

COMMISSION CONFERENCE**July 7, 2004**

<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
I-A Board of Directors and Community Transportation Plan Reorganization	20
I-B Recommendations of Charter Revision Board	1
I-C Proposed Charter Amendment by the Citizens Initiative Against Over-Development	13
I-D Petition to Add the Name, James A. Dalls Sr. Boulevard to NW 2 nd St. Between Andrews Ave. and NW 7 th Ave.	1
I-E Public Safety Bond	15
I-F Fort Lauderdale Evaluation and Appraisal Report Process	20
I-G Broward County Landscape Revision Plans; Broward Boulevard Median Between I-95 & NW 7 Avenue	20
I-H Residential Solid Waste Bid Proposals	20
I-I Commercial Boulevard from NW 9 Avenue to NW 31 Avenue – Florida Department of Transportation Improvement Project	22
I-J City Hall Study	22
One Stop Shop	23
I-K Voting Delegate & Alternate for Florida League of Cities Annual Conference – August 19-21, 2004	24
I-L Air and Sea Show Pin Program	24
IV City Commission Reports None Given	
V City Manager Reports None Given	

COMMISSION CONFERENCE

1:37 P.M.

JULY 7, 2004

Present: Mayor Naugle
Commissioners Hutchinson, Teel, Moore and Vice Mayor Trantalis

Also Present: Acting City Manager
City Attorney
City Clerk
Sergeant At Arms – Sergeant Joe Ryan

I-D – Petition to Add the Name, James A. Dallas Sr. Boulevard to NW 2nd St. between Andrews Ave and NW 7th Ave.

Commissioner Moore stated that he had the opportunity of working with the Dallas family who has been a contributor to the City's history. He stated that some individuals in the community want the City to consider a name change to a street known as NW 2nd to James A. Dallas Sr. Boulevard.

Ronald Dallas stated that he wished his father could be present to witness this event. He stated that many individuals present today have contributed to making this City an outstanding one. He thanked the City for the recognition being shown to his father. He stated that he is a practicing attorney who graduated from St. Thomas Aquinas High School and Notre Dame Undergraduate School and Law School.

Michelle Dallas thanked everyone who supported this endeavor. She believed her father is present today in spirit. She stated that she also graduated from St. Thomas Aquinas High School and Georgetown. She announced that she is a practicing dentist.

County Commissioner Josephus Eggelation stated that Jimmie Dallas is an icon in the community, and he knew him for a long time. He was his fraternity brother. He contributed to the texture and fabric of his community. He wanted to lend his support to the street renaming. He proceeded to recognize Mr. Collins who is one of the oldest matriarchs of Broward County. He also recognized Senator Mandy Dawson.

Senator Dawson stated that she was born in this City, and indicated that the Dallas family has been an integral part of the City and County. Many lives are intertwined in the northwest portion of the City. She felt this is very appropriate and asked the Commission to consider renaming the street.

Commissioner Moore recommended that the street be named Dr. James Dallas Sr. Street. He stated that it is to begin at Third Avenue going west to the City limits.

Action: Street to be named Dr. James Dallas Sr. Street, beginning at Third Avenue going west to the City limits

I-B – Recommendations of Charter Revision Board

The City Attorney stated that he has sent a memorandum to the City Commission, outlining recommendations made by the Charter Revision Board. There are 19 recommendations. He announced that staff has received word from the Supervisor of Elections Office, that there is limited space on the ballot, and the timing for getting such

issues to that office is also limited with the deadline being next Friday. He explained they would have to be put in ordinance form, and putting the ballot question together. It would be impossible to get them all done.

Mayor Naugle asked if any indication has been given as to how many items could be placed on the ballot. The City Attorney stated the City has not been told how many would be allowed.

The City Clerk advised that no official answer has been received to her letter.

Commissioner Moore suggested they review the recommendations and see which ones should be considered for the ballot.

Commissioner Teel stated that at her pre-agenda meeting many individuals were present that had attended the workshop, and they stated that this matter is moving forward faster than they had anticipated. They thought that further dialogue was going to take place, and some individuals felt that certain items were missing and they wanted the opportunity to offer such items.

Mayor Naugle stated that the Board has worked very hard, and he felt the voting machine crisis in Broward County is causing this to be accelerated.

Commissioner Teel further stated that the thought has been that since this is such an important document, which is not reviewed frequently, they want to get it right this time. If they rush, there is the possibility that things would not get done right.

Commissioner Moore agreed it is an important document, which has been given a great deal of review by the Board, and he thanked everyone for their hard work. It was very important how the community attended the meetings and discussed the matter. He preferred that the recommendations be taken to a public hearing so comments could be provided. He felt dealing with this "Bible of Government" during the day is not appropriate and discussions should be held in the evening so more individuals could attend. He urged that this opportunity take place in September or October so it could be considered in a City election cycle. He questioned some of the recommendations that were made, such as Item 2 because this is already the City's form of government, and having the Charter restate it is repetitious. He felt the public should be allowed to state the reasons for their recommendations and provide input. He felt this is possibly rushing the matter.

Commissioner Hutchinson did not think they are rushing the matter. In looking at Items 2 and 3, she felt those questions do not have to be asked because they already exist in the Charter. She felt the Board has done a good job, but it is unfortunate that the Supervisor of Elections is rushing them. The biggest percentage are easy questions, such as deleting Section 8.11 of the Charter which states the City could sell land without competitive bidding because it is located at the airport. Some of the items are housekeeping and not difficult. In the past, there has never been a consensus in regard to Item 5, the matter of an independent auditor. She continued, stating that they should move forward.

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated that many of the items are housekeeping and possibly those could be isolated. He felt this would not preclude them from adding items at the time of

the municipal election. He stated that subjects have been discussed, but in regard to items missing, possibly enough consensus has not been reached, and therefore, such items did not make it on the list. Possibly additional dialogue is needed on such items. He felt this Board did not go far enough. Some things should be added. He preferred to see some of the housekeeping items included to clean up the Charter. The more controversial items, such as the auditor and Item 1, should have more dialogue.

Vice Mayor Trantalis referred to Item 17. He realized this has created some stir within the office. He continued, stating that when this item was first discussed, he suggested that each Commissioner have their own staff member they could rely upon. Currently, staff is assigned to the Commissioners through the City Clerk's Office. He stated that could still take place as long as each Commissioner could participate in the selection. He did not know if that should be considered as part of the Charter. He indicated that he wants such an assistant, but to change the Charter in order to accomplish that does not necessarily seem the procedure to follow.

Mayor Naugle explained that in the past, the interpretation has been that the Commissioners could influence who obtained a position, and therefore, the Charter could now prevent such influence.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she has probably talked about this matter more than anyone has, and modeled it after Broward County. She saw this as an interim step in the beginning of a process, and in order to start the process, a Charter change is necessary. At the County level, she explained that each Commissioner is allocated a budget, which she believed does not include their salaries. A certain amount of money is granted, and out of those monies, staff is paid and expenses for travel are included, along with office needs. She stated those positions fall under the Administrator, but the daily supervisory roles of staff rests with the Commissioners. She felt these are the beginning steps. She did not feel the City's system is broken, but it is time they present themselves at a level they are performing at. Fort Lauderdale is the largest city in Broward County, and they need to bring their level and staff up to that professionalism.

