

FORT LAUDERDALE CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE MEETING
FEBRUARY 7, 2012

Agenda Item	Page
City Commission Reports	8
1. E911 Call Taking and Dispatch Services	8
2. Transportation Enhancement and Scenic Highway Grants	9
3. Grand Prix; Special Event	9
4. Richard Mancuso; Recognition	9
5. 17 th Street Causeway Bridge, Resurfacing and South Federal Highway Repavement Projects	10
6. Homeless; Panhandling Legislation	10
7. Resolutions; City's Position on Various Matters	10
8. Earth Hour and Earth Day	10
9. Early Cost Recovery for Electric Utility Charges for Nuclear Power Plants	10
10. School Resource Officers	10
11. Advisory Boards; Telephonic Participation including Voting	10
12. Events and Matters of Interest including Planning for Neighborhood Police Meetings	10
I-A Florida East Coast Corridor Fast Start Plan	1
I-B South Florida East Coast Corridor Study and Central Broward Transit Projects	2
I-C Community Development Block Grant Application – Public Service Program Criteria – Discussion with Members of Community Service Board	4
I-D Banner Sign Pilot Program	5
I-E Proposed Lien Settlements – Special Magistrate and Code Enforcement Board Cases	5
II-A Replacement of Hydraulic Elevator Jack Cylinder and Sleeve – Von Mizell Center – Emergency Purchase	5
III-A Communications to the City Commission and Minutes Circulated For the Period Ending February 2, 2012	5
III-B Board and Committee Vacancies	8
City Manager Reports	6

CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE MEETING 1:37 P.M. February 7, 2012

Present: Mayor John P. “Jack” Seiler (arrived shortly after 1:37 p.m.)
Commissioners Bruce G. Roberts, Charlotte E. Rodstrom, Bobby B.
DuBose and Romney Rogers

Also Present: City Manager Lee R. Feldman
City Auditor John Herbst
City Clerk Jonda K. Joseph
City Attorney Harry A. Stewart
Sergeant At Arms Sergeant Robert Borowski

I-A – Florida East Coast Corridor Fast Start Plan

Bill Cross of the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority (SFRTA) reviewed slides on this topic. A copy of the slides is attached to these minutes. The SFRTA believes their service plan (Slide 15) could be implemented in three to five years. He elaborated upon the reasoning for proceeding with use of state funding to get the initial phase completed without federal assistance. SFRTA does not believe this would jeopardize receiving federal funding in the future. SFRTA believes the first phase is viable and could operate for many years as is.

Mr. Cross responded to questions raised by Commissioner Rodstrom: The operating cost would be shared amongst federal, state and county governments, adding new revenue from fare increases and administrative changes being made at SFRTA, with the shortfall of about \$6 million to be shared amongst fourteen municipalities. Station design would be minimal. This proposal and the one that is set out in Agenda Item I-B are two different approaches for the same transportation objective. The key difference has to do with federal funding. He believed that in order to secure federal funding, strong partnerships must be in place, yet the Florida Department of Transportation has cut the SFRTA and Metropolitan Planning Organizations out of the process. Mr. Cross confirmed for Commissioner Roberts that this plan would use Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) infrastructure in their long-range plan with respect to construction of stations. In fact, SFRTA is providing contractual services for the partnership amongst the City, FDOT (Florida Department of Transportation) and MPO, and integrally involved in the City’s downtown hub as well as being the WAVE project sponsor. In response to Vice Mayor DuBose, Mr. Cross advised the shortfall mentioned would be an annual cost to municipalities. The legal framework has not been worked out yet, but generally fifty trains per day would represent a full level of service. There would not be an additional fee charged to a municipality for anything above fifty trains per day. Delray Beach, for example, would receive a prorated fee for only six trains per day. The goal is to spread the cost. SFRTA will be presenting a term sheet, setting forth an approach for discussion. Any change to service level or fees originally negotiated would require SFRTA to return to the municipality. The municipalities can back out at any time. However, a long-term agreement of at least thirty years would be necessary before SFRTA builds a station for a municipality. In response to Commissioner Rogers, Mr. Cross indicated there has been discussion at the MPO as to representation on the SFRTA from the MPO board with respect to municipalities. This would require legislative action. The initial composition of the SFRTA board was to be balanced with those who are investing in the system. He could not respond specifically to the question of the status of discussions with the FEC in making this a reality. However, he pointed out that the FEC is different than it was twenty years ago. The FEC owns real estate along the corridor and they are motivated in that regard. He stressed again the need for strong partnerships. In further response as to traffic flow on the river, Mr. Cross indicated that SFRTA is comfortable in

