

**COMMISSION CONFERENCE****FEBRUARY 4, 2003**

<u>Agenda Item</u>		<u>Page</u>
I-A	Flamingo Park neighborhood - Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Tri-Rail Double Tracking Project	1
I-B	School Board of Broward County Long-Range Facility Master Plan Study - Public Schools	4
I-C	Public Safety (Fire-Rescue and Police) Capital Plan	8
I-D	Community Services Board	11
I-E	City of Hollywood Resolution - Opposition of Annexation and De-annexation Powers Transferred to Broward County	12
I-F	Organizational Climate Employee Survey	12
II-A	E. Clay Shaw (S.E. 17 Street) Bridge Underdeck Parking - Lot Permits and Special Event Lot Rentals	15
II-B	Advisory Board Appointments	15
	1. Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board	15
	2. Board of Trustees, Police and Firefighters Retirement System	15
	3. Budget Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	4. Cemeteries Board of Trustees	15
	5. Code Enforcement Board	15
	6. Community Appearance Board	(Deferred)
	7. Community Services Board	15
	8. Economic Development Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	9. Education Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	10. Insurance Advisory Board	16
	11. Marine Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	12. Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board	16
	13. Nuisance Abatement Board	16
	14. Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board	(Deferred)
	15. Urban Design Core Steering Committee	16
IV	City Commission Reports:	16
	1. Bayview Park	16
	2. Urban Land Institute Study (ULI)	17
	3. Palazzo Las Olas Project	17
	4. Bicycle Advisory Board	17
	5. Airport Expansion	17
	6. Broward Boulevard Landscaping	18
	7. "Adopt A Street" Program	18
	8. Neighborhood Recognition	18
	9. Rock Island Neighborhood	18
V	City Manager Reports	19

Present: Mayor Naugle  
Commissioners Hutchinson, Katz, Moore, and Smith

Also Present: City Manager, City Attorney, and City Clerk  
Sgt. Martin

**I-A – Flamingo Park Neighborhood - Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Tri-Rail Double Tracking Project**

The City Manager stated there had been ongoing discussions with the residents of Flamingo Park, and the District Commissioner, Cindi Hutchinson, had been very involved in trying to see how this matter could be resolved. Representatives from the FDOT and Tri-Rail were invited to today's meeting.

Peter Partington, Public Services, stated that representatives from the Department of Transportation, including the District Secretary, Rick Chesser, were present at today's meeting, along with Dan Mazza, Director of Engineering for Tri-Rail, and representatives of the consultants for Tri-Rail, and a representative of the contractor for the project.

Rick Chesser, District IV Secretary for FDOT, stated that he had met with Commissioner Hutchinson a few weeks ago and that this had been an ongoing issue. He stated there was a railroad and a roadway in one area, and stated that one facility shielded the other. The concerns had been multiple and they stated that as part of the new bridge for the double-tracking for Tri-Rail, they would include a 6' sound absorption wall on the west side of the bridge. They also stated they would look to see if they could do some sound absorption materials on the inside of the bridge in order to absorb some of the train noise. Another issue was landscaping on the west side of the railroad tracks on the road next to the trailer park. The key was that there was 30' of right-of-way from the edge of the tracks to the roadway, and CSX Railroad required 25' of clearance, which only left 5' and that was contingent on moving the tracks further to the west.

Mr. Chesser stated they had also discussed the potential on their roadway resurfacing project to create a glare screen. The other issue they had researched was an attempt to see where the noise was coming from. There was road noise obviously, but a lot of noise emanated from the under side of the bridge, and sound baffling and other measures did not really give them a clear indication. One of their recommendations was to do a study so they could determine better where the noise was emanating from before spending money on any type of retrofitting. If the study recommended some measures, they would suggest through the MPO to prioritize funding for such measures.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked when the short study had been done. Mr. Chesser replied that they had done further research after the meeting and called the various companies that provided sound absorption materials asking what could be sprayed onto the outside structures, what could be installed such as panels, and baffling under the bridge. He stated they were not sure if such remedies would solve the problem since no one could determine the exact source of the noise.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the indepth study would start prior to the double-tracking of the Tri-Rail or would it be after-the-fact since they were presently dealing with car noise, and how long would the study take until completion.

Mr. Chesser stated this involved two different issues. He continued stating that the train bridge included some of the features he had just mentioned and was an ongoing project. Down the road, there would be a resurfacing project on the Interstate. Separate from those two activities, they would recommend doing a study which could occur at any point they wished to begin that would look at the roadway bridge which existed and deal with sound absorption. Mr. Chesser explained that when the bridge was elevated, you blocked a portion of the road, therefore, different treatments would have to be applied to different areas.

Commissioner Smith asked how long the study would take. Mr. Chesser replied he did not know how long it would take.

Paul Lampley, Engineer with the Florida Department of Transportation, stated they had been working on this issue for over one year. He stated they had the profile of both the Tri-Rail and the new Tri-Rail Bridge that would go over the South Fork of the New River, and the I-95 Bridge. He proceeded to show a map of the site.

Mr. Lampley explained that for over 1900 feet in the Flamingo Park neighborhood, the Interstate would be blocked from view by the new bridge. He stated it would be a 2' 8" safety shake barrier wall with a 3' carsonite glare screen attached to the top. He explained the Tri-Rail Bridge would have a 6' noise wall attached to it. He further stated that Tri-Rail was going to use a welded steel rail which provided a 5 decibel noise reduction, and also used a ballasted track on a concrete structure with exception of a through girder would also be ballasted. He continued stating that DOT in partnership with Tri-Rail had committed \$1.35 Million to provide a noise wall on the west side of the Tri-Rail Bridge for the community. They also had committed to putting sound absorption material on the inside of the noise wall being constructed on the west side of the tracks.