Commissioner Hutchinson further stated that over the course of time, they could possibly look at allocating budgets for each Commissioner. She explained that if they run out of money, then they would have to prepare a budget amendment and explain why. She indicated they would be responsible for their own budget. Currently an assistant is assigned to the Mayor and each Commissioner. A full-time reception position is established, and they would continue to report to the Commission Assistant Coordinator who currently is Pam Brown. She stated that Coordinator should report to and be held accountable to the City Commission and general supervision and coordination of the office would remain under that position. Hiring of assistants would be a joint process between the Commissioners and the Coordinator. She indicated that is done at the County level. Each County Commissioner has an aide who works directly for them, along with other staff.

Mayor Naugle envisioned each person having an assistant, but not having anyone over them.

Commissioner Hutchinson further stated that day-to-day direction of the assistant would lie with the appropriate Commissioner, and likewise they would participate in their evaluation. She felt it is time they have more say in the running of their office. She felt it

does not make sense for their staff to work for the City Clerk. She stated the Charter change is the way to start so as to make things more clear.

Mayor Naugle agreed that changing the Charter would be the first step.

Vice Mayor Trantalis asked if some of the housekeeping items could be done.

Mayor Naugle stated that due to the limited space on the ballot, they should take the more important things. The two items he wanted to see on the ballot are something dealing with the prevention of selling park land, and the item dealing with the auditor. He felt the auditor is desperately needed, and had the item been put on the ballot in '96, possibly they might not have had a City Manager making unauthorized expenditures.

Mayor Naugle suggested that they review the 19 recommendations being made.

Commissioner Moore suggested that each Commissioner state the items they want to be considered for placement on the ballot.

Commissioner Teel believed parks are a primary concern. It was the purpose of convening the Charter Review Board. She did not know if the assistant issue could be accomplished, but maybe they could at least begin working toward it. She definitely wanted the auditor item on the ballot. She asked if the top three recommendations are placed on the November ballot, then could additional items be placed on the March ballot. She asked if the Charter Review Board would continue working or would they be sunsetted. Commissioner Moore replied that this Board would continue working on the Charter. Commissioner Teel wanted Items 1, 5 and 17 considered for the ballot.

Vice Mayor Trantalis agreed on Items 1, 5 and 17 to be considered for the ballot.

Commissioner Moore suggested that all recommendations be held and put through a public process before being considered.

Commissioner Hutchinson wanted Item 1 considered for the ballot. In regard to Item 4, she asked if the Commissioner still has to live within their district. The City Attorney confirmed yes. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the recommendation would change anything in the Charter as it presently exists. The City Attorney stated that the current residency requirement is that the Commissioner lives within the district for six months in order to run for office. This recommendation would allow a Commissioner to live anywhere within the City, but in order to run for the office they would have to live within that district at the time of filing.

Commissioner Hutchinson indicated that the items she wanted considered for the ballot would be Items 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. She questioned Item 10 since the City annexes areas, and possibly, they should convert the corporate limits into an ordinance versus the Charter because it would change over the course of time. She stated her personal preference is to consider all the recommendations. In regard to Item 11, she asked if a Commissioner does not presently have the ability to place items on the agenda. The City Attorney confirmed yes. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the Charter would delete that ability as it stands today. The City Attorney replied it would not. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if that is placed anywhere in writing in the Charter. The City Attorney explained that in the Code of Ordinances, it states that the City Manager shall establish

an agenda. In the Charter, it states that the Mayor may run the meeting according to an agenda. It does not state who would prescribe. There are about eight references in the Code, which state that under various circumstances different department heads could agenda an item. Commissioner Hutchinson stated she also wanted to add Item 11 to the list. She asked if Item 12 exists today. The City Attorney replied that part of the discussion has been the issue regarding the Mayor voting last. The Commission already has the ability to set their own rules and regulations regarding meetings. Due to a separate provision in the Charter, the Mayor always votes last. Commissioner Hutchinson wanted to include Item 12. She remarked that she does not understand the logic for Item 13. She did not feel Item 14 is necessary, but Item 15 is necessary.

Commissioner Hutchinson further stated that she needed to understand the logic regarding the City Clerk's office in regard to Item 16. She asked if they would be appointed-at-will positions versus hired positions. The City Attorney stated that this item was raised by the City Manager, and explained there is some confusion in the Charter regarding classified and non-classified. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if this item would involve clean-up language for the Charter. The City Attorney confirmed yes. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that Item 16 should be included since it involves housekeeping. Item 17 should definitely be included, along with Item 19.

Mayor Naugle indicated that there appears to be a consensus regarding Items 1, 5 and 17. He agreed that other items should be placed on the ballot at some point in time. He continued, stating that they are being rushed, and due to the problems of the voting machines, they need to keep the recommendations to a minimum.

The City Attorney explained that the City has to have the recommendations to the Supervisor of Elections immediately. He will draft the ballot questions, which would be submitted. An ordinance would have to be adopted in September, authorizing them to appear on the ballot. Once they are submitted to the Supervisor of Elections, the City only has until the beginning of September to pull any items back either to be withdrawn or for rewording. He advised that he would circulate the wording for comment the day before the deadline because it would take time to put together.

Mayor Naugle stated that a meeting is scheduled for July 26, 2004. The City Attorney stated that an ordinance could be presented for first reading on July 26th. Commissioner Hutchinson reminded everyone that is an afternoon meeting. The City Attorney indicated the meeting has to be after 6:00 p.m. Mayor Naugle asked if there could be a first reading at 6:00 p.m. on July 26th. The City Attorney explained there has to be 10 days intervening. He believed the first reading could take place at the first meeting in September, and then it could be reworded since it is not going to be on the ballot until November.

In regard to Item 1, Mayor Naugle believed the proposal from the Charter Review Board is an improvement over what they presently have, but he suggested something similar to what is at the Las Olas and A-1-A lot, which would require voter approval. He felt it should apply for park land and other lands that the Commission would agree to put in the mix, which could be other City-owned parcels.

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated that there has to be a minimum amount of open space that would trigger this. On tonight's agenda there is an item regarding a sliver of land on

Cortez Street, and he hoped they would not have to go to a public election to sell such lands.

Mayor Naugle remarked that the City has hundreds of parcels, but he is referring to parcels designated in the Comprehensive Plan as park land. He did not like the radius concept business because he felt there could be a valuable park that an enterprising developer could swap for an undesirable parcel with some future Commission. According to the proposed recommendation, only four votes would be needed. In the past he has seen four votes do away with some parcels in the City.

Commissioner Teel asked about the linear parks. Mayor Naugle asked if the Commission wants such lands to be included. If such lands are not included, then they could be added.

Vice Mayor Trantalis asked who created the park list. Mayor Naugle explained that the Commission has approved the park list, which has been listed in the Comprehensive Plan. The City Attorney explained that the list needs to be designated as the "Park List". The recommendation requires a designated list and the park list would be the designated list.

