka understood that bonds were predicated on the revenue stream that could be generated.

Dr. Gassman stated that is why they are not going out for the bond request for stormwater until the stormwater rate study is complete.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if a rate structure change, if any, has been agreed upon.

Dr. Gassman advised that it would be validated as part of the bond process.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the intent was to be a capital requirement for the study for the next set of neighborhoods beyond the capital requirements of the seven neighborhoods.

Dr. Gassman replied correct. Part of the bond activity is intended to be the next set of modeling and, if required, design for funding flooding issues in the remainder of the City.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that would be treated as a capital cost.

Dr. Gassman confirmed it would be treated as a capital cost much like the Stormwater Management Plan was treated as a capital cost.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned that another thing stated at the Workshop was sea level rise. Mr. Ostrau questioned how to move forward without addressing all the other seawalls in the world.

Mr. Kwoka believed that priorities should be discussed and noted that the seawall discussion was a discussion for a meeting all to itself.

Mr. Orshefsky indicated that the seawall issue about whether the City should pay for private seawalls has gone around many times. It is essentially a political judgment and in the past, that judgment has come back as a "no".

Mr. Kwoka stated that the political judgment did not take into consideration what has been necessary and successful in other places. Currently, the City is trying to come to grips with the impact of accelerating sea level rise. Everyone is speculating what is going to happen in 10, 15, 30 years.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned how that was related to the capital infrastructure needs of the City short term, which was the current discussion.

Dr. Gassman stated that the City just finished a Seawall Master Plan, which looked at the projections for sea level rise and said what timeframes seawalls would need to be elevated. Sea level rise is part of the phasing of the Seawall Master Plan because in certain locations those seawalls are higher than other locations and there has been flooding issues in certain areas. Much like the way the private seawall ordinance will drive change as change happens, the Seawall Master Plan also says it is phased based on projections of the current heights of the seawalls, the current condition, and when sea level rise will start to drive the need for capital improvements.

Mr. Walters questioned how residents could protect their homes.

Mr. Kwoka explained that the City is going to replace City owned seawalls but there are hundreds of millions of dollars of private property that border up against City owned seawalls. The City is asking all the tax base to pay for the City owned seawalls that protect a large percentage of the private owned property in the City but the rest are left to take care of it on their own.

Dr. Gassman stated that was being addressed similar to any Code Enforcement situation. Seawalls are no different than a fence or a roof. The seawall is part of the individual property and must be maintained to keep it from eroding into the waterway.

Mr. Ostrau commented that seawalls are unique because of the rise of the sea level.

Dr. Gassman explained the way the citation reads is that it is for the protection of neighborhood by neighborhood flood prevention. If a resident is allowing tidal flows over their property then a remediation must be created to prevent those tidal flows from coming over the property.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that sea level rise was at the bottom of the list.

Mr. Lagerbloom stated that seawalls were in the top six and the more global of what can be done to the infrastructure to deal with the rising seas is #7, which is important, but there is not going to be an update on that in the next 90 days.

Dr. Gassman advised that there was not a separate plan for sea level rise; Sea level rise was in all their plans. It is one of the things that would be included just as there is planning for population increases, etc.

Mr. Stresau mentioned the George T. Lohmeyer Plant (GTL) and based on Dr. Gassman statement that there was an overall plan he questioned if GTL is at 7.5 and sea level rise is going to occur within the next 50 years, what is going to be done with a plant that handles 70% sewage in the City of Fort Lauderdale when it is underwater?

Dr. Gassman stated that by the year 2060, the expectation is that the maximum sea level rise projection for our area is two feet. At two feet, they are still substantially below the GTL's elevation. According to the topography, there is nothing in GTL at an elevation of 5.5 or below.

Mr. Kwoka stated that none of these things can be planned or addressed if there is no money to pay for them.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned what the Committee wanted to recommend about ad valorem other than minimum capital requirements.

Mr. Kwoka questioned the timetable on the TRIM.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the adoption is July 10, 2018 and the final adoption with the budget is late September.

