City of Coral Gables City Commission Meeting
Agenda Item F-6 and I-2
November 12, 2019
City Commission Chambers
405 Biltmore Way, Coral Gables, FL

City Commission
Mayor Raul Valdes-Fauli
Vice Mayor Vince Lago
Commissioner Pat Keon
Commissioner Michael Mena
Commissioner Jorge Fors

City Staff
City Manager, Peter Iglesias
City Attorney, Miriam Ramos
City Clerk, Billy Urquia

Public Speaker(s)
Ramon Castella
John Kilbowie
George Volsky

Agenda Items F-6 and I-2 are related [0:00:00 p.m.]

A Resolution of the City Commission of Coral Gables, Florida directing the City Manager and City Attorney to proceed with preliminary analysis and preparation, community engagement, project scoping, and to schedule one or more workshops on or before early April 2020 in connection with the potential citywide conversion of overhead utilities to underground utilities.
(Sponsored by Vice Mayor Lago)

Presentation regarding ballpark estimate for the undergrounding of utilities.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Alright. Now, we have a 2 o'clock time certain. Resolution directing the City Manager and City Attorney to proceed with preliminary analysis in preparation, community engagement project scoping and schedule one or more workshops before April 2020 in connection with the potential citywide conversion of overhead utilities to underground.

City Attorney Ramos: And Mr. Mayor, that goes along with I-2, which will come first. I'm going to ask the City's consultant, Mr. Ramon Castella, to please come up and give us the presentation regarding the Underline, and then you have the resolution for your consideration, sir. Undergrounding, not underlining, sorry.

(LAUGHTER)

Ramon Castella: Good afternoon.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Good afternoon.

Mr. Castella: Ramon Castella with Stantec. We're going to put…

City Attorney Ramos: Yeah, there it is.

Mr. Castella: So -- good afternoon, again. A couple of months ago, a few months ago, we had the workshop with the -- you, the Commission, the Mayor, to discuss initial steps for looking at undergrounding. As you recall, it was over at the building next door. You directed us to get the ballpark estimates from the utilities, which we have. And the next slide, please. So, we're going to discuss briefly the team that's been working on this, the history of the discussions that the City has had over the years on undergrounding just for the benefit of the public, the City's basic electrical system, the current infrastructure within the City. Then the little bit about the undergrounding, taking a look at the comparison between undergrounding and overhead. Then we'll present the summary, the ballpark estimates, which we've now have from the utilities, some

-- discuss some additional savings costs and factors and look at an overall cost analysis and comparisons to other projects that have been done. And then we'll go into recommended next steps and a brief timeline. So, on behalf of the City, you have, of course, this project has been spearheaded by your City Manager and your City Attorney and their staffs' assistance, have been working diligently with us. I, myself, Ramon Castella, I'm with Stantec. We're a global engineering firm, but more importantly, we've been working with the City of Coral Gables for the last 25 years on a variety of different projects. We've done several underground conversion projects. Nothing as large as this is. Nobody has done one as large as this. And we're working with Jeff Bartow, Hamptons Group. He's an expert in government affairs and utility matters. A little history going back a few years, since at least 1992, after Hurricane Andrew, the City has been looking at possible conversion of the FPL system in particular. In 2004, 2005, several storms hit or affected South Florida, including a few that directly hit Coral Gables, Katrina and Wilma. There was a utility service reliability task force that was set up back then and did some work on potential relocations. And finally, in 2017, Hurricane Irma caused extensive power outages here in the City. And there was a resolution to -- asking us to prepare a report on conversion, which we did. Following up on that this year, there was a workshop that I mentioned at the beginning that was held to look at -- a fresh look at the costs and then you directed us essentially to go back to the utilities, get ballpark estimates, and then essentially, that would be the next step. And that's why we're here today. So when you look at the a utility system that feeds the City, you have -- looking at the slide behind me, you have the power plant going to a transformer that steps up the voltage, takes it on the high voltage transmission lines to different parts of the City. Then it goes to a substation where the voltage is stepped down. And then from there, it goes out to distribution throughout the community to everybody's homes and businesses and so forth. The project that we're talking about is essentially from the substations out. Everything behind that is very robust infrastructure and it's feeding the whole city, and that's really not what we're doing. We're burying everything after the substations. That's the project. So, within the City, you have most of the telephone, cable and power all mounted on primarily FPL-owned poles throughout the City. A lot of them are, as you know, in rear yards. FPL has a total of 24,000 customers tied to those 13 substations that ring the City, that feed it. Within the City, there's 12,000 single family homes