Mayor Naugle suggested that the list be provided to the Commission for their next meeting. He stated that parcels not listed in the Comprehensive Plan that are park land could be added. He asked how the Commission felt approval should be granted.

Commissioner Moore believed they are rushing these issues even though they cut the recommendations down to three. It should not be addressed at this time. More time and dialogue is needed in regard to park lands, and he felt the public needs to provide more input. If the issue is whether it should be put forth in a public vote or not, and whether a super majority or a unanimous vote for park land would be needed, he preferred a unanimous vote by the Commission. He did not think it is appropriate for the Commission to state to the public that when they are making decisions regarding development or opportunities for the City, that they have to wait until an election year or that the items be placed in a special election with additional costs in order to deal with City-owned property which is park land. He realized that park land was the reason for the Charter Review Board to convene, and he felt they arrived at a recommendation that he could live with, but he did not believe that any Commission would be supportive of putting out park land for any other use. Even if there is a supermajority, it would have to be something that would be beneficial to the taxpayers for all five Commissioners to vote unanimously. He felt it is inappropriate to consider that this be put on a ballot.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she has been torn with this issue, and asked how much park land has been sold over the course of the City's history without input from the residents. She further stated that they were never interested in selling Hardy Park to the federal government. They wanted it, but the City Commission was not interested. They could have taken the land, but she felt it would be hard to get a 5-0 vote regarding the sale of park land. She stated she would be comfortable if the Charter amendment reflected a unanimous vote for such sale.

Mayor Naugle stated that the word "unanimous" would cover things in case the number of Commissioners changes.

Commissioner Hutchinson indicated that she would be interested in knowing how much park land the City has sold over the years.

Commissioner Moore agreed it should be a unanimous vote.

Vice Mayor Trantalis asked why the Charter Review Board has recommended a super-majority instead of any other number.

Dan Lewis, Chair of the Charter Review Board, stated that in listening to the Commission's discussions, it appears they understood the Board's intent. They felt the Commission at all times should be able to legislate, and they honored such responsibility.

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

Mr. Lewis stated that the Board felt it should not be a majority, but a super-majority. They felt it is inappropriate to go to the public for every issue because that is the job of the Commission. He stated that during elections, the public would decide if the Commission is doing a good job. He was not sure if they would have opposed a unanimous vote had it been offered. The Board wanted the Commission to have the option in case something had to be done, while at the same time they wanted to make it as difficult as possible. They felt that open space and park land is a scarce commodity and should be preserved.

Commissioner Teel agreed that it should be a unanimous vote, and did not think it should be a ballot issue, which could be cumbersome over the years.

Mayor Naugle stated that in 1952, developers had been after land, which is now the South Beach Parking lot, to build apartment complexes. He would accept "unanimous" which would be an improvement over what is presently on the books.

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

Commissioner Teel asked if they are going to include open space. Commissioner Moore indicated they are only including park land.

Mr. Lewis stated that it was the Board's sense that it is a definition the City needed to address and create a registry of areas they want preserved. From time to time, it would be updated. He cautioned them regarding five votes, noting that essentially would give any Commissioner the ability to veto. He was not sure where they were headed in that regard.

Commissioner Teel stated that when she spoke of open space, she thought of the Coral Ridge Country Club. She stated that is a big concern for those residents because the land consists of many acres and is privately owned.

Mayor Naugle suggested that two maps be provided at the next meeting showing parcels identified as parks under the Comprehensive Plan, and other City-owned parcels. He stated they could then discuss any other items, which should be added to the mix.

Vice Mayor Trantalis noted that it would take five votes to sell park land, but it would only take three votes to add or delete items from the list. The City Manager stated that is not correct.

Commissioner Moore understood the Charter Review Board's recommendation regarding super-majority. He advocated a unanimous vote. He wanted the public to know if they did not have the opportunity to vote, they could feel comfortable that they could negotiate with the Mayor or a Commissioner to get one person to ensure that the park land would not be given up for development. He felt the way to do this would be to capsule it with a unanimous vote. He was concerned when they began discussing property that is not presently entitled park property. He did not want to get into the caveat of looking at property they own and whether it is or is not. If it is now park land, then it should remain park land, and the issue would be to continue it as such.

Commissioner Moore stated further that discussion regarding slivers of property on A-1-A or an opportunity for people to access the waterways as open green space is now being named a park. People are concerned about existing park land; they do not want it sold. If it is to be considered, then they want the Commission to be cognizant that they are making a move that would be beneficial to the City and its taxpayers.

Mayor Naugle stated that once they review the park land exhibit, they probably would not want to add others to it.

Commissioner Teel stated that the Imperial Point entranceway is a large parcel and she was not sure about its ownership. She added that there is another parcel in The Landings. She felt they both would need to come under the park designation in order to protect them. She indicated they are being maintained as if they are parks.

Commissioner Moore continued stating that if the other properties being mentioned are not parks and a Commissioner wants them named as such, then they would not be sold unless there is a unanimous vote.

Vice Mayor Trantalis asked how they are going to get lands named as parks, and how could they prevent lands from being de-named as parks.

Mayor Naugle stated that the City needs to codify the existing list and then have a mechanism whereby things could be added, but not deleted.

The City Attorney explained that in the ordinance they could adopt the Charter issue. They need to provide for how to get something on the list. At present, there is no way to designate parks, but they have been listed in the Land Use Plan. For purposes of the Charter, they would have a specific designation.

Mayor Naugle suggested that a majority vote could add items to the list, and a unanimous vote could delete items.

Commissioner Moore asked why that should be part of the Charter. The City Attorney stated there is another element of the recommendation. In the recommendation suggesting a super-majority, there is another suggestion, that property acquired be an equivalent or greater size property within a radius.

Mayor Naugle stated that it sounded to him like trades are being set up.

Commissioner Moore stated he did not have a problem with the language because it would require a unanimous vote of the Commission. However, he did not want to tie the hands of future Commissions.

Commissioner Hutchinson clarified that it might not be part of the language for the Charter amendment, but could be part of the language for the ordinance that they may adopt. The City Attorney stated that it was his understanding that the acquisition of an equal size property is a condition prerequisite of being able to have a unanimous vote in order to sell it. There could be a unanimous vote to sell it based upon the Board's recommendation, but if they did not acquire an equal size parcel, then it could not be sold even if there is a unanimous vote. He wanted to confirm what the Commission wanted before attempting to draft the language.

Commissioner Moore preferred to see the replacement required. Commissioner Hutchinson agreed. Commissioner Teel stated that possibly it could be replaced with a waterfront property that would not be two acres, but only one acre because it is waterfront property. She felt there might be some other issues, which could complicate the matter. Commissioner Moore stated it would also be more prevalent for the issue of why they are discussing changing park land for another site and based upon the land use plan, they had to have a certain number of acres of park land. He stated the Board did not want to allow the Commission any reason to reduce the acreage of park land.

Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager, asked if an easement has the effect of a transfer under this scenario. There have been examples where the City has transferred properties to provide easements for small pieces of park land. He thought they have also transferred some land to the Department of Transportation so they could fix an intersection.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 2:32 p.m.

