



CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE

MEETING MINUTES
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
INFRASTRUCTURE TASK FORCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FORT LAUDERDALE EXECUTIVE AIRPORT
RED TAILS CONFERENCE ROOM
6000 NW 21 AVENUE, FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
MONDAY, APRIL 1, 2024 – 2:00 P.M. TO 4:30 P.M.

<u>January-December 2024</u>		<u>Attendance</u>	
Marilyn Mammano, Chair (arr. 2:11)	P	4	0
Peter Partington, Vice Chair	P	3	1
Gerald Angeli	P	4	0
Gregory Barnett	P	1	0
Shane Grabski (arr. 2:03)	P	3	1
James LaBrie	P	4	0
Michael Lambrechts	P	4	0
Marta Reczko	P	3	1
Roosevelt Walters	P	4	0
Ralph Zeltman	P	4	0

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

Staff

Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works -- Engineering
Semele Williams, Senior Administrative Assistant
Jill Prizlee, Chief Engineer
Yvette Matthews, Assistant Director, Office of Management and Budget
J. Opperee, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to the City Commission

None.

1. Call to Order

i. Roll Call

Vice Chair Partington called the meeting to order at 2:01 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

ii. Approval of Agenda

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

iii. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes – March 4, 2024

Motion made by Mr. Walters, seconded by Mr. LaBrie, to accept the minutes with or without changes. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Grabski arrived at 2:03 p.m.

2. Old Business

i. Reimagine City Hall Upcoming Workshop

Sheryl Dickey, president of Dickey Consulting, provided a recap of the March 2024 Reimagine City Hall workshop, which had addressed not only procurement methodology, but financing options as well, including targeting federal grants as well as identifying revenue-generating opportunities.

Vice Chair Partington recalled that some members of the public at the March workshop had asked why the City was constrained to the options provided. He added that a progressive funding method had been previously mentioned, and asked if this was discussed at length. Yvette Matthews, Assistant Director of Management and Budget, stated that the City's Purchasing Director had indicated this funding method presented challenges under the City's Procurement Code and guidelines.

Ms. Reczko advised that at the March 4, 2024 Committee meeting, she had recommended including a progressive design build method as one of the proposed funding methods. This method would allow for costs to be seen immediately while the project is being designed. She asserted that this is a preferred method by other municipalities at present, but acknowledged that the City would have to pass an Ordinance allowing it to be used.

Vice Chair Partington explained that he would like the summary of the March workshop to capture the fact that members of the public had asked why their choices for methods of financing were restricted and did not discuss the progressive design build option.

Chair Mammano arrived at 2:11 p.m.

Mr. Walters requested clarification of what was intended by "revenue-generating," recalling that the Committee had had discussions of possible services that could be provided at City Hall at no charge. Ms. Dickey replied that there had been no discussion of a specific percentage of revenue to be generated.

Chair Mammano commented that during the breakout session, other attendees at her table had indicated they did not want to pay more taxes to fund a new City Hall. Mr. Walters confirmed that he had heard similar feedback from the community as well.

Ms. Dickey addressed the survey results from the March workshop, noting that there have only been 21 responses to that survey thus far. The respondents to the survey were asked to rank their preferred responses regarding the proposed facility. Of the 21, 13 respondents chose maintaining public ownership of the land and building as their highest priority. The second-ranked option indicated that respondents preferred intergenerational equity to pay for City Hall over a term equal to the building's useful life. The third-ranked option recommended financing the total cost of the project.

Mr. LaBrie asked if the top-ranked choice, maintaining ownership of the land and building, would eliminate the public-private partnership (P3) option. Chair Mammano explained that a P3 would mean the City would own the facility and building, although they would not have full control of either until the end of the term.

Chair Mammano expressed concern that it is difficult to draw conclusions based on feedback from only 21 survey respondents. Ms. Dickey stated that her team is seeking more information from the community by contacting homeowners' associations and encouraging responses from their members. Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee ensure the City Commission realizes there has not been a great deal of general public interest in the subject of a new City Hall.

Ms. Dickey advised that today's meeting would allow the Committee to draw on the information gathered from each of the workshops in preparing the final presentation. She reviewed the aspects of City Hall emphasized at previous workshops, as well as potential amenities. Feedback from the most recent workshop included financial and procurement information.