Mr. Kwoka commented that by establishing the minimum of these three recommendations to identify the need to have a placeholder for the TRIM is a response to the Commission.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned how big the placeholder should be. There is the ROI piece, a minimum amount of general revenue going into the CIP on an annual basis; and others.

Infrastructure Task Force Committee

May 7, 2018

Page 11

Mr. Ostrau believed the recommendations should be articulated.

Mr. Orshefsky clarified that one is ROI.

Mr. Kwoka stated there is minimum capital investment; stormwater.

Mr. Orshefsky wanted to stick with ad valorem, which is roads, some of the seawalls, and sidewalks.

Mr. Kwoka believed the Committee needed to keep the recommendations to stormwater, rate structure, and the elimination of the ROI. The Commission was asking for an expedited set of recommendations on some of these key points and this meets that request.

Mr. Lagerbloom agreed.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the Committee has a meeting in June so if those recommendations can be gaveled at that time they will be in the pipeline.

Mr. Kwoka advised that the recommendations have to be gaveled in June because the Committee needs to make this recommendation. A recommendation was previously made that was not well received. The Committee needs to understand the temperament of this Commission to move in a direction.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned homelessness and stated that it came up at the BAB meeting and there was a presentation about what the City was doing by way of budgetary support for homelessness, whether it was enforcement, Social Services, etc.

Mr. Kwoka stated that once recommendations were made, the Committee would understand what direction the Commission planned to take and then their course could be adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Verma went back to when the Committee asked for the long-term projection; it was 10, 15, 20, 25 years. The discussion today seemed to focus on short term. Mr. Verma thought the Task Force should look at the short, middle and long-term; that was the focus.

Mr. Kwoka agreed. The Committee has been spread wide for 12 to 13 months and it is time to bring the focus to what brought them here. Fundamentally, there is not enough dollars to pay for needs to be done today let alone five and ten years. Everything cannot be bonded out responsibly. Ultimately, when there is a \$120 million gap and \$120 million ROI, the City is spending what they do not have. It is time to address the spending.

Mr. Verma stated that the Committee's decision is to determine whether the projects need to be prioritized based on what can be afforded or on what is needed and then go beyond the affordability; there is still development and other issues.

Mr. Kwoka was not suggesting going this direction, but in discussing this loosely with a seasoned planner from New York City, the question was why hasn't a moratorium been

5/22/2018

discussed. That has not come up and he was not proposing that, but there is short, medium and long-term.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that there are a number of studies out there. The Committee did not have the Reiss Report when they first started these issues. The Parking Master Plan is due in the next six months, and Phase 2 of Stormwater. The Committee did not have the data in terms of dollars but narrative recommendations can be made about what is going on.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned another piece of data he would suggest short term, if it is available. He referenced the minutes on Page 16, top of the page, when Diana Alarcon discussed mobility and traffic rather than roads. It says, "The City is putting together all of the initiatives they have been working on in moving cars", which was the transportation piece as opposed to the road piece. That would be an interesting data point to add as a counterpoint to roads because mobility is going to be part of the budget no matter what is done.

Mr. Stresau found it interesting that Ms. Alarcon made the pitch for spending \$50,000 on additional ability to add the "Bluetoad" System. Ms. Alarcon had said if there were a lot of "Bluetoads" more would be known about where to predict people are going. Mr. Stresau did not know whether that lists as an "I want" or "We need" when you get to roads.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if there was any discussion about mobility.

Mr. Lagerbloom believed they are having that discussion right now. The number being used this year based upon taxable value is one mill equals \$32.4 million.

5. Old Business

A. Reschedule September 3rd Meeting Date (Labor Day)

- i. August 27th, 2:00 – 5:00 p.m. 8th Floor**
- ii. September 6th 2:00 – 5:00 p.m. 8th Floor**

Mr. Orshefsky suggested the meeting be scheduled for September 6, 2018.

Ms. Shuster commented that the September 6th date would be after the Commission meeting date. With regard to the July meeting, Ms. Shuster advised that the City Commission meeting was moved to July 10, 2018.

