

**FINAL**  
**BUDGET ADVISORY BOARD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
City of Fort Lauderdale  
100 North Andrews Avenue  
8<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 33301  
June 16, 2010 - 6:00 p.m.

<b>Board Member</b>	<b>Attendance</b>	<b>10/2009 through 9/2010 Cumulative Attendance</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>A</b>
Keith Cobb, Chair	P	7	1
June Page, Vice Chair	P	8	0
Bud Bentley	A	6	2
Marc Dickerman	P	6	2
Nadine Hankerson [6:12]	P	4	0
Sam Monroe	A	3	5
Fred Nesbitt	P	8	0
Alan Silva	P	8	0
Anthony Timiraos	P	6	2
Ray Williams	P	5	3

**City Staff**

Norm Mason, Staff Liaison, Assistant Budget Director  
Shonda Singleton-Taylor, Acting Director, Office of Management & Budget  
J. Opperlee, ProtoType Services  
Public Works Department:  
Albert Carbon, Public Works Department Director  
Mike Fayyaz, Assistant City Engineer  
Julie Leonard, Public Works/Utilities Assistant Director  
Tom Terrell, Maintenance Facilities Manager  
Peter Partington, City Engineer  
Hal Barnes, Engineering Design Manager

**Guests**

Vice Mayor Romney Rogers

**Communications to the City Commission**

None

**PURPOSE:** To Provide the City with input regarding the taxpayers' perspective in the development of the annual operating budget; to review projections and estimates from the City Manager regarding revenues and expenditures for upcoming fiscal year; to advise the City Commission on service levels and priorities and fiscal solvency; and to

submit recommendations to the City Commission no later than August 15 of each year regarding a budget for the upcoming fiscal year.

**1. Call to Order/Roll Call**

Chair Cobb called the meeting of the Budget Advisory Board to order at 6:00 p.m.

**2. Review of Meeting Minutes from May 19 and May 27, 2010**

**Motion** made by Mr. Dickerman, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the minutes of the Board's May 19, 2010 and May 27, 2010 meetings. In a voice vote, motion approved 7-0.

**3. Public Works Department Presentation**

Mr. Albert Carbon, Public Works Department Director, gave a Power Point presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes for the public record.

**4. Questions and Answers**

Mr. Nesbitt asked how the City could increase recycling, and recycling revenues. Mr. Carbon said the per-ton rate for recycling had been decreasing, but they were negotiating a new price with the Resource Board for the waste-to-energy plant. Once this was accomplished, they would convert to single-stream recycling, which would increase participation by 40 – 50%, resulting in more revenue. This would also reduce the tonnage that went to the waste-to-energy plant.

Mr. Nesbitt asked if the FPL light maintenance contract covered the cost of the program. Mr. Tom Terrell, Maintenance Facilities Manager, explained that it was “about a wash” with the two employees and the electrical for the streetlights, but the City benefited from having the two employees to help out in other areas.

Chair Cobb asked Mr. Carbon about “things that could happen to us that are going to cost you a fortune.” Mr. Carbon stated he worried about deferred maintenance, i.e., buildings that reached their life expectancy, such as the Fire Stations the City was currently replacing.

Chair Cobb asked what type of technological opportunities were coming that would increase efficiency. Mr. Carbon said new lighting strategies, such as LED, would cut costs by being less costly to operate and longer lived.

Mr. Silva asked if the annual cost was the amount that was in the General Fund, and part was reimbursed by other funds, or if this was the true cost to the General Fund net of all the others. Mr. Carbon said almost \$17 million was expenditures and revenues were \$4.1 for a net cost to the General Fund of \$13 million.

Mr. Silva asked, "To what extent do we have fees that go along with their permit processing and packaging ..." Mr. Carbon stated for the land development section, their cost was contained within the building permit, and the revenue was in the building services section; it was not divvied up because it was all General Fund. Mr. Peter Partington, City Engineer, stated the land development section received some income from building permits.

Mr. Silva thought that with WaterWorks 2011 winding down and a reduced CIP level with taxes declining, there would be less need for engineering design, construction and management staff. Mr. Carbon said they had planned on this in WaterWorks, and had not hired utility engineering staff or construction inspectors, but contracted a program manager. He said they were not filling engineers positions and would seek additional grants.