that are tied in, 2,000 multifamily and 1,600, essentially, non-residential/commercial. Because of the way the City was developed over time, north of Sunset, there's a lot of overhead, south of Sunset, it's mostly underground. So, we looked at some pros and cons, if you will, of what it would mean to underground. And it really boils down to a question of cost benefit, paying for this, but increasingly -- significantly increasing the reliability of the system. And I'm not going to go into all the detail here, but there's, you know, how long is it acceptable for the system to be down after hurricane is a big question or just during non-storm days, or thunderstorms or so forth. What is the long-term aesthetic benefit of taking down these lines and letting trees grow where they can. The fact that the customers, the residents of the City do not have to buy and maintain generators. There's life and safety issues. When the power's down, you lose, of course, your traffic lights, your streetlights. You have downed power lines that could potentially injure or kill people. Running generators itself can be dangerous. And you lose life-sustaining equipment and -- obviously, in hospitals or whatever, if they don't have generators, but also, in homes. And the problems that we have with the last hurricane, not here, but in other places in Florida where a nursing home had a problem with heat stroke and so forth, and a couple of losses of life. There's a positive effect on property values when lines come down. It's been proven to be at least 5 percent in projects that we've been involved in. And then there's a positive effect on attracting new businesses if the system is hardened and businesses see that as a positive if they're thinking about moving in. So, this could be a big game changer as far as, the continuity after a storm and the aesthetic of the City, including the arboreal plan that would include no lines up to mess with that. There's also a potential to go with all fiber for the communication, which it's currently a mix of copper and fiber, and we'll go into that in a minute. And really, the big question and the big impact is the cost. I mean, typically, what we presented last time and we'll present today, we estimated about $25,000 per property, which is a substantial cost. And then the, you know, challenges that creates. So -- and it -- but it boils down to is it's an issue of reliability, safety and aesthetics versus cost, and of course, all the disruption and inconvenience that comes with a project of this size. Just a look at what some of these systems look like. There's a typical area where things are buried. You see transformers and stuff on the ground as opposed to just here near Miracle Mile in the alleys where you see everything above, including the transformers in the air and so forth. When

you go underground, there's also some large equipment that needs to be housed. Typically this is done in parks and medians and areas where landscaping could shield it. And of course, you got your -- every property has to be fed. On the left here, you can see a typical home being fed from above down to an electrical meter. And on the right is a typical underground service where you have the same thing, but it's coming up from the ground into the meter. And this is stuff that would stay. You have the high voltage transmission lines on the left. This is one of the installations that exists down Ponce de Leon Boulevard, parallel to US-1, and a typical substation. All that would stay above ground. It would be from the substation out to all the community where everything would be buried. So, getting into the ballpark estimates, we -- these have not been negotiated in any way. We've just spoken to the utilities. We've kind of gone over some of the ground rules and how they would break down their costs and so forth. And these are rounded to the nearest million. You have Florida Power and Light at 120 million, and that would be inside the City limits. But we also asked them, what's the cost outside the City limits to get you to the substations? That's another 21 million. We feel it's critical that you do go to the substations, that way you're much more -- you're increasing the reliability of your system much more because you're not relying on a little piece of overhead line from the borders of the City to the substations. We're burying -- we're recommending everything we've buried from the substation out. So, that's 141 million minus a 25 percent discount for projects such as this takes you to $106 million, essentially, for FPL. AT&T, they gave us a couple of scenarios. The one that we're really leaning towards is scenario two, which is conversion of the entire system to a fiber system instead of fiber and copper, which is what you have today. There's a lot more logistics involved with that about converting every single property. But long-term, that's really where the City should be. And Comcast came in at 15 million. So, those are the basics of the ballpark estimate. There's other things that go into this. You know, we still have to optimize, project engineer and negotiate, you know, these improvements. These are generally worst-case scenarios, the ballparks that we just presented. So, we do see, should you move forward with this in the future, that those numbers are likely to come down as we optimize things, group things, and you start to get some scale in there that drives the costs down. So, in general, we think -- we thought the AT&T estimate was very high compared to what we thought it was going to be. That's the only one that kind of surprised