that the trains are short, however, this is an investment in a different mode of transportation, putting pedestrians ahead of the automobile. No changes are proposed for the bridge. He will have to confirm whether there is funding for all of the quiet zones. He estimated that SFRTA would invest upfront for quiet zone infrastructure. Mayor Seiler asked about synchronization coordination of the crossings with traffic intersections that could seriously impact east/west traffic flow. Mr. Cross advised that this has not been looked into. It is a County function and SFRTA could coordinate with the County. There will be an interruption. In further response, Mr. Cross indicated that SFRTA anticipates an additional 56 trains per day across the river (to the current eleven). Trains going in each direction could be timed the same so as to reduce the bridge closings in half. Mayor Seiler emphasized that the marine industry could not tolerate 56 openings on the New River each day. Mayor Seiler asked what would be the minimum number of stations for the project to remain viable. Mr. Cross advised that would depend upon which cities would opt out. There are many cities that he felt it would be their loss if they chose not to participate. However, Fort Lauderdale and Miami are a must. In between those two points there is a high degree of flexibility. SFRTA has been conducting outreach and to date, they anticipate full participation. Commissioner Rogers emphasized the need for educating the public to compare what exists now and what is proposed. Mr. Cross concurred. In response to Commissioner Rodstrom, Mr. Cross indicated that the SFRTA is aware that the southeast Florida MPO's have retained an independent consultant to review both proposals.

I-B – South Florida East Coast Corridor Study and Central Broward Transit

Khalilah Ffrench of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT), indicated that she is the project manager for the Central Broward Transit Study. She reviewed slides on this topic. A copy of the slides is attached to these minutes. She noted that the FDOT anticipates that the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) will select an alternative in June of this year.

In response to Commissioner Rodstrom, Ms. Ffrench indicated that the FDOT intends to seek federal funding for this project and consequently are in the federal process. The funding plan is to have 50 percent federal; 25 percent state and 25 percent local. The FDOT has not gotten into the details of the local share breakdown. Generally FDOT would prefer to first have an alternative selected before more refinement of cost breakdown. Commissioner Roberts wanted to see cost comparisons for the east/west from this proposal as well as the one set forth in Agenda Item I-A. Commissioner Rogers wanted to know the cost for each route. Ms. Ffrench advised that FDOT is working on the costs. In response to Vice Mayor DuBose, Ms. Ffrench indicated that the two choices are a result of community input. Commissioner Roberts felt the City needs to know if the ridership numbers drive the two alternatives as well as what are the future economic development impacts. He believed west Broward Boulevard as opposed to Griffin Road presents more opportunity for economic development in the interest of Fort Lauderdale. In response to Vice Mayor DuBose concerning the two alternatives, Ms. Ffrench indicated perceived disruption to the community by rail came out in the public input. Mayor Seiler questioned that this proposal, unlike that in Agenda Item I-A, would change transportation in south Florida. He pointed out that there are already buses for this route. Amie Goddeau of FDOT, explained that the major commuter pattern from east/west is from the western communities to the downtown. Currently, it is necessary to change buses three times to commute from Sawgrass to downtown and it would take three hours. FDOT is looking to create a commuter pattern for people who work downtown and would be interested in a one-seat ride and the reliability of peak-hour service. A short-term study is underway to convert one lane on Broward Boulevard for express bus service. She referred to a similar example of the express service from Miramar to Miami; there are about 10-12 buses per day during peak periods of time only. Currently, the idea would be for the service to operate along State Road 84. Ridership