Mr. Lagerbloom indicated that an August joint meeting with the Commission was discussed; however, the Commission thought this Committee would also take a break at that time.

Mr. Walters commented that the Committee cannot afford to rest; there are deadlines to meet.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned the date of the August meeting.

Ms. Shuster stated it is scheduled for August 6, 2018. Ms. Shuster clarified that the Infrastructure Task Force Committee meeting would be on July 2, 2018 and the TRIM and the City Commission meeting would be on July 10, 2018.

Mr. Kwoka asked for a motion to reschedule the September 3, 2018 meeting to September 6, 2018.

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. Ostrau, to reschedule the September meeting to September 6, 2018. In a voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

B. 40-Year Building Inspection Report

Mr. Kwoka advised that if it is no longer in the Committee's mandate as per this discussion to look at buildings and facilities, the 40-year report did not need to be reviewed today.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if it was facilities position and noted that it did not sound that they were going to get a red tag on any of the buildings.

Mr. Lagerbloom stated that is exactly how he read it. He did not think the Commission thought that long term the Committee might not get to parks and buildings, etc., but were saying that they needed a focused effort right now.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if that included the Police Station.

Mr. Lagerbloom replied no.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that was the one building that has been obsolete for 40 years.

Mr. Kwoka noted that could be tacked on at the end.

Mr. Orshefsky commented that one of the funding solutions for the police station was to go out for a General Obligation Bond.

Mr. Lagerbloom stated that the City Commission might address the aging facility outside of the context of the Infrastructure Task Force Committee.

Mr. Kwoka read the report in its limited capacity and there was no smoking gun in the report. The City tends to follow these reports, which says the Committee needs to focus attention on these buildings. It is of his opinion that at this moment the Committee did not need to address buildings.

Mr. Orshefsky read the 40-year report. Some of it has to be done; the electrical is one thing that has to be done.

Mr. Stresau commented that did not seem to be the Committee's responsibility. Mr. Zeltman advised that is a code compliance, maintenance and structural integrity issue.

Mr. Kwoka suggested moving the 40-year inspection report up to now and holding on the General Discussion further.

Mr. Orshefsky mentioned deferring the 40-year inspections until there were definitive numbers since they did not need to be focused on between now and the TRIM notice.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if, other than what was seen in a Power Point presentation, if they were prepared to go beyond the details in a 15-minute presentation or if they were here to provide a summary report that the Committee has already seen.

Mr. Zackria, with Walters, Zackria & Associates, stated that he was going to provide a summary report of what has already been seen. If the Committee has already read the report there was nothing more to show. The actual reports were provided and the Power Point was a summary of those reports.

Mr. Orshefsky requested that staff circulate that report.

Ms. Tokar commented that the report was more than 500 pages.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned the proposed budget that must be addressed and if it is a half-million dollars or a million and a half dollars.

Ms. Tokar advised that there were preliminary estimates. Out of 11 sites, five were already taken care of. At this point they were not sure what the amount would be.

Mr. Zackria advised that when the inspections were done some structural cracking was noticed. When the City gets to that point there will need to be further investigation.

Mr. Walters questioned if the report on buildings included what the City currently owns and not what the City owns and needs.

Mr. Lagerbloom replied that the report addressed the same thing any other 40-year inspection addresses, which is the City's facilities that meet criteria and threshold to have the inspection done. Nothing about future need was mentioned; only existing assets.

Ms. Tokar stated there was a list of what buildings needed to be inspected every year.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned that one of the points in the presentation was that their report was mandated by a certain set of criteria under the Florida Statutes but it did not address suitability for future earnings.

Mr. Walters questioned if the Task Force would address future needs. He wanted to be sure he was looking at the total picture when looking at the report.

Mr. Lagerbloom stated that their report was a completely different process than future planning. They were looking at things the City owns.

Mr. Zackria explained the history of the 40-year building inspection report and what it entailed. It was noted that staff was able to repair many of the facilities and those buildings are signed off. Contractors must be hired to do the repairs on buildings that had more damage.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if the buildings with more damage were subject to the 180-day requirement.