Mr. Lampley explained further that the glare screen would be installed on I-95 and I-595 in 3' panels. The noise wall would be placed on the Tri-Rail structure itself which would be a 6' concrete wall. Other things they had looked at involved a spray-on material which could be put on existing walls for the Interstate which would cost about \$1.2 Million. Another product was Sound-Sorb which could be tiles mechanically attached to the wall which also would cost about \$1.2 Million. Another possibility was to plant vegetation between the rail corridor and I-95, but because of clear zone requirements they would be limited.

Judy Sadler, Treasurer of the Flamingo Park Homeowners Association, stated that their neighborhood was dramatically impacted by the sounds from I-95 and I-595, along with the noise from the trains. She explained that it was a multiple problem and they looked at this as an opportunity to mitigate existing noise. She stated that the Environmental Assessment Report, which had been done for this project, was woefully lacking in that it did not address any noise coming from aerial structures and how it impacted the area. She further stated it did not address the train noise from engines or wheels going uphill and downhill, and ignored the fact that it was a 55' aerial structure. Therefore, they felt this report was greatly flawed. She stated that when the wind blew from the east, northeast, and southeast it was unbearable. She asked the Commission to help their neighborhood to get some mitigation, and stated she was uneasy about a study being done after the project was built. She explained they preferred an 8' wall on the I-595 feeder so they would not see or hear the traffic, and a 12' wall on the new train structure to block the noise and view of the train. She stated they realized they would not get everything they wanted, and might not get anything, but they did desire some mitigation. She also felt they should receive information as to what the increased noise would be and an estimate of aerial noise.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 2:18 p.m.

Pat Fian asked who was the lead agency since the bridge had been taken out of Segment V and was not going to be funded by the FTA. Mr. Chesser stated it was not actually out of Segment V, but involved a different contractor. He explained it was still part of the widening of the Interstate and was being funded by the DOT. He also stated that it was still being administered by Tri-Rail.

Mr. Fian asked why FTA was still the lead agency even though they no longer were providing funding. He explained that their noise criteria was lower than the State's criteria. He asked if they could have a copy of the revised Environmental Study, and a copy of the Joint Partner Agreement between Tri-Rail and FDOT. Mr. Fian explained that the study they had reviewed showed no noise on a concrete and steel bridge. He stated further that steel acted as a harmonic effect and made the noise worse.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 2:19 p.m.

Mr. Fian asked what class this project was in.

Mayor Naugle asked Mr. Chesser if Mr. Fian could be supplied the requested information. Mr. Chesser confirmed.

Commissioner Hutchinson requested that Mr. Chesser commission the study as soon as possible. She stated a lot hinged on the noise as it related to the highway which was one of the area's biggest issues. She reiterated that she did not want the study done after the project or during construction, but requested that it be done now.

Mr. Fian requested that when the study was done, they needed to take the wind into consideration.

Mayor Naugle asked why the wall was only going to be 6 feet. Mr. Chesser replied that a study had been done regarding height and the reduction of noise, and a 6' wall had a 7-10 decibel range reduction, and an 8' wall had an approximate 10 decibel range. He explained that once you went higher than 8', you would have to redesign the structure due to additional weight. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if it would carry an 8' wall. Mr. Chesser stated it would carry up to 8', but the higher walls did not see any greater reduction than 10 decibels. Mr. Chesser explained they were doing an 8' wall because it stated a range of 7 to 10 decibels.

Commissioner Smith asked what the additional 2' of wall would cost. Mr. Chesser stated that he was not sure if they had the answer to that question. He asked if they could review this and see if it was possible.

Dan Mazza, Tri-Rail Director of Engineer and Construction, explained they had talked to the contractor and were told that to go 2' to 4' on the wall would double the price. He stated that the 6' wall would cost \$1.3 Million. Commissioner Hutchinson asked how much this project was going to cost. Mr. Mazza stated the total cost was \$53 Million.

Mayor Naugle felt they should look at installing an 8' wall.

Elizabeth Hayes stated that she lived in the neighborhood across from Flamingo Park and proceeded to ask if they were going up in height on the bridge section, how much further would the noise radiate beyond Flamingo Park. She felt this was something their neighborhood needed to consider.

Dan Dobler, noise expert from PBS&J, stated that a decision had been made early in the process which was a technical issue in regard to the aerial structure. He stated there was an adjustment within the noise methodology which had been used specifically for an aerial structure. They chose not to implement it in the evaluation because it only increased the noise level to .3 decibels, which was inconsequential. In retrospect, there was a large public outfall and they should have implemented it.

Mayor Naugle asked for a further clarification of Mr. Dobler's statement. Mr. Dobler explained that the methodology used to evaluate train noise was within a document of data used by FTA to determine how much noise was generated by a certain amount of trains under certain conditions. Within the procedure, one of the adjustments which could be applied was for an aerial structure, but implementing that there was only a .3 decibel difference between the two. He stated the difference was so small because it was a dynamic noise environment.

Mr. Mazza stated he had spoken with his operations people and stated that people had a perception that trains were similar to diesel trucks. The diesel engine on a train was to direct power and was a DC electric motor which drove the wheels of the train. He further stated that whether the train was on a flat surface or going up a hill, the speed was still at the same level and there would be no noticeable increase in

sound.

Commissioner Smith asked if there was any chance for sound attenuation on private property. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the problem was that commercial property abutted it and the noise went over into the neighborhoods. Dan Dobler stated that a typical rule of thumb used was that you needed approximately 100' of fairly thick vegetation, about 15' high, in order to get a 5 decibel reduction. He reiterated there was a perception issue in this case. He reiterated that vegetation was never pursued as an abatement technique which would reduce noise.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she wanted an 8' wall on the structure, and wanted FDOT to comment on the scope of work. Mr. Partington stated that it was a worthwhile offer from FDOT.

Mr. Chesser stated that when they were making commitments to the neighborhood, they looked to see what other means were available to address noise from the Interstate. Discussion entailed where the noise was emanating from and that was what led to the proposed study to be made before recommendations were proposed. He explained they needed a better analysis for the Interstate portion. He stated the study would either go through a contract they had today or would contract it out as soon as they could.