us a little bit. Um, there's other additional costs and factors which they didn't include that we do have to include in the overall number. One of them is restoration. You know, when you're doing all this digging and you're damaging landscaping and sidewalks and everything else, that has to be restored and patched up. You got trenching and backfilling, even though a lot of this should -- would be done with trenchless installation methods, which are a lot less disruptive. And then you have the conversion of each individual drop, you know, to each house which are not included in those numbers that they gave us. Any easements that have to be procured, which there'll be some, that's not included. And overseeing and administering the -- and inspecting the project is not included in there also. So, if -- going to other projects that we've been involved in or other projects have been done over the last, you know, 10 or 15 years and brought to today's dollars, the average on these projects has been about $20,000 per visit per property and another 3 to $5,000 to bury the service line overall. And that's pretty close to what we found overall when we put the ballpark estimates together with some numbers that we see that we might get some efficiency and we're looking at about 250 to 275 million, which is consistent with what we discussed at the last presentation, which works out to about $20,000 per home or per property, plus the service drop cost that has to be converted in most cases. That's another 3 to $5,000. So, overall about $25,000 per property. And if you annualize it over 20 years with some interest, that works out to about $1,500, more or less, per property per year. So, those are the overall numbers. Here's some recommendations that we see as the next steps and some timeframes. So, we've basically, you know, you know what the costs are going to be, and these are probably a lot -- there's a lot more certainty behind them. You know, we did -- we -- the ones we did before were more -- kind of just based on areas and so forth. Here, this is actually incorporating costs from our utility partners. And so, the next step would be to, you know, once you -- you've got to figure out how it's going to be paid for and how each property would be affected. So, the preparation of a strategy -- a potential strategy, should it move forward, for how these assessments would be assigned to each property because you have some areas that are already underground but would still receive a general benefit of having the whole community underground, and the resilience and continuity of the whole community. There's a benefit that the property receives, but it's not the same as the property that has currently overhead lines in the area, which would receive an additional benefit.

So, figuring out how that would be fairly assessed and legally defensible in a legally defensible way would be a good first. Oh, one of the first steps, prepare a stakeholder, public outreach, if you will, and it would include some renderings of what things would look like so people can see it, so it was, you know, good for people to see what you're talking about. And a series of newsletters, websites, you know, community meetings with community groups or certain areas that would take place over a series of months to get a good feeling from the community what the folks think. Additional negotiations with the utilities as far as potential phasing and doing things in a way that would kind of, again, if you, economies of scale, drive down costs. And then after a series of these steps take place over the next four to five months, we recommend, then it will come back here to the City Commission, sometime in April, at least to one meeting, maybe two, where all this would be discussed. And the -- you would have the benefit of all the community's feedback and all the additional negotiations with the utilities to see how we can align things better and get and drive costs further down. And at that point, the City Commission would take a look at it and decide whether this is something you and the community want to move forward with. And if so, the ballot could be -- this could be included in August -- in the August ballot, which -- for the County -- that the County would host, and you would have enough time then to prepare the language and get it on the ballot in time for that. So --which would be August 18. That's a date that's been prescribed by -- for the vote. After that, if the voters approve it, there's a bunch of things that need to be done. And from -- oops, sorry. From number nine down, they're not necessarily in order, but they would all need to be done. Several of these could be done concurrently. First of all, you would have to provide -- get the funding, the bonding of, you know, how to pay for this. I mean, ultimately, the property owners will pay for it over 30 years, but somebody needs to pay for it to get it built in 10 years or whatever it is. So, the financing, figuring out best practices for communicating with the community about progress on the project as it moves forward, getting your easements, seeing how it affects your arborist or your arboreal plan for the City and taking that into account and making it better, uh, you know, you have to pay the utilities to actually engineer these things and work with whoever is going to be leading this for you to get it designed and into buildable packages. Getting your binding estimates from the utilities. They're not going to give us a binding estimate for the whole thing. They're going to give us binding estimates per