numbers will determine when an express bus could be justified. In response to Mayor Seiler, Ms. Ffrench indicated express service from Sawgrass to downtown would be fifty minutes. Mayor Seiler questioned why one would use a bus if they could also reach downtown in their automobile in thirty minutes. Ms. Goddeau felt reliability is the reason. Mayor Seiler questioned the cost per rider and Ms. Goddeau indicated subsidy is a consideration. Mayor Seiler pointed out that tens of thousands of people have to change their mode of transportation in order for this to be successful. Ms. Goddeau indicated that it will not change overnight. She referred to traffic congestion on Interstate 95 in the future. Commissioner Rogers emphasized the need for a model that would help people visualize these points in the perspective of today. Ms. Goddeau suggested the opening year could be emphasized. Commissioner Rogers felt each individual will make a cost-benefit decision and they need to be given choices. The City Manager felt the cost of fuel will help drive transportation solutions for the future. Another point to consider is that the easier east/west commute becomes, the more urban sprawl is promoted and the City's ability to create certain densities will be impacted. In response to Mayor Seiler, the City Manager felt the target audience is the individual that will be making the trip five times a week. Mayor Seiler asked what would be the volume goal. Ms. Goddeau explained without an east/west connection the western communities are not serviced. FDOT sees this as the strong backbone of the east/west connection. Without an east/west connection, the north/south ridership cannot be built. She offered to furnish information on other successful bus services. Greg Stuart of the Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization pointed to Phoenix, Dallas, San Jose and Salt Lake City as to successful systems and particularly drew attention to Phoenix and Salt Lake City.

Ms. Goddeau elaborated upon the state and federal processes. FDOT believes that a federal environmental document is necessary. For both of these projects, there is no state funding for right of way or construction. If state funding becomes available, these projects could be easily submitted. She emphasized the need to stay open for federal financing in order to attract a private partner (Slide 15 – SFECC Status – Ongoing Activities).

Ms. Goddeau reviewed those slides pertaining to the South Florida East Coast Corridor Study attached to these minutes. In response to Commissioner Roberts, Ms. Goddeau indicated that the FDOT is working with the Coast Guard on the bridge opening scheduling. Stations needed to support the system will be built regardless of a community's participation. The capital cost projections include quiet zones, station parking and cross-overs in Pompano Beach and Northwood. Operating and maintenance cost is based on train service every thirty minutes during peak hours and every hour during off-peak hours. Referring to the Slide 21 – Potential Scenarios for Passenger Service; Miami to Fort Lauderdale, she indicated that FDOT believes this option would avoid \$120 million in capital cost and would mean only one freight railroad. The Pompano connection to integrate with ridership on Tri-Rail could be built in the future. She contended that none of the studies presented today are faster than another; they are all dependent upon funding. In response to Commissioner Roberts, she agreed that there were four stations in Fort Lauderdale originally cited. They are all under consideration at this time. Evaluation should be concluded by February, March. Coordination efforts are underway at the airport.

In response to Commissioner Roberts, Ms. Goddeau advised if the Fort Lauderdale to Miami segment was done with non-federal funding, it could be completed in less than four years. In response to Commissioner Rogers, Ms. Goddeau indicated the entire 85 miles would be around \$600 million capital cost. Operating cost for Fort Lauderdale to Miami is about \$14 million. Fares and development rights at the stations should be factored in.