Mr. Mazza stated they wanted to make this project eligible for FTA funds.

Robert Smith stated that the minimum a human ear could hear was 2 decibels and .3 of a decibel would be undetected. He further stated that a second issue existed which was psycho-acoustics and explained that if you could see it, it would irritate your hearing more. Even though the figures say it would not affect one, it would.

Sanford Rosenthal stated that he liked the idea of the study and possibly the cement wall would not have to be very high and a tunnel effect could be erected instead.

Paul Lampley suggested that Tri-Rail could possibly address the source of the noise because with a 6' wall you were only blocking the rail noise. He explained the exhaust of a locomotive was over 18' high, and in order to block the major source of noise from a train, one would be dealing with the turbines of the engine and an 18' high source.

Mayor Naugle stated that they had been informed that a 6' wall would reduce the noise 7 decibels and an 8' wall would reduce it 10 decibels. He felt it would be worth it for the extra 3 decibels.

Mr. Mazza stated they could request the design contractor to quote a price for adding the 2' to the wall.

**Action:** Resolution to be presented at Regular Meeting in support of an 8 foot wall, and the study to be expedited.

### **I-B – School Board of Broward County Long-Range Facility Master Plan Study - Public Schools**

The City Manager stated that the matter of the long-range facility master plan had been brought before the Commission for discussion, and Leslie Carhart would report on the meeting held with the Education Advisory Board.

Leslie Carhart, Community and Economic Development Department, stated they were following up on this item. She stated that Broward County Public Schools did a standard five-year capital planning initiative and had employed the consulting firm of DeJong & Associates, along with subconsultants to do the additional five-year plan, thereby having a full-blown 10-year plan. She stated that copies of the minutes of the School Board meeting were distributed to the Commission and the reoccurring themes were about concerns of adequacy, planning for future school needs, and the issue of equity. She

proceeded to turn the presentation over to Tom Getz who was the Capital Planning and Program Director for Broward County Public Schools, and Tracy Richter, Associate Planner with DeJong & Associates.

Tom Getz, Director of Capital Planning and Programs for the School Board, stated that in April the School Board entered into a contract with URS Corporation to do a 10-year Facilities Master Plan. He stated the plan dealt with demographics and looking at the need for additional schools and classrooms at existing sites. He explained that the other piece going on simultaneously was the adequacy feature which involved looking at deficiencies in the existing schools and reviewing life-cycle and infrastructure.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 2:40 p.m. and returned at 2:42 p.m.

Tracy Richter, School Board Consultant, stated that he was going to proceed giving the background of what the master plan would be for the district, break it down into a planning area, give assessment and demographic information, and then a briefing of information for future planning. He felt the biggest job they had as facility planner on this project was to prepare the Board.

Mr. Richter explained that the plan was to provide a macro frame work for facility improvement. The Facility Master Plan did not give specifics regarding equipment, but provided a macro view of the facility. It provided a road map for the school type, including school buildings, renovations, additions, capital improvements, and maintenance for the next 10 years and beyond. He explained that generally the school districts went through a five-year plan, but they were going beyond that. He further stated the goal was to address the demographic, programmatic, and building conditions in order to provide school environments that were equitable, appropriate, and flexible academic areas. He continued stating that they had to provide facilities for the future which would be flexible for different types of educational pedagogies that could occur.

Mr. Richter further stated that they also had to accommodate demographic fluctuation. Therefore, when the document was completed, it would have to be updated every year. He stated that due to the great amount of redevelopment going on in the City, ideas would have to be changed as to how many students and what types of students came from those homes. The first step was to form a steering committee that would oversee the process. He stated that the gathering of data was very important because the facilities had to adjust to the demographics. He continued stating that facility options were developed for the schools. He stated that the Facility Plan was due to be completed by the end of March.

Mr. Richter stated that the team sat down with staff and planning managers for each school and an assessment was done per school. He explained that the demographic information was pretty indepth and they did not just look at the new houses in the area and calculate how many students would be added to the school system. A large indepth analysis was put into the projections. He stated that the deficiencies in the schools had to be identified so the needs for the schools could be determined. He explained they had to then correct the deficiencies which had been double-counted or completed.

Mr. Richter continued stating that along with the deficiencies, they needed to review the life cycles, and when a school was built one had to make sure it was maintained. He explained that every system within the school had a life cycle.

Commissioner Smith asked if the portables were considered as deficiencies. Mr. Getz stated they were not considered deficiencies in most cases, unless they were in poor condition. Commissioner Smith had been told that the portables were deficiencies due to the fact that they existed. Mr. Getz stated that the portables did provide additional space for the students.

Commissioner Moore asked why a portable was a deficiency. Commissioner Smith replied it was not a deficiency unless it was in poor condition.

Mr. Richter stated that enrollment projections were inherently wrong because they analyzed all data

showing a trend which had occurred. He explained that what was put into a projection enhanced its accuracy. He further stated as one got to more minutiae in a projection, it became less accurate.

Commissioner Smith asked how the projections came out for the City's schools this year. Mr. Richter stated that he did not have that information with him, but would provide it to the Commission. He further stated that they reviewed the historic enrollment, and also did a cohort survival which was a common type of projection. He explained that this projection had been done on several levels, including immigration, and adjustments had been made to reflect this. Mr. Richter remarked that live birth data was also used, including address matched by mother. He stated that housing had been done on several levels also, along with permit information. He continued stating that a land use analysis had also been done. He stated there appeared to be a larger Hispanic population, a continued increase in the white population, and a stabilization of the African-American population percentage wise.