phase, as we go forward. So, working with them to do that. And you know, once they give them to you, it's only good for 180 days. So, you know, there's a time element involved there. Then you go -- entering in your contracts for design and construction and then, finally getting it built. We anticipate this will take at least 20 phases, maybe more. It's going to take probably ten years. That's what Palm Beach is estimating for their system, which is smaller than this one. And it'll be, again, financed over a 20- to 30-year period. So, in a nutshell, that's where we're at. I mean, we've basically -- you've passed the first gate, which was, you know, get into the study phase of this and getting a good handle on what you're getting into. Now, you're considering going past that gate to the second gate, which is take it out to the community, get a real good feedback from a broad base of whether this is something the community wants or not and how to make it better because they're going to come back with a bunch of ideas of things that we -- none of us have thought of, and you know, how to make things better and you can take into consideration moving forward. And then ultimately, if that's -- after all that public education and education of us by the public, we would go back -- come back here and decide whether you want to actually take it as a formal vote to spend hundreds of millions of dollars going forward. So, that's where we're at. So, if there's any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer it or…

City Attorney Ramos: Commissioners, also, I believe representatives from all three utilities are present to answer questions as well.

Mr. Castella: Yes, they are.

Vice Mayor Lago: Thank you, Ramon. I appreciate that.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you.

Vice Mayor Lago: I just wanted one brief question before we start discussing anything about the second phase. I just want a little bit more clarity in regards to AT&T and why the number was so

significant. Because the limited knowledge that I do have of directional boring and underground utility work -- we usually hire subcontractors to do that in my field. We don't…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: Do that in house.

Mr. Castella: Right.

Vice Mayor Lago: That work usually gets done by the main utility that's…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: Leading the charge, and that would be FPL in this case.

Mr. Castella: Right.

Vice Mayor Lago: Why did AT&T's number come in so much more significantly…

Mr. Castella: Well…

Vice Mayor Lago: Robust than FPL's actually did. I find it interesting.

Mr. Castella: Yeah, I mean, like I said, we found it surprising that their number's so high. And we did discuss it with them. They said a lot of it has to do with -- well, initially, because they were running double systems, the copper and the fiber. And we said, well, give us an alternate, where it's just the fiber, and that was actually the lower number, and that's the number that we used. But it's still quite a bit higher than we originally had thought. Part of it is, again, ballpark estimates are, by nature, higher than -- you know, there's lots of fluff factors in there. So, I think that might

be part of it. You know, when these -- when AT&T, and for that matter, the other utilities get into it, they're going to see that, well, if we hire one contractor to put in the three conduits at once, it's going to be a lot cheaper than having, you know, each one do it and that kind of thing. So, there's going to be plenty of ways that we can optimize this thing and it'll affect -- AT&T's number, you know, will definitely come down. And like I said, we're going to be undergoing -- if we decide to move forward -- negotiations with the company about, you know, how can we get this? Maybe they'll do an actual design on a little pilot area and see what the costs really are as opposed to…

Vice Mayor Lago: These numbers always come down when you have a preconstruction phase…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: You're able to get -- peg down a design…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: And then move forward on that, you know, you always see the number significantly come down and you value engineer them, you can do a constructability analysis and you find out…

Mr. Castella: Exactly.