Commissioner Moore clarified it would be a unanimous vote no matter what the number of Commissioners. Mr. Bentley stated it could possibly have an adverse impact. The City Attorney asked if the easement has been granted over land owned in fee or is it a right-of-way. Mr. Bentley explained that they have expanded the right-of-way, and the City has fee title to the park.

Commissioner Hutchinson returned to the meeting at approximately 2:33 p.m.

Commissioner Moore indicated that 800 sq. ft. has been given to DOT because they needed a turning lane adjacent to the park. In this recommendation, it would require that the State also have to consider giving the City another 800 sq. ft. somewhere. He felt the public is saying that if they are going to deal with the issue of park land, it does not matter who got the easement. They want the land replaced. It would be more difficult, but he believed the public is saying why should they take away the park land.

The City Attorney stated that if they limit it to sale or transfer, then they would not be troubled by the easement issue. Mayor Naugle asked if sale or transfer would cover a 99-year lease. The City Attorney confirmed yes, because case law states it is

tantamount to a fee transfer. Mayor Naugle suggested that something be included for a sale or long-term lease.

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated that his understanding of a transfer would be any right that one has of real property being given to another. A fee simple transfer would be a normal transfer, but if they gave an easement would it still be a transfer. The City Attorney replied that he is thinking in terms of transfer of a fee because of the number of easements across the property. Vice Mayor Trantalis indicated that if they left it open as transfer, it could include easements. The City Attorney asked if they would exclude road or utility easements. Vice Mayor Trantalis felt the Commission would do those pro forma. The City Attorney did not know how the Charter would affect their ability to be able to negotiate a settlement with DOT because they could take the property.

Commissioner Moore stated if they took the property, it would be because they have eminent domain power.

Mayor Naugle stated that it needs to be done in some way so as to accommodate the sports facilities. The City Attorney stated that he would work on this matter.

Mayor Naugle questioned whether the auditor has to be a CPA.

Commissioner Hutchinson emphasized that she would not “budge” from her position regarding this matter. She believed the auditor should be a licensed CPA because it gives that individual a broad background. Mayor Naugle remarked that some of the best auditors and accountants are not CPAs.

Commissioner Moore stated that if someone is a good auditor, they would be able to pass a CPA examination. He did not believe this is the appropriate time to do this because he believed there should be public hearings and input opportunity before the item is placed on the ballot. He stated his concern about the Auditor position change is that unlike when they changed the Charter to have the City Clerk hired by the City Commission, the Auditor position change gives the impression that the present auditor is not “up to snuff,” and that they want the opportunity to select someone else. He wanted this to be placed in a manner where if the issue passes, the present auditor, who has performed his duties in an appropriate manner, would be offered the position. He stated the Charter change would simply be regarding how the person reports.

The City Attorney stated the question is whether they are going to leave the Manager’s office with the ability to have their own internal audit staff. If this is replacing that function or would this be a separate function. He stated that the County’s old model is that they have their own internal audit staff as a tool of management, and they also have the independent auditor, which reports to the Commission.

Commissioner Moore stated if that is the case, then this is a “witch hunt,” and he did not want it. He stated if there are going to be two separate entities with a Manager with his auditing team, and the Commission with their auditor, then he did not want to be a part of it. It should be one or the other; he did not see the need for two.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated this is not a “witch hunt,” and indicated that the County’s model worked well for the last 25 years or more. She felt it is an opportunity for whoever they have working for them to incorporate a check and balances system. She

also stated that in regard to the wording "have the power to pull any agenda item for one meeting for review," it would be for a "cooling off period." Possibly a glitch would be noticed, and additional time would be needed for further investigation.

Commissioner Moore stated that the County has not had an internal auditor for 25 years. This has just been done due to a Charter change where they have an external auditor selected by the Commission. The system is in its infancy, and it has not been two years since they started it. They have an auditor who has been hired by the County Manager.

Commissioner Teel referred to the CPA license, and asked about an individual who might have just graduated and passed their examination. Commissioner Hutchinson indicated they still have a license. Commissioner Teel felt that makes a difference in comparing that person to an individual who might have over 20 years experience. She felt they are tying their hands. She is not opposed to the CPA license, but she felt it needs to be further defined.

Vice Mayor Trantalis left the meeting at approximately 2:45 p.m.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that a license would be required; no time frame was given. Mayor Naugle preferred not to have the CPA requirement because he felt quality is being limited, but he would accept anything just to get it on the ballot.

Dan Lewis stated that in the County model they had for years, at the request of the County Manager the auditor would review the audit or business practices of any given deal. The auditor also could do spot checks under the auspices of the Manager for business practices. He served on the County's Charter Revision Commission, and explained that the financial aspect is so important to modern government today that the person should be on the dais at the same level as the City Attorney and City Manager.

Mr. Lewis further stated that they also felt there are two different functions. He explained that administration is in charge of accounting, as opposed to auditing functions. Therefore, the Board separated the auditing and review functions.

Vice Mayor Trantalis returned at approximately 2:46 p.m.

Mr. Lewis continued, stating that the Board consolidated everything into one office and elevated it to the County Controller model. The Board did not feel it made sense to have two audit functions, but it did make sense to separate the auditing function from the accounting function. Some members of the Board felt it did not go as far as they preferred, but it appeared to be a reasonable compromise and a first step. It was meant to be separate and not to duplicate.

Commissioner Moore stated that the description just given is different than what the Commission has stated in the past in regard to a staff auditor, as well as an external auditor. He believed this is not the appropriate way to handle the matter. Having someone in Accounting, review how checks are cut, what compensation is being distributed, and making sure that the guidelines are being followed, has nothing to do with the allegation made by the Mayor regarding the \$6 Million. It has nothing to do with the external auditor claiming the City has over-spent. It has to do with the policymakers not receiving enough information and not following what is being spent, along with revenues not coming in to meet the budget.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated it is the Manager's job to get the information to them, and it was not done.

Commissioner Moore indicated that the auditor would not be able to give that information. It would still require the policymakers to follow the bouncing ball. He stated that involves a difference of opinions. He was concerned that they not have a "witch hunt" situation. If they are going to have an external auditor hired by the Commission with the same authority as the City Attorney, City Manager, and City Clerk, then there is no need for two of them. If that is where they are headed, then he would speak against such auditor.

Mayor Naugle explained that the City Manager would still have his audit office, but this would be a separate auditor who would report to the Commission. Commissioner Moore indicated that he would not be in support of such auditor, and he would do whatever possible not to have the public accept it.

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated it is the City Manager's prerogative how he runs his office. It is the Commission's prerogative to have their own person to look over the shoulder of the other auditor.

Commissioner Moore asked how many staff people are they talking about and what type of budget would be involved. Mayor Naugle stated they would be saving \$6 Million. The City Attorney stated it is his understanding that a budget would have to be put together in order to run that office, and would probably require less staff since the organizations are not going to be combined. One is currently under the City and would stay with the Manager's office, and the other would be a stand alone. When this is put out for election, it would not be considered until November, and then they would have to adopt a budget, put a hiring plan together, and have a consultant specify what kind of staff would be required to perform the necessary duties. It would probably involve less than five people to start.