Commissioner Katz asked if they were seeing more immigration of high school students from South America. Mr. Richter stated they did not do this by grade level, but had noticed an increase in the middle grade level. Commissioner Katz suggested they review the high school level because she felt their statistics were not recognizing certain facts. He proceeded to state that there was an aging population in the schools at this time. He stated that the County was projecting that they would grow by another 900,000 in the next 30 years.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 3:10 p.m.

Mr. Richter stated that the crux of the issue was projected enrollment. He stated there was a leveling off at the elementary level, but the high school level still appeared to be growing. If policy changed in the district, enrollment projections would change. He explained that he had met individually with the District Commissioner and the Mayor last week, and concerns were identified. One area of concern was redevelopment, and he did not feel that they had all been identified and they would have to be revisited. He believed the projections would have to be modified to reflect redevelopment. He stated that this was also a change in philosophy.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at 3:13 p.m.

Mr. Richter stated in regard to the migration of students, the figures were dramatic. He explained that an overall housing yield could not be done due to diversity and pockets in the County which could throw off the overall yield, and therefore, it had to be broken down into areas. The South Side property was identified as a concern to the City. He felt equity was a huge issue for the City. He explained that most times money did not show equity, but a break down would be provided as to what had been spent over the last 10 years in the schools, and what was going to be spent in the next 5 years. Equity went to different levels in a school and went from the walls to the books. He stated they were attempting to achieve the facility equity part which was one of their goals.

Mr. Richter stated that he had toured some of the high schools and needs had been identified.

Commissioner Smith asked what the life span of a school was determined to be. Mr. Richter explained it changed according to region, but generally a school had a life cycle of 40 to 50 years.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she was concerned that as the School Board created their vision on the Facilities Master plan, what were they gearing up to do. She stated they wanted to focus on the schools in the City. She remarked that minimum renovations had been done at Stranahan which was 52 years old. She stated that in looking at the charts, it was unconscionable to think there was no new growth in the City. She stated it was a shame that the School Board had surplused schools because they did not know if they were going to be needed.

Mayor Naugle stated that he wanted to thank the Education Advisory Board for their hard work. He

stated that replacements were needed for some schools, and he felt the South Side School should be taken off the surplus list and set aside for future needs. He felt they would have to aggressively seek the money being allocated and believed there would be a bond issue.

Commissioner Moore stated if there was going to be a bond issue, they needed to state that the Commission would not support it and advise the residents not to support any type of bond issue for the School Board. He believed they needed to consider getting the schools into the business of education. He stated that he had been to the Pembroke Pines Charter Schools and felt they were wonderful and had a diverse curriculum. He felt this was possibly a course the City of Fort Lauderdale might have to take.

Commissioner Katz left the meeting at approximately 3:32 p.m. and returned at 3:34 p.m.

Commissioner Moore stated that he had sat on a committee called Government Efficiency. He did not understand why schools needed their own stadiums. He explained that a football field was built without an adequate concession area, nor adequate seating. Parking was also lacking and he felt it was unreasonable to continue down such a path if it was not feasible. He felt that Lockhart could possibly be used. He also stated that when an assessment was done of the schools, they needed to know where the money was for the renovation of schools.

Mr. Getz explained that the past plan from 1987 would show what monies had been spent. Commissioner Moore felt that question needed to be asked of the Education Advisory Board in order to find out where the money had been spent.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 3:38 p.m.

Commissioner Katz stated that she did not believe in Charter Schools because she felt you lost control of the quality of the schools, and preferred to see the City be more aggressive in impressing upon the School Board that they wanted equity both for capital improvements and education. She remarked that this had been done out west through increased parent involvement and involvement by the City Commission. She felt they needed to get more "in their face," and be more of a coordinator with the School Board members. She believed that economic development hinged with education.

Mayor Naugle stated that the message would be that if something was not going to be done, the City would have to take action and possibly take things over themselves.

Commissioner Smith stated they needed to be more specific and take an official position of where the City disagreed with the School Board's assessment.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the School Board was invited to today's meeting so they could hear the Commission's thoughts on this matter. Ms. Carhart stated that there was another meeting today and the meetings had overlapped.

Commissioner Smith asked how long it would take to delineate a position school-by-school. Commissioner Moore stated that this only dealt with facilities, and he felt they needed to look at the grading system for schools, and see where each school fell.

Mary Fertig thanked the consultants for their work. She stated they were focusing on high schools for a reason because when a community looked to see how they were identified educationally, one looked to the high schools. She felt everyone agreed they needed 3 state-of-the-art high schools in the community. She stated they had walked through Fort Lauderdale and Stranahan and renovations were necessary. She felt overcrowded classrooms should not be allowed to continue. She believed it was critical to look at each acre and density per acre. Finally, she felt they should retain South Side and not surplus it.

Leslie Carhart reiterated that it was important for them to review the past data.



Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 3:47 p.m.

John Wilkes stated that for 10 years he had been urging the City to take an active role in its public education. He stated the City needed to be a "watch dog," because it took them 15 years to overcome neglect. The purpose of this project was to generate funding.

Commissioner Hutchinson returned to the meeting at 3:48 p.m.

Ms. Fertig added that one reason the City felt their schools would be more successful in the future was because there was a number of good schools, and they should be maintained for children to achieve their goals.

Dr. Elizabeth Hayes stated that she believed the City was in the process of negotiating an interlocal agreement with the School Board, and she hoped they would review all issues. She felt it was more than facilities and she was ashamed of the rating of the schools. She stated that Palm Beach had a charter district where the whole City was designated and things could be done to make the schools better.

Nick Sakhnovsky stated that he applauded everyone's work and felt they had to be cooperative with the School Board and that Charter schools should be looked at as a temporary solution.

Commissioner Smith asked when they could expect a draft of the official position. Ms. Carhart stated the Education Advisory Board's next meeting was scheduled for February 20, 2003, and it would probably be March 18, 2003, before something could be crafted and submitted to the Commission.