Mr. Silva asked where they had seen savings or decreased costs that could reduce their budget needs next year. Mr. Carbon said on the capital side, they were seeing significantly lower prices. They had estimated the Riverland Road sewer project to cost \$10.5 million and the low bid had come in at \$5.5 million. The top three contractor bids had been \$6.2 million, \$6.3 million and \$6.4 million.

Regarding the NCIP and BCIP, Mr. Silva said it used to be that it was often a long time between the time the application was submitted to actual construction. There also seemed to be a lot of labor involved in small projects. He asked if this delay had been resolved, and if there was a way to encourage pro bono work from the community. Mr. Carbon stated they had utilized pro bono participation for the recent tunnel project, but there were other issues that required time to resolve with the community. Mr. Partington said they City had used engineering and architectural expertise as part of the match for the program, which helped to expedite a project. Mr. Hal Barnes, Engineering Design Manager, stated over the past few years, they had a tremendous push in the design area and currently they were designing and building 2009 grants. From grant initiation to completion was now an 18-month cycle.

Ms. Page asked about services that could be shared with other departments to increase efficiency and save money. Mr. Carbon said they had done a lot of this over the past several years. The Parks Department and the sanitation group did a lot of work at the beach, and they were coordinating better with different staff for less General Fund

exposure. The landscape architect had taken lead with parks plantings so more work was conducted in-house instead of contracting out. They had also worked with the Budget Department to work through the Capital Improvement Program to integrate their offices and expertise.

Mr. Timiraos asked if they had investigated duplication of effort in outdoor maintenance between the Parks Department and Public Works. He was surprised that Public Works, and not the Parks Department, mowed Executive Airport. Mr. Carbon responded that they contracted with the Parks Department for utilities work near pump stations. Regarding Executive Airport, Mr. Carbon explained that the individuals working there must follow FAA and Homeland Security regulations. Mr. Carbon stated their maintenance staff also helped out at the Police and Fire facilities.

Mr. Williams asked if there was a way to get departments to work together to streamline the project process. Mr. Partington stated the development review process had been extensively examined to determine how it could be streamlined. He added that the current process included steps that had been added to correct things that had gone wrong in the past. Mr. Williams said at some point, additional steps were not efficient and they must rethink and redesign workflow. He said there must be opportunities for increasing efficiency. Mr. Partington explained they had a flowchart describing how a project went from inception to completion and they were constantly examining ways the steps could be streamlined.

Mr. Carbon informed Mr. Nesbitt that the City had the contracts and the personnel to respond and protect the City in the event of a major hurricane. They had the emergency contractor, engineer, professional consultant and monitor in place.

Mr. Nesbitt asked if there had been a real cost savings from using contractors. Mr. Carbon said there was a cost savings because of the cost associated with the learning curve for particular work. They also saved on staffing costs by using contractors.

Mr. Silva wondered if it would make sense to focus the CIP to more preventive maintenance rather than create new infrastructure that had to be maintained. Mr. Carbon stated the proposed CIP list had a lot of annual programs to maintain what they had.

## **5. Communication to the Commission**

None

### Other Items

Ms. Singleton-Taylor agreed to send information to the Board prior to their June 30 meeting regarding major changes in expenses and revenues that they were considering in the budget.

Ms. Singleton-Taylor informed Mr. Nesbitt that she had not made a presentation to the City Commission because the document they had submitted was thorough. The Commission had questions regarding building permit fees. Commissioner Roberts had summed up the additional revenue at \$4.8 million. Mr. Nesbitt was glad the Commission was addressing fees because some had not been adjusted since 1995.

Ms. Singleton-Taylor informed Mr. Silva that the Fire Department had not submitted a recommendation to increase the Fire Assessment.

Mr. Williams said they needed to re-engineer some things and the three biggest departments must figure out a better way to provide services to the City. Ms. Singleton-Taylor said looking at things on a cost basis was new for the City and they had already identified areas for improvement.

Mr. Williams noted that the City had grown from 10 departments to 20 departments, and he asked if anyone had considered that this might not be as efficient as it could be and made recommendations. Chair Cobb but felt this would “only come when you get an active City Manager who’s interested in fundamental change.”

Vice Mayor Romney Rogers thanked the Board for their work, and stated it was invaluable. He remarked that this was not a 12-month process; it was a 3-5 year process, and he asked Board members to continue their work.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at **8:15** p.m.

**Next meeting: June 30, 2010**

[Minutes prepared by J. Opperlee, Prototype, Inc.]