Vice Mayor Lago: Where you stand. And there's really an opportunity then to start kind of cutting down, you know, how do you -- where do you place a conduit? What's the easiest way? Where do you trench…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: How do you avoid the most factors that drive up costs?

Mr. Castella: Yep.

Vice Mayor Lago: I agree with you. I just found that very interesting that that number was so…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: Pricey.

Mr. Castella: Yeah. It was very much beyond what we've seen on other projects.

Vice Mayor Lago: Is that -- when you look at Palm Beach, I mean, again, similar -- that's a coastal community.

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: Did they have similar situations where that price was also so much significantly higher than what was expected?

Mr. Castella: No, not to my knowledge.

Vice Mayor Lago: Okay. Because I want to use that as a litmus test.

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

City Attorney Ramos: Vice Mayor, they're present if you wish to ask questions of them directly.

Vice Mayor Lago: Well, yeah, I would love to. I mean, if they want to come up and address my question. I'd love to hear from our partner.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Let's focus on the process.

Vice Mayor Lago: Yeah.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: And not necessarily the cost. Let's focus on the process.

Vice Mayor Lago: How are you, sir? Thank you for coming, by the way. I appreciate that. I know it's very early in the stage. I know it's very preliminary, but just simple question that I, you know, just…

John Kilbowie: So, the cost is high. Why is the cost high?

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Excuse me. Could you speak into the microphone?

Vice Mayor Lago: Give your name and (INAUDIBLE).

Mr. Kilbowie: My name is John Kilbowie. I work for AT&T, area manager for South Dade.

Vice Mayor Lago: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Kilbowie: So, the cost is high. Why is it high? The reason it's high is because all the customers that we serve, right, you may have one building, but that one building, even that one house can serve two or three customers. Each customer can have its own drop. Okay, so then that already adds. When you have FPL and you have Comcast, it's just one wire coming down and it's stemming out of the wire. What do we have? Our lines are more complex. We have dedicated lines for each customer pretty much from the central office all the way to the customer. It's a dedicated line, whether it be fiber or copper. Each one of those got to be spliced individually, okay. So, then that adds to the cost. A lot of our costs is labor. You know, copper cable, you can

pretty much get on the internet and find out what copper cable costs, you know, what size you want, fiber, all that stuff. The rest of it is the actual engineering behind it and the actual to design the job, right, and the actual service to the customer is more complex.

Vice Mayor Lago: I just -- the reason why I bring it up, and I don't want to belabor the point anymore, I just was caught off guard that since you're not doing any of the directional boring or actually digging, most of it's being handled by FPL…

Mr. Kilbowie: Correct.

Vice Mayor Lago: I just thought it would be cheaper. That's just my -- you know, I've never laid fiber, so I didn't know.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you, sir.

Vice Mayor Lago: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Let's -- any questions on the process and his presentation? What is the next step for us?

City Attorney Ramos: So, if you move forward with adopting the resolution that's on the agenda today, the next steps would be for staff to go out and start to engage the community, whether it be through polls or community meetings, and then have a series of workshops with the Commission in March and early April in anticipation of potential ballot language at the April 28th, or very latest, May 12th meeting so that we could make the August agenda, if that's the Commission's wish. Also, you'll have to determine as you look to ballot language, whether you wish for the referendum to be binding or non-binding, and what percentage you're going to have guide your efforts, whether it's a super majority or a 51 percent or something in between.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Alright. Any comments on the City Attorney's comments? And if not, maybe we should address -- I mean, we should direct staff to start the community meetings, community engagement, and you know, to start discussing this because I think it's something that should be discussed.

Vice Mayor Lago: I agree with you. I think it's -- like again, I think we've all on this Commission have been very clear that this has to go to a referendum, so we can discuss this as -- you know, until we're blue in the face and we can get as much community input, which I think is important through town halls and whatever we can to get people to be engaged in the process, run a poll, do active community outreach. But at the end of the day, I think it has to deal with the fact -- and I think Commissioner Mena mentioned it 50 times, and that is that we need to have a reference on this issue, either super majority or not, that'll be decided. But I think we need to have as much community engagement as possible, if we move forward from this step and my colleagues want to move forward with the resolution that I have on the agenda today.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Commissioner Keon.