Mayor Naugle stated that the next item for discussion is No. 17, and he felt this should be worded that the hiring of Commissioner assistants should be done by the City Commission and not the City Manager. Presently the selection is done by the City Manager. He explained that no new positions are being created.

Commissioner Hutchinson suggested that they make it that the assistants would be hired by the City Commission and if that passes, then they could discuss the process. She stated it did not necessarily have to be part of the Charter, but they should discuss how it should take place.

The City Attorney stated that the question he would draft would amend the Charter to create the option. Mayor Naugle suggested that the coordinator be one of the assistants and then have a receptionist, which totals six.

The Acting City Manager asked why they have to define how many; could they simply state that the Commission would appoint their assistants. Commissioner Hutchinson reminded everyone they are looking to the future and not just the next six months. A future Commission might want more than six people.

Commissioner Moore asked what would be the responsibility of the City Clerk with respect to the staff. He also asked if they would be in the present retirement system along with other City employees. Commissioner Hutchinson explained that the only thing being changed is how they are hired. The City Attorney explained there would be a salary range, and they would be at their same existing level. Commissioner Moore asked if he would have full jurisdiction over his assistant, and that the City Clerk would have nothing to say. He also asked if the receptionist and coordinator would be reporting to the City Clerk. Mayor Naugle replied that the coordinator would become one of the Commission assistants. Commissioner Moore indicated that the City Clerk would only have the responsibility of dealing with the receptionist. Mayor Naugle confirmed that as correct. The City Attorney stated that he is going to propose language that would allow them to select support staff for the Commission office, and the Commission would decide where they work. Commissioner Hutchinson added that possibly the receptionist should work for the coordinator versus the City Clerk. She did not think they needed to discuss such details at this time. She indicated that they need the Charter change to allow this to take place. She felt everyone in their office needs to work under the auspices of the Commission office, and not one floor below.

Mr. Lewis stated that the Board anticipated that the Commission would have the right to place rules for the hiring and supervision of such assistants that they might require. He explained it was not meant that each Commissioner could do whatever they wanted. Mayor Naugle confirmed that it was with the intent that the Commission collectively establish such rules. Mr. Lewis concurred.

The Acting City Manager stated that the idea is that the Commission would determine what their staff would be, and then decide the compensation plan. Mayor Naugle asked if the Acting City Manager is in favor of this proposal. The Acting City Manager confirmed yes.

Commissioner Moore stated that it had been described as the Commissioners having a budget to deal with their staff, but clarified that is not presently being discussed. Commissioner Hutchinson confirmed.

Action: City Attorney to draft ordinances for placement on the November, 2004 ballot: (1) require that if any City-owned park or open space is to be sold or transferred, an equivalent or greater size property within a certain radius be acquired, and requiring a super-majority vote of the entire City Commission for such sale, or transfer; (5) create the position of an independent auditor who would be selected & report to the Commission; and (17) allow City Commission to staff their office.

I-C -- Proposed Charter Amendment by the Citizens Initiative Against Over-Development

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated that he had this item placed on today's agenda because there has been a lot of discussion over the years regarding the type of development, which has been allowed to occur throughout the City. A group known as the Citizens Initiative Against Over-Development has formed, and has met in order to formulate a potential referendum that would encompass various changes that are being recommended so as to check over-development in the City.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 3:01 p.m.

Vice Mayor Trantalis continued stating that the City has experienced a good deal of over-development and he felt it is important that the Commission have the opportunity to discuss what parts of the proposed initiative they might want to adopt. He stated the item regarding park lands is an important step in the right direction. One of the biggest concerns has been that more discussion is needed regarding the proposals. He felt the changes proposed are important and fundamental to the future vitality of the City if they ever are going to allow individuals to enjoy the amenities and quality of life they came here for, and not be over run by rampant development.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that the Charter Review Board has been meeting for six months, twice a month. She asked why hasn't this Charter amendment been reviewed. It would have permitted public input. It affects the entire City. She indicated that her district has had zero input on this, and asked what is the cost analysis of it. She asked what would be the cost to the City when they take away people's rights.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 3:03 p.m.

Commissioner Hutchinson continued to ask what would be the fiscal impact to the tax base if suddenly people's properties are devalued due to some of the proposed Charter amendments. She indicated that she is a firm believer in the process. Twice a month she speaks to her district about participating in the process and the process starts with the public. This is an open Commission that encourages discussion. She is disheartened that this has not gone through the process, and was not allowed to be brought to the various neighborhoods, along with the business community. To not participate in the Charter Review Board is not the right way to go. She realized where they want to go with this item, but she is a believer in the process. She remarked that this is a lengthy document. The Commission has not yet received an opinion from the City Attorney in regard to its ramifications to the City and individual property owners.

Commissioner Teel stated that Commissioner Hutchinson's point regarding the Charter Review Board is well taken. She had suggested that is where they should start. She was also disappointed that they had not approached that Board.

Tom Connick, attorney, stated that he represents the Citizens Initiative Against Over-Development. They have met with each Commissioner and a copy of the proposed Charter amendment has been distributed. This amendment advances the interests of the citizens of the City, and is a reasonable regulation of property, while still providing property owners an economical and viable use of their land. Due to the configuration or particularities of a property, individuals still have the variance procedure available to them.

Mr. Connick continued stating that from reviewing the Unified Land Development Regulations and understanding practices of the past, the mechanisms available to get around the ULDR are not in reality following the true intent of the ULDR. Referendums give citizens power and protection over their quality of life. In reality, this City has changed during the last 10-15 years, especially in the beach area.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 3:09 p.m. and returned at 3:10 p.m.

Mr. Connick further stated that in reading the proposed ordinance, there is a progression whereby it applies to the entire City. The bullet points attempt to give a fair summary. He stated that this is something that the public wants. He further stated that the Charter Review Board should not be the exclusive way to have something brought forward in a referendum. He added that the reality is there would be no negative fiscal impact, but developers would not favor it because they do not want restrictions regarding the over-development, which has taken place. He stated that the fact of the matter is that this Charter amendment is legally defensible.

Steven Glassman, Central Beach Alliance, stated that in terms of the process, public workshops have been advertised. He remarked that they are meeting with the Council of Civic Associations next week, but they do not think the process would end so quickly. Mayor Naugle indicated that due to the problem with the voting machines, the City is being rushed with its referenda questions. Mr. Glassman stated that the membership of the CBA has voted overwhelmingly to support this referendum.

Andy Ziffer stated that he is astute with his property rights, and in reading this document, he did not understand many things. An open workshop is needed to help explain the document.

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated that there clearly is no consensus to move forward. He appreciated the Commission adding a Charter amendment question that would restrict the sale of park land. This item has been placed on the table, and there is a need to have laws changed to help arrest the over-development that has taken place. He stated they need to conduct public hearings and workshops, and it did not mean that this item would die. This is a voice out there screaming, "Stop them madness." He believed the item should be revisited, and that many of the proposals should be adopted.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated her issue is not whether this is right or wrong, but the fact that the Charter Review Board has been meeting regarding any Charter amendments the public is interested in. Once consensus has been reached within the CBA and other organizations, the first step would have been to share that information. She realized they are getting "cut off at the knees" regarding public input due to the deadline set by the Supervisor of Elections. For the past six months the group has met, and it would have been viable for them to have shared their documentation with the Charter Review Board. She stated it is not a debate as to whether this is right or wrong, but this is the process set up to discuss such matters.