Commissioner Hutchinson remarked that she had a copy of the Interlocal Agreement and asked if the Education Advisory Board had reviewed it. Bruce Chatterton replied they had received a copy last month. He further stated that they had been informed recently that there was a revised agreement in the mail. Commissioner Hutchinson asked how much input the Board had in regard to the agreement. Dr. Hayes replied they did not have any input at all.

Ms. Carhart remarked that Mr. Chatterton had made a presentation to the Board and the draft agreement had been distributed. She felt the Board would provide a policy statement soon.

Lu Deaner, Education Advisory Board, stated that they would appreciate it if information was passed on to all employees regarding a study that was being done at this time, and that all input would be appreciated.

**Action:** Draft proposal from the Education Advisory Board to be presented to City Commission on March 4, 2003.

#### **I-C – Public Safety (Fire-Rescue and Police) Capital Plan**

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 3:57 p.m.

The City Manager stated that this referred to assignments carried over for a few months after being charged to review capital needs in regard to the public safety arena. He stated that this presentation had begun approximately two meetings ago and he believed the Police Department presentation had been completed.

Chief Otis Latin stated that he would give a brief summary regarding their immediate needs. He explained that the immediate needs required up-front fund. The three areas were EMS, apparatus and stations. He explained that in regard to EMS they were looking at approximately \$1 Million for immediate needs, and the planning process required a lot of time. He continued stating that in regard to apparatus, the Fleet

Manager had made recommendations so reserves could be replaced.

Chief Latin stated that Fire Station 29 was located at 16<sup>th</sup> Street and N. Federal Highway and they wanted to relocate the station to property identified on Sunrise Boulevard. He explained it was about ½ mile from US1. He further stated that in regard to Station 29 they would be speaking with the Commission regarding the details for acquisition of property. He stated they wanted to sell the existing site so the funding could be used to pay for land acquisition and some of the Station located at the Airport. He stated things were tied together and they needed to move quickly.

Chief Latin further stated that Station 88 was a priority but the funding gap needed to be closed. In regard to Station 47 which was located at SW 27 Avenue, they needed to move forward and obtain proper funding. He stated they also wanted to buy land in the southeast so a station could be constructed.

Chief Latin continued stating that their intermediate needs were 3-8 years and a break down had been provided with more detailed information. He stated that the total assessment was about \$1 Million for EMS, \$9 Million for apparatus, and \$24 Million for station needs. He stated that they did a comparison with other cities in the County regarding fire assessments. He stated that there was a current rate in Fort Lauderdale of \$42, and if there would be a 25% increase, they would rank about 21 out of 27.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if there was a 50% increase in the fire assessment fee, what type of money would be generated that could be used for the departments. Chief Latin stated approximately \$3.2 Million could be generated, and if there was a 25% increase they would generate \$1.6 Million. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if they could bond the \$6 Million and get more out of it.

Terry Sharp, Assistant Finance Director, stated that they had spoken with the consultants and were told it could be bonded. He stated that interest rates and other issues would have to be reviewed.

Chief Latin stated he was looking for direction from the Commission.

Mayor Naugle stated that in 1986 the voters had approved a bond issue to pay for improvements throughout the City, and in 1996 there was a bond issue for park facilities and the money was still being spent. He felt they could consider a Public Safety bond where they could fill in and have the debt service continue at the same level, and pay for the stations. He felt the equipment should be on a pay-as-you go system because he was not comfortable using bonds for equipment. He felt the challenge was for the City Manager to return with a plan putting together all these pieces.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the Public Safety bond was a good idea, but there were problems now, and they needed to find a way to address some of the issues now especially regarding Station 47.

Commissioner Katz stated that the interest rates were really low at this time and who knew what would happen in the next 6 months. She stated that in regard to the bond, the numbers given were on top of what the City was already paying, but possibly if they did this sooner and not overburden the taxpayers, they could take advantage of the low interest rates.

Mayor Naugle remarked that in order to do a GOB, it required voter approval and normally they preferred to do it at the time of an election. Commissioner Smith stated that a revenue bond could be done without an election. Mayor Naugle agreed.

Commissioner Katz stated this should be looked at and she wanted to tread carefully about the assessments so the taxpayers would not be burdened. She commented that property values had risen in the City, and so had the taxes. Mayor Naugle remarked that possibly it could be phased similar to what had been done with the water and sewer rates.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that in regard to the stations, the total figure given at the workshop was

\$24 Million and the same amount of money was being asked for in the total needs assessment, and she asked if the level was raised for larger stations. Chief Latin stated that police presence was not included in the figures, and they were still working through the figures. He further stated that the dollar amount had been increased and they were working with the engineers.

Commissioner Smith asked if this would create enough space for police presence. Chief Latin stated it would not because it would have to come from the police.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that it was her understanding that when it came back to funding, there would be two prototype stations. Chief Latin stated the Engineering Department was working on this and they had come up with some prototypes, but the figures regarding square footage were will being worked on. He stated they had gone as high as 11,000 sq. ft. and they wanted to make sure enough space was being allotted.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that as the police station was redone and the public works facility looked at for housing the equipment, she asked if they were going to move some of the reserve equipment to other stations. Chief Latin confirmed. Commissioner Hutchinson added that she was not in favor of selling Station 29 because the City owned it, but asked if there would be a gap in response time as it related to moving further southwest from where it was presently located. Chief Latin stated if anything was moved there would be additional time allotted, but one had to look at the big picture.

Mayor Naugle stated that they would have to come up with a plan to take care of the immediate needs, and also look at the location for the future police station.

The City Manager stated that at end of Chief Roberts' report there were several suggestions or options listed regarding relocation or rebuilding of the station.

Commissioner Moore stated that he wanted to suggest Sunrise Boulevard and I-95 for the new station. He also stated that he was happy to receive information regarding the capital projects for the fire-rescue and police stations, but he felt they were late and early and did not think the bond issue should be discussed until April due to the elections.