Commissioner Keon: No. I think it's a good idea. I know you spoke in here about as we -- I think before you go out to the public to start speaking with them, I think you should address this issue where you have so many of your properties south of Sunset…

Mr. Castella: Yeah.

Commissioner Keon: That have already had their lines buried, so…

Mr. Castella: Yeah, Commissioner. And that's why…

Commissioner Keon: You're not going to be addressing this equally among all residents. Some will be affected by this and you have large communities -- or some communities that won't be

affected by it at all. So, you know, whether or not, you know, people are going to vote for something that will cost them that won't be a benefit to them personally, I have no idea. You'll find out. But I think it would be a good thing to give some thought to that issue of where the undergrounding is going to be, who is going to be affected by it and how you will maybe address those communities. You know, you need to decide whether, if it's for part of the City, it's for all the City. If you decide that it's for those parts of the City that don't have it and they're the ones that are going to vote. I think those details should be worked out before you go to public meetings because I think it's going to be a question that's going to be asked and we should have an answer. So, other than that, I think it's -- and even in the downtown, you know, you take that separately. You know, do you consider the downtown and the commercial districts of the City, you know, differently than you do the residential community and you do the property owners in the downtown. So much of that has already been -- sorry, so much of that has already been undergrounded. So, you know, and how you look at and how you deal with that. You know what I'd also like to see from us before we go out is where the substations are located that serve the City of Coral Gables. I mean, I know there's this one over here in Douglas. There's one in South Miami. I don't know where the one is that serves the Grove. I really -- I don't know. So, you know, we're really looking at where, you know, how long and how far that is. So, like a map of the substation. I'm sure it does. So maybe you could provide us with a map, of the substations.

Mr. Castella: : Yeah, the map exists.

Commissioner Keon: I'm sure it does.

Mr. Castella: : Yeah.

Commissioner Keon: So, if maybe you could provide us with a map of the substations that serve -- service, the City of Coral Gables.

Vice Mayor Lago: There's one on Bird Road. There's one on Ponce, right next to the University of Miami.

Mr. Castella: : Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: Those are the main two. But to the Commissioner's point, I think when we have that conversation with the residents and we go to listen -- we're going to do a lot of talking, but we should do a lot of listening, which I think is important. People need to understand that just because you're neck of the woods has undergrounding, your power will go out because the neighboring community doesn't have it. And until that neighboring community gets power back -- case in point, I lost power. And I've said this a dozen times when we've talked about this. I lost power two days before the hurricane as a result of somebody testing a generator and having a faulty reaction. So, just because you have undergrounding doesn't mean that you're not going to be affected. You are going to be affected because the neighboring community, when they lose power, you won't get it back until that neighboring community has power.

Mr. Castella: Right.

Vice Mayor Lago: So, you could be in a situation where you could be out of power for three weeks.

Mr. Castella: Right, and there's nothing wrong with your system.

Vice Mayor Lago: So -- and I understand and it's a valid point that a person -- you have to make them understand that, and you know, in a very rational way using science and using, you know, a very cohesive explanation to explain to them that, again, just because you have power -- just because your system is underground doesn't mean that you're never going to lose power. That's not the way that it works.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Okay. I think a motion to -- I mean, directing the City Manager and staff to present a plan to us for discussion at the next meeting.

Vice Mayor Lago: So moved.

City Attorney Ramos: Okay. So, we have a resolution in the book -- on the agenda. We have a resolution on the agenda that we should vote on. And if there's further direction to staff, we should take that separately.

Vice Mayor Lago: Well, the only issue about -- the only issue that -- I think we have one meeting next month, right?

City Attorney Ramos: Yes.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: So, we wouldn't be back until -- it's either next meeting or in January, so whatever staff feels comfortable with.

City Attorney Ramos: If you want something to come back to you.