Mayor Naugle wanted voters to be informed and to be able to consider such items on the ballot. It is unfortunate the City is being rushed and not able to have this item considered at this time. He was thankful that the parks issue has been included on the ballot in some form.

Action: None taken.

I-E – Public Safety Bond

Bruce Roberts, Chief of Police, gave a brief presentation regarding the assessment for the Police Department.

Ian Reeves, Architects Design Group, Inc., stated that for the last 10 months they have been working on analysis of the Police Department's space needs. He explained they have reviewed the facilities, and met with the staff.

Mr. Reeves continued, stating that the existing facilities consist of 96,107 square feet, including off-site facilities, which is the original facility. He proceeded to show photographs of the site and the existing conditions. He explained the building was built 46 years ago, and the last addition built over 20 years ago. He stated that they recommend that the Department continue to re-use the existing facility for a new facility even though it has some constraints such as the communications tower. He stated that in Orlando it cost over \$8 Million to move their communications tower. Therefore, it is their suggestion that they rebuild around the existing tower at this site. He continued stating that there are some existing environmental issues, which are not significant, but have to be resolved. He stated that some live Oak trees exist at the site, which they feel are an attribute and should be retained. He proceeded to show photographs.

Mr. Reeves stated that the facility was built using the old fortress mentality and is not user friendly. He proceeded to show photographs of the existing facility. He stated that an individual's first impression of the facility is very negative. He stated the facility is characterized as a "hodge-podge" of various spaces throughout the building. He proceeded to show photographs of the basement. The area contains the fire protection system for the building, the telephone system, and other critical functional elements. He remarked that if the basement would flood, the entire building would be inoperable.

Mr. Reeves further stated that factors that influence the spatial needs of the Department are:

- Annexation
- Legislative Mandates
- Tourism
- Population Growth

Mr. Reeves continued to show charts of Broward County's and the City's population growth. Projections show that about 258,000 sq. ft. is needed. Development alternatives are that the current property be utilized because it involves the least cost and controversy. He proceeded to explain the following options:

- Option A – Build for Year 2010. Not recommended because by the time the facility would be completed, in about 3-4 years, there would be over-crowding.
- Option B – Build for Year 2010 with additional shall space.
- Option C – Build for Year 2015. Recommended.
- Option D – Build for Year 2015 with additional shelf space.

Mr. Reeves explained that these options are expensive, and they have updated the cost of the projects during the last two weeks based upon what has been taking place in the construction industry. Since 2003, construction costs have risen 3%, and within the first six months of 2004, construction costs rose 9.8%. He provided costs for the various options as follows:

- Option A - Turn-key cost, including furniture, professional fees, site surveys, and other costs. The total would be \$59,442,100.
- Option B – \$63,346,280.
- Option C – \$65,552,696.
- Option D - \$69,455,476.

Mr. Reeves stated the funding opportunities they have analyzed to help reduce the costs are sales tax exemption, state grants, federal grants, homeland security grants, and impact fees.

Mr. Reeves further stated that their recommendations are the following:

- Establish a “Winning Strategy for Voter Referendum: March 2005”. He stated they are concerned about a November election due to not having enough time. Five voter referendums for law enforcement and/or public safety facilities have passed within the last five years and those are as follows:
 - * Palm Beach Gardens
 - * Village of Palm Springs
 - * Daytona Beach Shores
 - * Lake Worth
 - * Winter Park
- Create a Citizens Advisory Committee
- Select Development Option “C”
- Present findings to City Commission, City Manager, and the Public
- Seek all possible grant opportunities.

Mr. Reeves proceeded to show “The Vision” encompassing the new facility, which would be constructed around the existing facility so as to be fully operational before beginning demolition of the existing building. The new facility would be user friendly and secure.

Commissioner Moore asked if the jail has been included in the vision. Mr. Reeves advised no. He stated they projected the need for a jail as an option that would cost about \$5.5 Million.

Ted Fling asked if the existing Parks and Recreation building would be affected. Mr. Reeves explained it has the option to remain because they have not yet found an alternative site for that facility. It is designed so it could remain operational. In the long term, they see the facility relocating and the site being used as a multi-purpose training center.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked about the existing maintenance facility. Mr. Reeves explained it would be relocated to an alternate site. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the cost includes such relocation. Mr. Reeves replied it does not include the relocation, and a separate study is being performed in that regard.

Bruce Larkin, Director of Administrative Services, explained that the City hired a fleet consultant to do a projection as to the cost of building a new maintenance facility. He

explained further that would include police and general fleet maintenance, along with sanitation fleet maintenance and would cost about \$5.5 Million, not including land or site preparation.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if that would be part of the bond. Chief Roberts confirmed yes and stated that Chief Latin has the figures and projections for the fire facilities, along with Cecelia Hollar who figures for the cost of their facilities. The original intent and concept was to have all costs rolled into the public safety bond. Commissioner Hutchinson indicated that it would take place in 2006, not 2005. She remarked that there is no election in 2005. Mayor Naugle remarked if a special election is held in 2005, there would be additional costs involved. Chief Roberts stated that they are running up against the time to get it on the 2005 ballot so that it would be successful. He indicated they are also coming into the new budget year, and he was concerned about this issue being successful at this time.

Commissioner Moore stated that the November election is out of the question. He believed that the March, 2006 election would be the appropriate time. He felt the public's perception of supporting such a bond would make more sense at that time. He urged that they focus on 2006.

Mayor Naugle stated there is a need for a new police facility, but since it is also tied to Public Works and the garage, it is a more complex operation. As part of the deal, they might have to acquire additional land and relocate other facilities. They have been aware of the Fire Department's needs for years. He did not think they should wait for that portion, and should move forward for this November ballot. The Fire Department issue is less complex and could be a stand alone item. He did not think it would jeopardize the future of the Police Department and the Public Works projects. He felt this is a simple transaction and an easy one for the public to understand.

Commissioner Hutchinson wanted the option to split them because in the public's view \$120 Million is harder to swallow, than \$40 Million and \$70 Million. Both public safety departments are in dire need. She stated that Chief Latin only needs to walk the public through his facilities, and he would have an easy sell. Their present facilities are deplorable. If they were private homes, Code Compliance would shut them down. The City should be ashamed that they are still in existence. She felt a \$40 Million bond would be easier to sell. She also believed the Police bond would be an easy sell in 2006. She felt it makes more sense to split the issues.

Vice Mayor Trantalis stated that the funding would be crucial and the Commission has stated that they want such facilities replaced. He asked if it would be appropriate to make application for the funding sources prior to the referendum, or if it should be done afterward. If they have commitments from the federal or state government to assist in the building, then it would be an easier sell to the public. He also asked if they have given any consideration to having a company build it and then lease it back to the City.

Mr. Reeves stated that is an option. He advised they have worked on over 50 police facilities and that has been raised several times, but never come to fruition. He stated it has occurred in regard to large county jail projects, but he has never seen it successfully completed on a law enforcement facility. There is nothing to preclude them from seeking possible grant funds, which could change the financial complexion of the project. If they

pursue a federal legislative grant request for the next cycle, there would be the opportunity to seek a significant sum of money.