Ms. Tokar replied yes, but they may need an extension for the time it takes to hire contractors.

Mr. Zeltman mentioned certain Federal State and Broward County School buildings were exempt and questioned what buildings within the City were exempt from the 40-year report.

Ms. Tokar advised that there was one building that was under a certain square footage and there are exceptions with certain buildings. Every building was looked at to make sure they were under the regulations.

Mr. Zeltman stated that on April 9, 2018, he did a walk thru observation of the City Police Headquarters. Mr. Zeltman asked if there were inspections at that location because it is well over 40 years and the maintenance people indicated a lot of the Fire protection issues were grandfathered in.

Ms. Tokar indicated that the building was in compliance from the time it was built. They were not required to update it as code changes. They had to do the fire protection four or five years ago but at that time they were not required to provide a fire sprinkler system.

Mr. Kwoka commented that this goes back to the Committee's first meetings, the needs versus the wants. If there is a 500-page report that meets the Florida Code, satisfies the County and City, the Committee is wasting their breath.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if Mr. Zeltman's report was circulated to the Commission.

Mr. Stresau stated that ultimately the final report should include Mr. Zeltman's report. The Committee was instructed not to look at facilities and the Police Department.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if Mr. Lagerbloom believed there were enough dollars to go through CIP for the absolute minimum required to get the City out from under Broward County.

Mr. Lagerbloom did not know since he did not have the number. He stated that the new direction would be incorporated in the minutes.

Mr. Ostrau questioned if this was unanimous.

Mr. Lagerbloom indicated that there was no official vote but everyone's head was nodding in the same direction. There was a consensus.

C. Workshop:

i. Outreach Meeting Report for disbursement prior to the 5th Citywide Outreach Meeting

Mr. Kwoka indicated there was nothing to report.

ii. Interim Report for Incoming Commission - Framework

Mr. Kwoka commented that the Committee has a new direction.

Mr. Orshefsky advised that he was going to draft recommendations, A – E, or whatever it was going to be.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if that was something that would go to the Commission; he thought it should.

Mr. Orshefsky stated they were not going directly to the Commission.

Mr. Verma believed the Committee was putting together a report for the Commission for the Joint Workshop and that was the reason an outline was provided to see if the Committee wanted to expand on that.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that he looked at the outline but would like to revisit it since there was a change in the course of direction.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the interim report was intended, as he understood, to be backup for the Joint Workshop. At this point, there was not a date for the Joint Workshop.

Mr. Walters mentioned that if the Commission was going in a different direction they need to tell this Committee.

Ms. Shuster indicated that the Commission was unable to schedule a Joint Workshop prior to their recess in August.

Mr. Kwoka mentioned that if the Workshop could not be scheduled before the August recess some recommendations were going to have to be made without the Workshop.

Mr. Walters stated that recommendations could be given but they should not be instead of a Workshop.

Mr. Ostrau believed that the Commission would want to talk about what was being recommended.

Mr. Kwoka commented that this Commission has said these are the things they would like prioritized. That does not preclude this Committee from discussing other items that are considered important nor does it derail them from looking at the medium and long-term objections of their recommendations.

Mr. Verma questioned what was going to be done about the findings from the community meetings and how the findings would blend in when the items were prepared for the

Mr. Kwoka thought that Mr. Orshefsky should draft the recommendations and then collectively and through the appropriate channels, try to pull together an interim report that is delivered together with the recommendations.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the only comment he had about the Outreach meetings was that they were good. He would like to stay at least 15,000 or 20,000 feet and not count dots; let's deal with the concerns that were expressed. Mr. Orshefsky thought a summary could be a page and a half.

Mr. Verma agreed that the exercise needed to be incorporated with the recommendation and should not be more than four or five pages.

Mr. Kwoka stated that the Commission's desire should be what the community desires.

Mr. Verma wanted to be sure that the efforts were summarized and what came out of the meeting.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that could be included as an executive summary with Mr. Orshefsky's proposed recommendations and then the details could be discussed at a Workshop.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if staff could generate the page summary of the Outreach meeting; a lot of the information was attachments.