Ms. Dickey continued that the presentation will include boards with information from each of the individual workshops, including information from survey respondents indicating their City Commission Districts and demographic information.

Vice Chair Partington commented that he felt the demographic summary was misleading, as many responses may have come from the same individuals attending multiple workshops. Ms. Dickey acknowledged this concern, but noted that this was the typical method of capturing survey information. Vice Chair Partington suggested that the figures could be marked with an asterisk to indicate the possibility of overlapping responses.

The Committee members discussed how feedback would be provided in the final workshop, including whether or not responses should be weighted and what that information would indicate. It was determined that respondents would be able to show their priorities among the topics discussed throughout the workshops. It was also emphasized again that although the Committee, Staff, and the consultant team had done their best to engage the public, the overall response had been less than what was hoped for.

Mr. Walters asked if the Committee plans to meet again before taking its recommendations to the City Commission. Chair Mammano noted that Staff's preference was to have the recommendation reach the Commission before the beginning of summer.

Mr. Zeltman commented that although Ms. Dickey and City Staff had done everything possible to generate a greater public response, that response had not been what was expected. He did not feel it would be appropriate for the Committee to provide the City Commission with a recommendation based on the small survey samples, or to interpret those responses as representative of the City's overall population. Chair Mammano suggested that the Committee's final report could state that they were unable to ascertain a statistically valid sense of what the public wants.

Vice Chair Partington proposed that the Committee should feel empowered to make recommendations to the Commission, even based upon the limited feedback gathered during the process. Mr. Walters advised that feedback from the final workshop would be key in making a recommendation.

Ms. Dickey concluded that it had been her intent from the beginning to assign some type of ranking to the categories discussed at the individual workshops. The Committee members further discussed how the ranking process at the final workshop would be carried out.

Mr. Walters stated that the Committee would need to determine the top priorities from the workshop process at their next meeting. Chair Mammano asked if the Committee should take the results from a small sample size of survey respondents and make recommendations based on those results. Mr. Walters emphasized that while less than 2% of the City's population may have responded to the survey, the Committee members have discussed all the considerations at length and should address them in their final report to the Commission.

Vice Chair Partington reiterated that the Committee members should combine the available public input with their own personal preferences in the final report. There was consensus among the Committee members to proceed in this way, with Mr. Lambrechts noting that the members have sufficient collective knowledge and experience to make a recommendation.

3. New Business

i. Schedule for ITFAC Draft Recommendations

Chair Mammano asked how Staff plans to present the Commission with the information gathered throughout the workshops. Ms. Matthews stated that the Commission will see the gathered information from the public through the surveys and workshops. They will

also see the Committee's guiding principles. A third component of information from the Urban Land Institute (ULI) may also be provided.

Ms. Dickey continued that the Committee will receive a "wrap-up" report on the series of workshops at their May 2024 meeting. Their joint workshop with the City Commission is tentatively scheduled for June 4. This will give the Committee time to review and digest the information gathered at the workshops.

Vice Chair Partington characterized the proposed date of June 4 as ambitious, pointing out that this timeline may be driven by the City Commission's summer schedule. Ms. Matthews explained that the Commission would like to begin the process before their summer break.

Chair Mammano asked if the workshop report will be finished by the time of the Committee's May 6, 2024 meeting. It was noted, however, that the Committee will need to prepare their draft guidelines for the Commission after the May 6 regular meeting, and that the Committee members may not communicate with one another outside meetings due to the Sunshine Law. This would require a second meeting in May to review the draft guidelines prior to the joint workshop with the Commission.

Motion made by Ms. Reczko, seconded by Mr. Barnett, to call a special meeting on May 20, 2024 at 2 p.m. at Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Mammano concluded that her intent for the final public workshop was not to gather additional information, but to ensure the members of the public who participated in the process have expressed their preferences, which will be provided to the City Commission.

ii. FDEP Warning Letter

Omar Castellon, Assistant Director of Public Works (Engineering), stated that over the last 30 months, the City experienced eight boil water notices and had difficulty passing water sampling tests that followed some of these incidents. As a result, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) has sent the City a warning letter

Mr. Castellon explained that many of the City's pipes are old, which makes it more difficult to get rid of bacteria. Staff is communicating with FDEP to let them know which projects will be prioritized in the areas where they experienced difficulties. Funds will be reshuffled from other projects in order to prioritize the City's water needs.