Vice Mayor Lago: Yeah, yeah. I'm saying if that's what the will of the Commission is. If that's the will of the Commission and they're interested in embarking in this process after this legwork…

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: I think we should embark on this process, yeah.

Vice Mayor Lago: I think it's a good idea. I mean, if we don't -- we're not going to be asking or signing a contract with any of the three utility companies into a pre-construction agreement. I

want to make sure that staff is okay with it, with coming back at the next Commission meeting with a plan of action in regards to a public outreach campaign.

City Attorney Ramos: Okay. So, we could do that, but I think the first step is to vote on this reso.

Vice Mayor Lago: Okay, we can do that.

City Attorney Ramos: Which moves that process forward.

Vice Mayor Lago: Perfect.

City Attorney Ramos: And then you can direct staff to come back and show you their PR process at the December…

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Okay.

City Attorney Ramos: 12th meeting or whatever.

Vice Mayor Lago: So moved.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Second?

Commissioner Keon: Seconded.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Will you call the roll, please?

Commissioner Mena: Yes.
Commissioner Fors: Yes.
Commissioner Keon: Yes.

Vice Mayor Lago: Yes.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Yes.

(Vote: 5-0)

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: And now the next one directing staff. Do I hear a motion?

Vice Mayor Lago: So moved.

Commissioner Mena: What are we looking for…

Commissioner Keon: What are we directing them to do?

Commissioner Mena: From staff?

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: We're asking them to prepare a plan of public disclosure, public dissemination and bring it to us for us to discuss, supplement, you know.

Commissioner Keon: All those issues, right.

Vice Mayor Lago: Educational campaign.

Commissioner Keon: I would just like you to address the issue of where there is already currently undergrounding and whatever else in that plan.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Okay.

Commissioner Keon: Okay.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Will you call the…

Commissioner Keon: I'll move it.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: It's been moved and seconded. Will you call the roll, please?

Commissioner Fors: Yes.
Commissioner Keon: Yes.
Vice Mayor Lago: Yes.
Commissioner Mena: Yes.
Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Yes.
(Vote: 5-0)

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you very much. Very good presentation.

Vice Mayor Lago: Yeah, Ramon. Thank you. Thank you for your support.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Yes?

(COMMENTS MADE OFF THE RECORD)

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Fill a card and I will call you, yes. Yes, you can come. You can speak. This is George Volsky, please.

George Volsky: Just a couple of minor points. One is the technology. As we all know, technology moves very quickly. We haven't heard whether there is a new technology for undergrounding which is one of the major issues for the future of the City. The second most important thing which I just got this 15 minutes ago is who benefits of it. Of course, we, the owners of property do benefit, but every other company that uses electricity or any other conveyances which are going to be underground -- placed underground -- benefit too. We don't know how much, for example,

Florida Power & Light spends on updating its very, very, very ancient system. And so, they should contribute and every other company should contribute. This is something which we have to also look into. And of course, I don't know whether there's any help from state or federal governments for something like this. It's something which I haven't heard. But this is very serious and very complex issues. But then again, when I said about who benefits, let me give you one example. About, I would say, less than a year ago, Comcast -- I had a Comcast problem with my house, which on my block I was the only customer of Comcast. As a result of that, they had to change a cable from a post on my street, which is Alhambra on one block from the end of the block. It must have cost them tens of thousands of dollars to improve my TV reception. With undergrounding, they wouldn't do it. They wouldn't have to do it. So, in other words, they save money. What I'm saying is that by placing the onus on property owners, we are subsidizing, in effect, all the companies which would have to bear the cost of maintaining in case of hurricanes, which obviously are going to happen, repairing equipment, which otherwise with undergrounding, they may have some costs, but because would be much smaller. This is something which we ought to be thinking of and passing some of the cost from house owners to those companies.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you, George.

Mr. Volsky: Thank you.

Vice Mayor Lago: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Volsky: And (INAUDIBLE) says and we'll see what happens. But it is certainly necessary.

Mayor Valdes-Fauli: Thank you, George.

Mr. Volsky: Thank you.