Mr. Walters commented that he would like to see the summary by location because the issues were different in different locations.

Mr. Kwoka did not see the Committee having a fifth meeting and believed it would not accomplish anything.

Mr. Orshefsky did not disagree; however, he thought part of the reason for the fifth meeting was that it would allow public reaction to the Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Kwoka clarified that he was not saying that the fifth meeting needed to be terminated.

Mr. Stresau had a problem with the fact that there was a total of 70 or 80 people in four areas and that was the thrust of what the recommendations were built around. The Committee heard about sidewalks, roads, flooding, speed, and enforcement.

Mr. Ostrau commented that there were people present from various Associations.

Mr. Verma agreed and noted that staff has the survey results from ETC and would be happy to provide copies, which summarize what has been experienced. This was a full-blown neighborhood survey.

Mr. Kwoka reiterated that the Committee needs to understand what the temperament of the
5/22/2018

new Commission is. It is time to make recommendations and have a Workshop to see what direction the Commission wants to take.

Mr. Orshefsky requested the ETC report be transmitted electronically.

Mr. Verma thought this report should negate the final meeting that was planned. Ms. Shuster has done very well with the summary and the pie charts.

Mr. Stresau questioned if the pie chart has been compared with what was found in the neighborhoods.

Ms. Shuster replied not yet but stated it was very similar.

Mr. Stresau commented that when reviewing the notes there was a lot of discussion, it was operational and enforcement, and nothing to do with infrastructure.

Mr. Ostrau stated it was the mobility and traffic.

Mr. Kwoka advised that one of the tasks was to hear the community and communicate that voice.

6. Board Member Comments

A. City Police Department Building – Ralph Zeltman

Mr. Kwoka questioned if Mr. Zeltman already said his piece regarding the Police Station.

Mr. Zeltman obtained some photographs and submitted them to the City. Since the Committee's direction has been altered, taking out buildings and parks, but at least the work he has done is in the City's hands.

Mr. Kwoka took issue with Mr. Zeltman's comments. The Committee's direction has not been altered taking out anything. The priorities have been adjusted in the short term per the Commission's request.

Mr. Stresau commented that the Committee has heard about the Police Station and its inadequacies and how it affects the attitude of the people working there for 15 months. It is difficult to ignore even though the Commission says there are six items that need to be focused on.

Mr. Zeltman stated he was not very happy about that because he put in time but he is here to adjust as necessary. The Committee reports to the Commission and the Mayor and if the new group has refocused on certain items and deleted others, fine.

Mr. Orshefsky did not think the City facilities were off the table; it was just that between now and the gavel in September. He fully expects this group will make recommendations about the Police building and/or City Hall and/or any of the other City facilities.

Infrastructure Task Force Committee

May 7, 2018

Page 19

Mr. Ostrau stated that the flip side is that George T. Lohmeyer Wastewater Treatment Plant (GTL) would be done and the Committee would walk away fairly comfortable with what was going on down there.

Mr. Kwoka indicated that Item #7 could be canceled.

Note: Mr. Lagerbloom left the meeting.

Mr. Orshefsky believed that a lot of progress was made and a lot of that was a function of now having a detailed list of priorities that are focused. The two elements were criticality of the infrastructure with sewer mains being at the top of the list and the other one was chronological as to when and how it needed to be funded. He questioned if the Committee wanted to have a stack of each set or type of recommendations. That is up to the Committee and he thought that was a function of editorial decisions about how things would be presented. The only other thing he would urge staff to accelerate, if they could, the availability of things like the Parking Master Plan, which was going to give another 20 or 30-year view of what the parking needs were in this City. We have water and sewer, parks, facilities are on hold now, parking is on its way, and hopefully, within the next nine months, major pieces of the infrastructure needs would be identified.

Mr. Kwoka thought the recommendations being prepared would give a sense; whereas, a recommendation for the rate structure change was made and unilaterally dismissed. If multiple other recommendations were going to be made that are fundamental to moving forward there has to be some level of compromise in that direction.