Mr. Castellon explained that in some types of pipe breaks, water will still flow but bacteria can grow in the pipes. The pipes are then flushed to get rid of bacteria, and water from those pipes is sampled to ensure that the process worked. If the City does not pass this sample testing, it is necessary to close the section of pipe and heavily chlorinate it, after

which it will be tested once more. This has happened on a number of pipes, which drew the attention of FDEP.

Mr. Lambrechts asked why the City has not already prioritized the affected older pipes in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. Castellon advised that if an older pipe breaks, repairing that pipe becomes a priority and the CIP is re-prioritized so that break can be addressed.

Chair Mammano also noted that the City is in the process of conducting a comprehensive review of its water pipe system with the assistance of consultants, and requested an update on the status of this effort.

Mr. Barnett asked if FDEP is asking the City to replace older pipes or to ensure its water quality meets required standards. Mr. Castellon replied that they will need to replace the older pipes where breaks have occurred.

Ms. Reczko requested information about the City's plans to address this need, including how many miles of pipe can be replaced. Mr. Castellon stated that the CityWorks system is intended to map the City's entire pipe infrastructure for both sewer and water, and will indicate the age of the pipes as well as the probability of breaking. This will help identify which pipes are likely to break before others or what kind of maintenance will be necessary for them. He did not have an update on the progress of the CityWorks system at this time.

Vice Chair Partington remarked that he had been surprised by the number of "superchlorination" requests made by the City, which had resulted in the attention of FDEP. He suggested that in the future, the Committee see information on where additional chlorination has been necessary as well as where breaks have occurred, emphasizing that the Committee may be able to help secure funding for this need.

Mr. Castellon recalled that of the last eight breakages, two required superchlorination. Chair Mammano asserted that the Committee should see a list of these incidents from 2023 through 2024 thus far.

Vice Chair Partington asked how impact fees collected by the City are used, suggesting that some of these dollars could be shifted to address the prioritized breakages. Ms. Reczko advised that these fees can only be used to increase capacity, and cannot be used toward regular maintenance of infrastructure.

Mr. Barnett asked if there are ways other than chlorination to minimize bacteria after a break. Mr. Castellon replied that chlorination is the standard method, and can be affected by the length of time necessary to repair the pipe.

Mr. Walters noted that the FDEP letter specifically notes several distribution water mains have exceeded their useful lives. It also states that the City will be subject to fines if the issues are not addressed.

Mr. LaBrie asked what the Public Works Department is doing in terms of long-range planning and maintenance/replacement schedules. Mr. Castellon replied that every year, as part of the annual budget process, the Utilities Department identifies pipes that are experiencing issues. The two Departments meet to review the budget and determine the priority of pipes to be addressed. Once these priorities have been determined, the City will work on those prioritized projects over the next five years.

Mr. Walters observed that the City Commission is not typically willing to inform the public that more money will be needed to maintain its infrastructure.

Mr. Castellon explained that the City develops an annual budget to address pipes which would require a certain amount of funding, which the City Commission does not fully fund. This is not a process that is expected to change. Mr. Zeltman commented that another issue of concern is fire flow protection, which is also affected by the age and condition of the pipes. Ms. Reczko also noted that the condition of the pipes that will connect to the new water treatment plant will affect the quality of the water coming from that facility.

Mr. Castellon advised that he would look into additional information related to the water Consent Order and bring it back to a later meeting.

4. Public Works Update

i. CIP Financial Report

ii. Water & Sewer Breaks Report w/Mapping

5. General Discussion and Comments

i. Committee Members

Mr. Walters recalled that recent Urban Land Institute (ULI) meetings had focused on flooding elevations and the effect of flooding on City roadways. He recalled that at one of these meetings, the ULI's discussion had focused primarily on flooding in the Las Olas area. He requested a copy of the ULI's report on these meetings when it becomes available, noting that some of the City's neighborhoods which are prone to flooding were never discussed at the meetings.

Chair Mammano pointed out that the ULI meetings focused only on tidal flooding in a small area and did not address other issues such as severe rain or storm surge. She felt this limited focus made the meetings less useful.

ii. Public Comments

None.

6. Adjournment – NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING DATE: Monday, May 6, 2024

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

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

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]