Commissioner Katz stated that she did not have a specific location in mind, but felt that perhaps it was a good idea to sell the existing station and put the money into the CRA because it would eliminate TIF.

Commissioner Smith stated he liked using this as a catalyst for redevelopment and getting rid of the junkyard, and stated that several policemen had mentioned it would be a good idea due to access to all major thoroughfares and it should be explored, along with any other sites in the redevelopment area.

Mayor Naugle stated that the challenge from the study was the tower and the infrastructure that was there. He stated they needed to consider what the property could yield being sensitive to the historic district and the neighborhood, and see where the communication equipment could be relocated. In April there would be a new Commission and input would continue being received.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she wanted to hear some input from the Police Department as it related to what location they thought would be appropriate. She added that the cost of moving the tower would probably dictate the location. She stated that she wanted to get rid of the storage yard.

Bruce Roberts, Chief of Police, stated that they wanted to be centrally located. He added that in staying at their present site they had a jail which should be kept, but could be downsized. He stated that the jail and the tower had already been accepted by the neighborhood, and if they moved they would have to go through everything all over again. He stated they were opened to all suggestions. He reiterated that this Friday there was going to be a meeting with the County and the municipalities regarding smart sizing and future communications.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the problem in the area was not the Police Department, but with the Public Works facility and the traffic it generated through the community.

Commissioner Smith suggested that an assessment be done of the two sites, and look for a third location in the redevelopment area.

The City Manager stated that they were considering property already owned by the City, and the Public Works facility grew over time.

**Action:** Report to be made to the Commission on April 15, 2003.

### **I-D – Community Services Board**

Mayor Naugle stated that the recommendation was made to keep the Board intact. Commissioner Hutchinson asked why they had gotten away from the cab permits.

Faye Outlaw stated that the taxi permits still went to the Community Services Board. She stated that a Conference discussion would be held next month on this subject.

Commissioner Smith asked what was referred to when stating to review the general housing conditions of the City. Ms. Outlaw stated they suggested this function should be picked back up today because on an annual basis they met with various City housing organizations, and were worked into the 5-year plan. Historically, she was not sure what the Board had reviewed.

Margarette Hayes, Community Development, stated that in the past they had looked at the quality of housing throughout the City and the conditions of such housing.

Commissioner Katz stated that she felt this should be one of the jobs of this Board to look at affordable housing in the City.

Commissioner Moore felt this group could do the Certificates of Necessity, the taxis, housing conditions, as well as making recommendations for the new Code. He stated that the Code Committee was needed due to the urgency of the situation. He felt this committee had been the pulse of the City and helped him to understand the government, and felt it should be returned to that status. He asked if someone could look back and see what the Committee had been charged to do in 1984 and what their scope of services had been. He reiterated that they needed an affordable housing ordinance.

Ms. Outlaw requested that the Commission consider adding these additional duties to this Committee after the Conference discussion regarding the certificates. Commissioner Moore agreed.

Ben Guenther, new member of the Community Services Board, stated he was confused and was not sure what had been done in changing the duties of the Board.

Mayor Naugle stated that this Board was required by the Federal government to be the public agency that advised the Commission as to how to spend the community block grant funds.

Robert Smith, Member of the Community Services Board, stated that last year Commissioner Moore had requested the information and he did not understand why that material had not yet been provided to him. Commissioner Moore stated that he had made such a request in the past, and was restating it today.

Commissioner Smith suggested they review the document and make sure that it was very clear. Commissioner Katz stated that as things changed, rules were changed. Mr. Guenther stated that it appeared the Board did not meet very much during the year.

Mayor Naugle stated that the Board did not meet monthly and evidently only met as necessary. Commissioner Moore stated that when he was a member of the Board years ago, they not only discussed the 5-year plan of a project for the block grant dollars, but looked at innovative methods as to how the monies could be used and made recommendations for future years.

Margarette Hayes stated that one of the things that changed was HUD's planning process. Previously it had been an annual planning process, and now was a 5-year planning process.

Commissioner Smith suggested that next month some historical perspective could be supplied to the Commission regarding the Board.

**Action:** Information listing duties and objectives of the Board to be supplied.

**I-E -- City of Hollywood Resolution - Opposition of Annexation and Deannexation Powers Transferred to Broward County**

Mayor Naugle stated that Hollywood asked this Commission to take a position on this matter.

Commissioner Smith left the meeting at approximately 4:39 p.m.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 4:40 p.m. and returned at 4:41 p.m.

Commissioner Moore stated that he did not know why this Commission should take a position.

Mayor Naugle stated that the position they took was already in the legislative position of the League of Cities. He felt they were concerned about attacks on cities where boundaries would be stricken from a city against the will of the city, and the fact they wanted to turn over to the County the powers of annexation. He proceeded to ask if Commissioner Moore was more comfortable with the County having those powers or the legislative.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that they had stated their position through the League of Cities, and therefore, no further position needed to be taken. He felt that what happened would bring closure to this. He continued stating that the unincorporated pockets had a fee that rose each time areas were annexed.

**Action:** No action taken.

**I-F – Organizational Climate Employee Survey**

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 4:42 p.m.

The City Manager stated that Commissioner Katz had raised this issue several meetings ago, and had asked for an update on this matter. He stated that this was the first report of what would be a series of reports. In the backup material, specific information had been supplied on departments and work had been ongoing.

John Panoch, Personnel Director, stated that ETC Institute advised that the City should focus on 2-3 areas so results could be achieved. He stated they had committed to a 3-year re-survey for the Spring of 2005.