Mr. Orshefsky stated that the BAB was able to schedule a Workshop with the Commission about a week ago. He heard a renewed willingness to be open to the concept of spending and to deal with the ad valorem taxing issues. There was a very responsive Commission particularly with respect to deferred maintenance kind of things. That Workshop is available online and was an hour and a half.

Mr. Kwoka questioned if it would be a problem for Ms. Shuster to forward a link to the meeting Mr. Orshefsky was referencing.

Ms. Shuster advised that the meeting was public record and that she would forward a link.

Mr. Verma advised that the Parking Master Plan is expected in June and then information on how the \$200 million was freed up probably could be provided.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if a Venn diagram could be done of the CIP dollars sooner because to shape some of the recommendations, it would be useful.

Mr. Verma believed the last time he asked about that information the numbers were still being finalized because of the budget. He assumed that the work has been substantially completed enough to share.

Mr. Orshefsky stated there was a City Manager's report; it was a budget amendment that dealt

5/22/2018

with allocating the \$200 million. He could not follow what was being done and the piece that was not evident was what allocated dollars have been freed up.

Mr. Stresau questioned what roads were involved other than resurfacing and general maintenance.

Mr. Verma stated that if the pavement structure has deteriorated to a point that resurfacing does not work then they have to go for the reconstruction. When the base material fails resurfacing will work.

Mr. Stresau commented that there was discussion at the Commission meeting the other night and a motion was made to take Las Olas Boulevard off the FDOT right-of-way and return it to the City so they could do crosswalks and change manipulation of what was going on in exchange for rebuilding the intersection at Broward Boulevard and Federal Highway, at Broward Boulevard and 3rd Avenue, at Broward Boulevard and Andrews Avenue, and at Broward Boulevard and 7th Avenue. Apparently, FDOT has determined that the bricks that have been laid were not adequate and need maintenance, which means they need to be pulled up, the surfaces recompact, and the bricks put back down. FDOT is calling the City on it because the City has an obligation to do that and the tradeoff was the piece on the beach and from the Rogers Bridge at the Intracoastal Waterway at 17th Avenue; that the City take over that obligation and maintenance in lieu of and FDOT would redo all four of the intersections. To Mr. Stresau, those intersections are fine except for a few areas where there has been some construction and the bricks were not adequately compacted and put back. It was almost like those four intersections were a signature for Downtown. There is going to be a lot happening on Las Olas Boulevard and he did not see how FDOT decided that those four intersections were below the level of service. When you get to Complete Streets and to what is in the new manual, some of what was done in that location conforms to what FDOT has put in their general guidelines for Complete Streets, which is not just going back and paving everything brand new.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if that was what they were proposing.

Mr. Stresau stated they were going to take all the bricks out and repave.

Mr. Orshefsky questioned if that was consistent with the new manual.

Mr. Stresau stated that Diana Alarcon told him that while the manual has all sorts of new information that the new people at FDOT are not following the manual.

Mr. Verma questioned what was going to be the major item for next month's agenda other than providing the information requested.

Mr. Kwoka believed the major items were going to be coming to conclusion on an executive summary and these recommendations.

Mr. Orshefsky added talking about how to prepare for the Workshop if a date can be scheduled.

Mr. Kwoka requested Ms. Shuster to ask about a Workshop again.

Mr. Ostrau mentioned a discussion of the City Attorney's opinion.

Mr. Kwoka stated that was also a priority item for him as well.

Mr. Stresau mentioned that in reading Mr. Zeltman's information and then their information that it was a different scope.

Mr. Zeltman agreed.

Mr. Kwoka stated that they have a certain guideline to follow; they are bidding from other people so they are going to give exactly what the County asks for.

Mr. Verma requested that information go through Ms. Shuster as a central point so there is enough time to distribute.

7. New Business

A. Joint Workshop with City Commission (dates TBD)

Ms. Shuster informed the Committee that a date has not been determined as of yet; however, it is not expected until after the summer break.

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

This was discussed above in Item #5.

8. Public Comments – None.

9. Adjournment – Next Regular Meeting –June 4, 2018

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:59 p.m.

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