Terry Sharp, Finance Director, stated that when the voters approve general obligation bonds, the City is not required to sell them all at once. Even if they receive grant monies after an amount is approved, the City would not have to sell all the bonds. He stated the City could emphasize that as part of the process.

Commissioner Teel stated it is clear that the Fire Department issue should move forward, and she is supportive of that for the November election. It would reduce the "sticker shock" of the bonds, and give an opportunity to the citizens to see how the project would move forward. It would also give them additional time to resolve the issues regarding the other facilities such as Parks and Recreation and Public Services. It is a complex issue and she felt they could do a better sales job if enough time is granted.

Chief Roberts appreciated the Commission's support regarding this issue, but he indicated that they are concerned about separating the items because then they would be going back to the taxpayers twice in 2-3 years. The Fire Department has been gracious in allowing them to stall their process, and they recognized that their needs are more dire than the Police Department.

Otis Latin, Chief of Fire-Rescue, stated that they have broken the work into phases. In the first phase, they would address four stations that are in more critical need. In the next phase, there are three stations to be done.

Commissioner Moore was concerned about the public perception of reading every week about the deficit of the City, layoffs, and management leaving. He is not supportive of any bond going to the ballot in November. The City has to gather the taxpayers' confidence, and he did not think now is the appropriate time. He preferred they go through the City's financial advisor, as they did with the Community Redevelopment Agency, along with the lending process, and possibly they could deal with the four critical sites mentioned. He preferred they go ahead with a loan, and then in March 2006, both issues could be placed on the ballot, and the loan could be retired through such bond. He did not support going to the public at this time with any additional major investment that could cause them to turn it down.

Mayor Naugle announced there is a consensus to move forward with the Fire Bond issue on the November 2004 general election ballot.

Commissioner Moore asked if this item could be placed on the Commission's next agenda to get information about the feasibility of borrowing money for the sites, which have already been approved, before taking this action. He did not think it could cause any harm just to investigate the matter.

Mayor Naugle did not see any harm in doing such an exercise, as long as they are able to save their place on the ballot.

Action: Place fire-rescue component on the November 2, 2004 ballot. Place loan financing as an alternative on the July 20, 2004 agenda for discussion.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 3:45 p.m.

I-F -- Fort Lauderdale Evaluation and Appraisal Report Process

Mayor Naugle announced that the recommendation is to go to the South Florida Regional Planning Council. Commissioner Moore agreed. He asked what other elements the Commission wants to include in the plan.

Commissioner Moore stated he has no items other than what is required. He stated that he is the representative of the League of Cities on the South Florida Regional Planning Council, and they are very professional on such issues.

Mayor Naugle concluded the City would do what is required.

Action: City to delegate EAR review to the South Florida Regional Planning Council and only include required elements in the EAR letter of understanding.

I-A -- Board of Directors and Community Transportation Plan Reorganization

Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager, stated this is one of two Transportation Management Association issues. The second item was pulled. Evidently there has been some confusion, as they thought both items were pulled from the agenda.

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

Mr. Bentley stated that they are responding to a request by Commissioner Moore last year regarding the organizational structure. This has been done in conjunction with the County representative and the Downtown Development Authority. It is recommended that the TMA Board be reconstituted; the City Commission would then appoint two members, along with the County appointing two members.

Due to the fact that the TMA was not present, Commissioner Moore preferred to wait until everyone is present to discuss the issue.

Action: None taken.

I-G – Broward County Landscape Revision Plans; Broward Boulevard Median Between I-95 & NW 7 Avenue

Commissioners Moore and Hutchinson stated they just wanted to have the work done and to see ground cover and fast growing material used.

Action: As recommended.

I-H -- Residential Solid Iste Bid Proposals

Mayor Naugle stated the recommendation is to accept the bids and put the monies in reserve.

The Acting City Manager suggested that whatever monies are saved, they be placed in a reserve account.

Commissioner Moore asked if they are ending the City handling disposal services, and using one hauler. Mayor Naugle confirmed that as correct. Commissioner Moore urged the Commission not to do this. He understood the issue of discussing savings, but the minute the City gets rid of their equipment and loses staff, they would find themselves drowning. Every other municipal entity that has the relationship where they have no support but the private sector in such manners, has found their costs to increase. The City has done a good job over the years perform that function. The City might have to buy equipment when none is available. He did not want to be in the situation where a conglomerate is going to have such control.

Commissioner Moore stated it is good to review in order to see the cost advantage, but even in that regard, the City is still saving money.

Commissioner Hutchinson was concerned because they are in an interim mode at this time. The new City Manager would not come on board until August 2, 2004, and she did not want to do this now. She felt before this decision is made to give up the current 40%, she wanted the new City Manager's opinion. The current contract does not expire until November 2004, and therefore, she did not feel this matter has to be addressed in July.

Ed Udvardy, Public Services, stated that it has been bid with two options. Option I is the routes currently under contract with Waste Management, and that contract would expire on November 1, 2004. Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the bids are good until the contract expires. Mr. Udvardy confirmed yes. He further stated that the second portion is not to be awarded until the following year. They could return at the next meeting and consider award of Option I.

Mayor Naugle stated they would discuss this matter in September with the new City Manager.

Harold Carter, Waste Management, stated there are two issues before the Commission at this time. He stated that Option I is the current contract, which would expire in November, 2004. They are the low bidder. He would appreciate that decision being made quickly so they could move forward. He stated that Option II could wait until September.

Commissioner Hutchinson did not object to the request.

Vice Mayor Trantalis asked if Waste Management is going to buy the equipment, was recently purchased by the City. Mr. Udvardy stated that some of the equipment was recently purchased. Waste Management was the only bidder who has given a price for the vehicles. They are presently working with the Fleet Department to see if it would be effective to utilize the price given, if they proceeded with Option II. Vice Mayor Trantalis asked how much would be lost if they accepted the bid price. Mr. Udvardy stated that it is a speculation. A price of \$565,000 has been given for all the vehicles if they buy them "lock, stock and barrel." They are presently working with Fleet and auctioneers to see what the costs would be if they went to auction. The original purchase price of all the equipment was \$1.7 Million, but the vehicles have deteriorated over time. The recently purchased vehicles cost about \$165,000 each.

Mayor Naugle remarked that the technology being used by the City is obsolete. Mr. Udvardy stated they would bring back Option I to the second Commission meeting in July, and Option II would be scheduled for discussion in September.

Action: Wait for new City Manager's input with respect to Bid Option II and schedule award of Bid Option I on July 20, 2004.

I-I – Commercial Boulevard from NW 9 Avenue to NW 31 Avenue – Florida Department of Transportation Improvement Project

Commissioner Moore wanted to make sure that FDOT would ensure the City that there would be input by the Rock Island and North Andrews Gardens communities on this issue.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if they had made a presentation in any of Commissioner Moore's district neighborhoods. He replied no, but that he wanted that done. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that is the place they should start.

