

DRAFT
MEETING MINUTES
BROWARD METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
METRO TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING AND
CONSTRUCTION COOPERATIVE (MTECC)
100 WEST CYPRESS CREEK ROAD
6TH FLOOR, SUITE 650
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA 33309-2181
THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 2024, 9:00 A.M.

Members

Chair Andrea McGee, Vice Mayor of Pompano Beach
Vice Chair Caryl Shuham, Commissioner of Hollywood
Tim Fadgen, Councilmember of Plantation

Staff / Also Present

Lowell Clary, MTECC Executive Director
Matthew Pearl, MTECC General Counsel
Christopher Bross, MTECC Contracting Officer
Christine Fanchi, MTECC Program Management Consultant
Julia Ronquillo, MTECC Administrative Support
Jessica Rubio, Florida Department of Transportation
Sabrina Aubery, Florida Department of Transportation
Victoria Peters, Florida Department of Transportation
William Cross, Broward MPO Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Programming
Andrew Riddle, Broward MPO
Paula Prusinski, Broward MPO

REGULAR ITEMS

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Board Member Fadgen, seconded by Vice Chair Shuham, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion made by Vice Chair Shuham, seconded by Board Member Fadgen, to approve. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

ACTION ITEMS

1. MTECC Project Status Update

MTECC Executive Director Lowell Clary reported that two cities, Deerfield Beach and Hallandale Beach, will work directly with the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) to close out technical support for their projects. Two other cities, Coconut Creek and Pembroke Pines, are anticipating bringing tri-party agreements to MTECC in July 2024. Fort Lauderdale has requested support via Resolution, and MTECC expects to take a tri-party agreement to that city once a scope of work has been finalized.

Mr. Clary continued that the tri-party agreement has a base scope for its project with Coconut Creek. MTECC has also developed a bid option scope. The scope will be refined during the design phase and ensures that if prices come in lower than expected, additional light poles can be installed. The design phase will include a detailed lighting study.

In the case of Pembroke Pines, the MPO has completed a concept scope, which was presented to the city in May 2024. Once the scope has been approved at the city level, the tri-party agreement will be developed. MTECC has again prepared a base scope and bid option scope, as the project in question has a tight budget.

Chair McGee asked if MTECC should include language in its contracts which would allow some costs to be “under the contract” but also paid for exclusively by the municipality. Mr. Clary confirmed that the MTECC’s current contracts have this capability built in, particularly in the case of equipment items. Funding would have to be amended into the agreement because MTECC is delivering the project.

The Fort Lauderdale project is larger than the Coconut Creek or Pembroke Pines projects. It is located on 17th Street and will receive funding from a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant. The MPO prepared a conceptual scope with assistance from the City, and Fort Lauderdale adopted that scope by Resolution.

Mr. Clary continued that MTECC received a letter from FDOT on two Local Agency Program (LAP) projects FDOT plans to deliver in fiscal years (FY) 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 for Deerfield Beach and Hallandale Beach. It was clarified that FDOT has provided the cities with access to their library of consultants. This is the extent of FDOT’s support of those projects.

A question was asked regarding the potential risk of having two separate procurement strategies. Mr. Clary replied that the only risk is greater administrative effort to manage additional contracts. There will continue to be individual Task Orders. He added that having two procurement systems is not uncommon, pointing out that a city undertaking a project on its own would have to have separate procurement processes for federal and non-federal grants.

A question was also asked regarding feedback from Deerfield Beach and Hallandale Beach, both of which contributed to MTECC shortly after its creation. Mr. Clary replied that these municipalities were agreeable to the process and have indicated they would like to work with MTECC in the future. He noted that Pembroke Pines has proposed a LAP project in FY 2024-2025 on which MTECC will work closely with both FDOT and the City in order to continue to build its processes.

2. Proposed Fiscal Year 24-25 Budget

Mr. Clary advised that while MTECC's proposed FY 2024-2025 budget appears to be tight, they have advanced \$25,000 per project from the General Fund to the Capital Projects Fund per task order. As more projects come on board, these funds will be reimbursed. The funds cannot be counted until their projects are amended into the budget upon adoption of agreement, at which time the advances will be moved back into the General Fund. The budget will not be adopted until September 2024, and will look very different at that time due to the inclusion of projects.

3. Executive Director's Report

Mr. Clary noted that the Executive Director's Report is included in the members' backup materials.

4. PMC Report

It was explained that agreements with Pembroke Pines and other municipalities have been refined in recent months, and meetings have been held with Oakland Park, which will admit some LAP projects in the future. MTECC will need to work with FDOT to determine if they can offer assistance. He felt PMC could be helpful to that city, as they may be experiencing difficulties at staff level.

Mr. Clary noted that the tri-party agreement is a collaborative process. The goal at this stage is to keep these agreements flexible, as they are at the beginning of a project rather than at a construction agreement stage. As this process moves forward, more details will be added to the agreements. He added that Christine Fanchi of MTECC has done an excellent job working with the cities and FDOT to ensure all elements work together, as well as the projects' budgets.

5. General Counsel's Report

None.

6. Budget to Actual Report

Mr. Clary commented that this report is trending well.

7. Board Comments

A question was asked regarding MTECC's structure, including whether Broward County can become a member. Mr. Clary advised that that this would not be a recommendation in the short term, as the County has its own procurement process and requirements, and there may be conflicts between their process and local participation. It would bring an additional layer of complexity to the organization.

It was explained that this question arose because there may be situations in which projects have components, such as road striping, which would occur on the County side, and coordination of the project as a whole could be helpful. Mr. Clary stated that he did not disagree with this type of coordination, and recalled that there had been discussion of having a member of Broward County Staff participate in the selection of a design team.

There was brief discussion of the possibility of a change in meeting dates in the new fiscal year.

There being no further business at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

NEXT MEETING: July 11, 2024