Bruce Lucier, Organizational Development and Training Manager, stated that work had been ongoing at two different levels. The first level was at the Executive Management Team level who were working on three major areas which had come out of the survey. The first was the health plan which was unanimous in terms of needing assistance. Employee health insurance committees were formed and the participation

in those committees had increased employee awareness of the issues. In terms of strategic direction, employees indicated they wanted to know where their efforts were directed and how they were contributing to a common goal. Another area was communication which was a hard area to deal with, but any effort was dependent upon the ability to approve such communications. Commissioner Smith returned to the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

The City Manager stated that as they set forth a strategic direction and communication, they needed to spend attention to communicating with everyone involved which took a lot of time.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Commissioner Katz asked how was it possible to give a clear understanding of direction and priority over the next several years, if the Commission had not forwarded what their priorities were, and were they making them up as they went along. Mr. Lucier stated some direction was in regard to how the organization operated, which was not directed towards a specific goal. He stated that part of their goal was to build the organization so it was responsible to the Commission's needs and priorities, but part of it depended on the organization itself.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the Mission Statement had been finalized. Mr. Lucier replied that it was now a draft and would be coming to the Commission. He further stated that the overall thing that was looked at by the employees was how what they did on a day-to-day basis fit into the bigger picture.

Mr. Panoch stated they were working on values and behaviors, and not tasks.

Mr. Lucier stated that at the department level a summary was distributed stating the actions of each department. He further stated there were some common elements between the departments. First was that all the departments were involving employees at all levels to look at the survey data and further clarify it, and to gather ideas and form committees to address the issues. He further stated that the next status report would be given in August, 2003.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she felt that staff was the first customer and their needs had to be met, their input encouraged, and they needed to be listened to. She stated that she believed in recognition and awards and it appeared that some departments had a backlog in this area. If there was a backlog, she encouraged that things be looked into and progress pursued.

The City Manager stated that when he arrived there had been a backlog in this area, but to date he had been signing awards and attending ceremonies for service awards. He did not believe a backlog existed at this time.

Commissioner Katz stated that she wanted to make sure things were taking place in the departments that had been mentioned often in the surveys unfavorably, and that management changes or whatever was necessary had been occurring. She had heard that nothing was transpiring and she did not want everyone talking, but wanted action and assured that things were happening.

Mr. Lucier stated that he had been involved in a number of departments, but not all. He stated that it took a while to get things moving. He further stated that he was not sure how to answer this question.

Commissioner Katz stated that she could be more specific in private, but felt this needed to be looked at. It appeared though that no concrete changes were taking place. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that when resurveys were taken of those employees and nothing had been done, the City would be wasting their time and money. Commissioner Katz agreed.

The City Manager stated that things were being done and whether all concerns of every employee had been satisfied was not always possible. Things took time. He further stated that regarding the health plan,

information was brought recently to the Commission to address those critical concerns. Efforts were being made to speak to employees and to improve communications and set the strategic direction. He stated that another area mentioned was training and efforts were beginning and involved work in progress. He assured the Commission that work was being done on those matters.

Commissioner Katz reiterated that she wanted the City to continue moving in the right direction and changes be benchmarked. Mr. Lucier stated that was part of establishing goals and it was important to have such goals.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she noticed in reading her backup material that some departments were going to create a means to speak with their employees, whether it was a newsletter or some other form of communication, and she wanted the Commission to receive copies of such communication to make sure things were moving forward and input was being received from employees.

Commissioner Smith felt it was important to recognize good employees more often and in a more substantial way, and asked if any new programs were being considered.

The City Manager confirmed they were and stated that recognition went beyond years of service, and encompassed work above and beyond the "call of duty." Recognizing employees of the month might not be sufficient and they were exploring in the various departments various levels of recognition. He felt employees liked to be recognized by their peers and possibly something could be done in that area. He stated that previously he had been engaged in a program entitled "Catch Me Doing Something Right." Employees were recognized individually and visually. Now, they were attempting to come up with some type of recognition for people who had done an outstanding job regarding the conversion of the City's Payroll/Personnel System. He felt this was worthy of some type of recognition and could possibly involve something to put in their pocket because the work was very valuable.

Commissioner Smith remarked that programs such as "Catch Me Doing Something Right" were invaluable.

**Action:** As discussed.

#### **II-A – E. Clay Shaw (S.E. 17 Street) Bridge Underdeck Parking - Lot Permits and Special Event Lot Rentals.**

Commissioner Hutchinson asked what constituted a special event.

Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager, stated that it was an event which exceeded the available parking at the business.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated she was concerned they were going to "eat up" all the parking created for the public. Mr. Bentley stated they were not, but from a parking perspective they wanted to maximize the use of the facilities. He reiterated that the public came first. He stated they were only referring to the "B" lots. He stated they were always protecting the "A" lots for the public. He proceeded to give some examples of how things worked for large special events.

Commissioner Smith left the meeting at approximately 5:01 p.m.

**Action:** Trial basis for 6 months.

**III-B – Advisory Board and Committee Vacancies**

1. Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board

Commissioner Hutchinson reappointed Eileen Helfer and appointed Al Miniachi to the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board.

Mayor Naugle reappointed Joanne Johnsen to the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board

Commissioner Katz reappointed Stephen Tilbrook to the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board, and appointed Brad Fitzgerald.

Commissioner Moore reappointed Ina Lee and Pamela A. Adams of the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

2. Board of Trustees, Police and Firefighters Retirement System

**Action:** Deferred

3. Budget Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred

4. Cemeteries Board of Trustees

Commissioner Hutchinson reappointed Mark Van Rees and Susan Telli to the Cemeteries Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Katz reappointed Robert Powers and Franci Bindler to the Cemeteries Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Moore reappointed Mary Boyd and Richard Kurtz to the Cemeteries Board of Trustees.

Mayor Naugle reappointed Sharon Navarro and Sandy Casteel to the Cemeteries Board of Trustees.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

5. Code Enforcement Board

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

6. Community Appearance Board

**Action:** Deferred

7. Community Services Board

Commissioner Katz reappointed Chas Brady to the Community Services Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.