Commissioner Moore suggested that in the future when they are dealing with this particular item that the street is no longer called NW 31 Avenue; it is Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue, and should be noted as such in all documentation. He stated it is not an alternate name.

Commissioner Teel acknowledged that the changes are acceptable.

Peter Partington, Acting City Engineer, stated there is one policy issue, which is that the proposal includes additional landscaping. The question is whether the City is prepared to maintain it. The estimated cost of doing so is over \$10,000 per year. They want to move forward and have something formal presented on the agenda, stating there would be an agreement to maintain the landscaping.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked what type of landscaping is going to be provided.

Will Suarvo, Consultant, stated the landscaping would be from Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue to Powerline Road and would be a combination of trees, as well as ground cover. He stated that where sod would normally be placed, there would be pavers. It is a landscaping design, which matches a consistent theme that started near the Turnpike. They need a formal consensus from the Commission because they are at the point where they need to include the landscaping or proceed with xeriscape.

Action: Move forward with the improvements.

I-J – City Hall Study

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she pushed for this to be on the agenda. Originally, she stated there was to have been a special meeting, but that has not occurred. She felt this is an important matter that needs more time for discussion. Since they are scheduled for a meeting on July 26th for an ordinance to be presented at 6:00 p.m., and a meeting with the DDA at 1:00 p.m., she asked if they should possibly begin at 4:00 p.m. or 5:00 p.m. and meet later with the DDA.

Commissioner Moore stated he did not have a problem with that suggestion. Mayor Naugle suggested that they meet with the DDA at 4:30 p.m., and then have the public hearing regarding the ordinance at 6:00 p.m.; Vice Mayor Trantalis asked if anyone from the County is going to attend the meeting.

Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, stated they could be invited and they are aware of today's discussion.

Action: Deferred to July 26, 2004 special meeting. Broward County to be invited.

One Stop Shop

Commissioner Moore stated that he has been to the site of the One Stop Shop and he felt the employees would now have adequate space to operate, and the consumer would have a better way of having services rendered to them. He remarked there would also be sufficient storage now, and he wanted to compliment on how well the facility has been planned.

Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, announced that Marc LaFerrier of Keith & Schnars is present at today's meeting, along with Wayne Jessup, in-house Architect and project manager.

Commissioner Moore asked what it would cost to erect a canopy at the entranceway extending to the end of the sidewalk. He felt it would make sense in regard to how the building has been constructed, and it would protect individuals from inclement weather. Wayne Jessup stated he would check into the matter.

Commissioner Moore stated another issue is in regard to furniture; he did not know if that cost has been included. Mr. Jessup replied it is under budget at this point in time. Commissioner Moore further stated that they should consider furnishing the exterior lounge areas. Mr. Jessup stated that has not been included, but he would check into the matter.

Commissioner Hutchinson left the meeting at approximately 4:04 p.m.

Commissioner Moore stated another issue is signage along the roadway to guide individuals to customer parking, and away from the residential housing. One of the issues the public has been concerned about is the impact of traffic. He felt that could be addressed with signage. Individuals should be encouraged to use 18th Avenue, rather than 19th Avenue. Mr. Jessup stated that signs could be erected.

Commissioner Hutchinson returned to the meeting at approximately 4:05 p.m.

Mayor Naugle stated that they might have to wait to erect ground signs until the environmental issues are resolved regarding the park, but meantime signs could probably be erected. Mr. Jessup suggested that roadway signs could be erected.

Commissioner Moore further stated that due to the increase in traffic to the area, there has not been a level of service to justify a traffic signal at Sistrunk Boulevard and 19th Avenue, and he felt the consultant should investigate the matter.

Marc LaFerrier of Keith & Schnars, stated that the traffic study did not warrant a traffic signal, but he would review the study once again. Mayor Naugle suggested that once the road is used they could place a counter in the area and then check the numbers.

Commissioner Moore suggested that an opening ceremony be held for the One Stop Shop.

I-K – Voting Delegate & Alternate for Florida League of Cities Annual Conference – August 19-21, 2004

Action: Mayor Naugle selected as the Voting Delegate and Commissioner Moore as the alternate.

I-L – Air and Sea Show Pin Program

Commissioner Moore stated that he asked for this matter to be discussed. This was not placed on the agenda since the back-up information was not provided. Representatives from the pin company are present at today's meeting. He explained that they have a license agreement with the Olympic organization.

David Hyman, Aminco International (USA) Inc., stated that not only do they work with the Olympic organization, but also with all the major sporting organizations. When they read about the dilemma of the Air & Sea Show, and the possible non-renewal of it, he felt they would be able to assist the City. He stated that they put together a proposal and showed the types of pins that they have done. He also proceeded to distribute pins to all staff sitting at the Commission table. He explained that the concept is that they would sell pins in three different areas, such as on-site using an official pin, which would be numbered, on the back, and about every hour a number would be selected and a prize distributed. They would also create a website, and after the show individuals could retain their numbered pins and still win a prize once a week or once a month to keep the interest going.

Mr. Hyman explained they are offering 40% back to the City, which could generate well in excess of \$200,000. They would manage the entire program, and only ask for exclusive rights and the availability to sell the pins. In addition, they would sell the pins as they did for the Olympic sponsors, and royalties would be given back to the City. He explained further they would also attempt to do a retail program with either supermarket chains, McDonalds or whoever would be designated as a good partner for the City. He stated he has been doing this for ten years. Such a program generates enthusiasm and children contests are also done. Pin trading is a big thing, and today it could be compared to baseball trading cards in the '50's. During the event they have VIP centers where pins could be traded and an education provided regarding them, along with contests. He explained this way it becomes a family event, not just a revenue generator.

Mr. Hyman further stated that leading up to the event, monthly reports and check payments would be provided. He explained that they would design the pin, but the Commission would own the mark and have to approve it.

Mayor Naugle stated that this appears to be a great idea. The Acting City Manager and City Attorney could review the proposal and see if this could be done through a sole source, or if it would have to be put out for bid.

Commissioner Moore was happy that this could be considered, and he believed it would be to the City's advantage. He has learned there is an issue regarding the trademark of the Air & Sea Show, and suggested that they also discuss the item with the sponsor of the show. It was brought to his attention that there is an individual to do t-shirts and other items for them, and a pin has been mentioned which has never been done before. He wanted the Commission to encourage the partnership of this so everyone could be brought to the table in order to build consensus as to how the revenue issue could be addressed. The material reflects that they are willing to give revenue to a sponsor's program. They might consider giving up such revenue in order for the partnership to work.

Linda Gill asked if there is a way to sell the pins prior to the event. Mr. Hyman replied yes and explained that the sponsor would be contacted and they would sign an agreement with the Air and Sea Show. The Commission would approve the logo along with the company, and then the revenue would go back to the committee as part of the licensing agreement. He explained it would be pins for the Air & Sea Show, in conjunction with the sponsor's logo.

Action: City Manager and City Attorney to determine whether the pin program would have to be bid or could sole sourcing be used.

CLOSED DOOR SESSION 4:10 P.M. FOLLOWED BY

EXECUTIVE CLOSED DOOR SESSION

MEETING RECONVENED AT 6:00 P.M.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting is adjourned at 6:00 p.m.