8. Economic Development Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred

9. Education Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred.

10. Insurance Advisory Board

Commissioner Katz suggested Alan A. Silva for the Consensus appointment on the Insurance Advisory Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

11. Marine Advisory Board

**Action:** Deferred

12. Northwest-Progresso-Flagler Heights Redevelopment Advisory Board

Commissioner Moore appointed Ella Phillips to this Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

13. Nuisance Abatement Board

The City Commission reappointed Helen Surovek, Caldwell Cooper, Rita Jackson, Harry MacGrotty, Douglas H. Reynolds as Regular Members, and David C. Svetlick as an Alternate Member on the Nuisance Abatement Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

14. Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board

**Action:** Deferred

15. Urban Design Core Steering Committee

The City Commission clarified the appointment of the Downtown Development Authority Representatives to the Urban Design Core Steering Committee as follows: Jack Loos, Doug Eagon, and Alan C. Hooper, and Charlie Ladd as Alternate; and appointed Peter Feldman as the CRA Advisory Board Representative to the Urban Design Core Steering Committee.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at Regular Meeting.

**IV – City Commission Reports**Bayview Park

Commissioner Katz stated that she wanted an update on where the money stood at the next Conference Meeting.

Commissioner Smith returned to the meeting at 5:07 p.m.

**Action:** Update to be provided at Conference Meeting on February 18, 2003.

#### Urban Land Institute (ULI) Study

Commissioner Katz asked when the ULI person was going to come and discuss the beach.

The City Manager stated they were working with Mr. Hudnut in order to finalize a date for their presentation. He added that the final report had not yet been received by the City. He stated that he had also attended the Beach Redevelopment Advisory Board meeting last week, but no date was yet available for the presentation.

**Action:** Update to be given to Commission.

#### Palazzo Las Olas Project

Commissioner Smith stated this was going to the Commission in two ways. There would be a developer's agreement and then the site plan would be reviewed. He stated that it took years to reach a consensus on the developer's agreement and he hoped things were moving forward.

The City Manager stated there was a team of lawyers working on the agreements which totaled approximately seven. They had hoped to bring those to the Commission soon.

The City Attorney stated the agreements were very complicated. He had hoped the package would be presented to the Commission by the end of March. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Board had deferred this matter to February 19, 2003. He added that everything was contingent upon the site plan and the agreements. The City Attorney remarked that there would be a contingency. When they acquired the property, there was a condition that it could not be sold, but it could be leased. There were going to ask Commission to approve documents and the deal, contingent upon the State signing off on the Lease Agreement because it was for 200 years. He explained that according to Florida law a 99-year lease was paramount to a fee simple title. The question arises whether this would be considered as a sale.

Mayor Naugle stated it would have to go to the Cabinet for an answer. The City Attorney agreed because a lot of money was involved and they were required to share the revenue with the State. The question was if the \$15 Million parking structure they received according to the lease would be considered revenue that would have to be shared with the State.

**Action:** Information supplied to the Commission on March 4, 2003.

#### Bicycle Advisory Board

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she was glad to see that the Parks Board had taken up the matter of a Bicycle Committee. She asked if an Ad Hoc Committee was going to be formed and if it would consist of active bicyclists.

Ernest Burkeen, Director of Parks, Beaches and Recreation, confirmed.

**Action:** Matter to be raised at the Regular Meeting.

#### Airport Expansion

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if everyone had read the letter from Hollywood regarding their stand in connection with the airport expansion. She stated that all the Presidents of the Associations in Fort

Lauderdale had received the letter and she hoped this City would send a similar letter stating their position on the matter.

The City Manager stated that he was going to be in touch with the Manager of the City of Hollywood.

**Action:** Letter to be sent to Homeowner Associations regarding Airport expansion.

#### Broward Boulevard Landscaping

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the landscaping was unsatisfactory on Broward Boulevard. She asked who could be contacted in the County so they could be informed that the landscaping did not meet the City's standards.

The City Manager stated that they were following up on the matter.

**Action:** Matter being looked into.

#### "Adopt A Street" Program

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that Tyrone Schumacher had sent a letter to Greg Kisela about the Adopt a Street Program that the County had, and she wanted to see this City do something similar.

**Action:** Status report to be given in a Friday memo.

#### Neighborhood Recognition

Commissioner Hutchinson stated she was not comfortable with this being in the Planning and Zoning Department and did not see the connection. She felt things were moving too slow. Questionnaires had been sent out, but nothing was happening.

The City Manager stated he was reviewing what department to place this in, and 32 neighborhoods had responded.

Mayor Naugle asked if the Commission could be notified which areas had not responded.

Commissioner Smith suggested that letters be prepared to those who had not responded.

**Action:** Update to be provided.

#### Rock Island Neighborhood

Commissioner Moore stated that Rock Island was interested in coming into the City of Fort Lauderdale, and he understood that legislation had been proposed that there might be an election. He further stated that they had commented it was their desire to make the decision which municipality they went to.

Commissioner Katz stated that she was on the North Annexation Committee, and felt this group was far ahead of all the groups in the County. Commissioner Lieberman had reviewed the areas that wanted to be annexed and it was now up to her. She added that there was a section of the area she wanted staff to review and make sure they were going to be revenue neutral.

Jenni Clark, Planning and Zoning, stated that the Community Inspections Division had taken an area similar to the City of Fort Lauderdale and did a comparison as to how many Code Officers they anticipated hiring. She believed the neighborhood of Lauderdale Manors was used in the comparison.

Commissioner Moore stated he wanted to know what area it was so he could become familiar with it. He felt if there was a way to accelerate this matter, he hoped that would be done. He stated that more than

90% of the housing was owner-occupied. It was an area that had been de-annexed from the City.

Mayor Naugle stated that if it fit within the City's policy, the City Manager would know what to do.

**Action:** Status report to be provided.

**V - City Manager Reports**

No reports to be given.

There being no further business to come before this Board, the meeting was adjourned at 5:22 p.m.

**Note: A mechanical recording has been made of the foregoing proceedings of which these minutes are a part, and is on file in the office of the City clerk for a period of two years.**