I-C – Community Development Block Grant Application – Public Service Program Criteria – Discussion with Members of Community Services Board

Donald Karney, chair of the Community Services Board (Board), advised that with respect to ranking, as suggested, points are being awarded for agencies that have private funding. Wendy Gonsher, member of the Board, offered specifics about the points with respect to private funding. The Board was uncertain whether the Commission was interested in private funding for the agency as a whole or the program for which funding was being sought. Commissioner Rogers thought there should be more weight given to this area. He suggested some points from the criteria of need be reassigned. Ms. Gonsher explained that the Board looked only at the points for funding, not for the application as a whole. Points are also given for the agency's plan to continue as funding goes away. Commissioner Rogers thought an agency that has between twenty-five and fifty percent private funding is doing well. Ms. Gonsher indicated that a longstanding dilemma for the Board has been the big agency versus the small agency. If the goal is to build capacity and support services, some of the newer agencies need to be supported and they tend not to get too much of the private funding, which is why the Board did not want to put too much weight for that criteria. Commissioner Rogers thought the degree of private support does not always go hand in glove with the size of the agency. Vice Mayor DuBose emphasized the importance of looking at the service and not the agency. Focusing on the agency could result in being counter-productive. Commissioner Roberts was concerned about effectiveness. Mayor Seiler wanted an agency to be sustainable. Commissioner Roberts agreed; he felt part of the measurement should be whether the agency can be sustainable. Ms. Gonsher indicated it was in the criteria as it existed before points were adjusted. She reiterated the Board's first question is whether the Commission is interested in private funding for the agency as a whole or the project for which funding was being sought. Vice Mayor DuBose commented that often the funding is used for a position and without the funding, the service is not provided even though the agency itself may be stable. With Ms. Gonsher's explanation that the need criteria is actually about severity and magnitude of the need, Mayor Seiler saw value in such reasoning. Mayor Seiler thought there should be more weight given to the financial area. Points should be given for having private funding. Vice Mayor DuBose cautioned that it should be specific to the objective; he commented about the subjectivity that exists. Mayor Seiler thought that agency status may be weighted too high. He suggested making each criteria nineteen and adding five points to agency status if an agency has never received funding. The City Auditor agreed that finances are a valuable part of the evaluation process. There are strong programs with great needs and management structures that have failed for financial reasons. Fraud and theft occurs in small not-for-profits that do not have strong financial controls. There was consensus approval to change the points to nineteen in each of the first five areas and five points to agency status. As to the question of whether the Commission is interested in private funding for the agency as a whole or the program for which funding was being sought, Ms. Gonsher thought it should apply to the program, however, larger agencies will switch funds. Chairman Karney commented if it is based on program, many startup agencies will be eliminated. Greg Brewton, Director of Sustainable Development, preferred basing it on program. Jeri Pryor, Housing and Community Development, advised that federal reporting requires both. There was consensus approval to require information on the amount of private funding available for the program.

Ms. Gonsher referred to changes made to performance indicators and indicated that request for forecasting information has been added. She mentioned a disconnect between the funding and performance appraisal calendars. As projects are recommended for approval, the Board will be identifying certain specific criteria for those projects. Consequently there may be additional criteria when the Board sees the projects.

In response to Vice Mayor DuBose, Ms. Pryor indicated staff now requires what the U.S. Housing and Urban Development Department requires, that is, how many clients will be served with a specified amount of funding. There may also be demographic information such as income level. With the new performance indicators, outcomes will be available. Discussion ensued about benchmark information and when it will be considered in the process wherein Mayor Seiler suggested giving the Board at least eighteen months with the new structure before the matter comes back to the Commission. Vice Mayor DuBose did not object to waiting eighteen months, but emphasized that it should be understood that such hard information will now be captured. With different agencies applying each year, there will be benchmarks on some and not others. Ms. Gonsler indicated at least in the initial years, benchmarking will result in a rule out and not a rule in. Such agencies could be ruled out by staff and not go to the Board in those cases. There was consensus approval on this item.

I-D – Banner Sign Pilot Program

This item had been requested by Commissioner Roberts. There was no objection.

I-E – Proposed Lien Settlements – Special Magistrate and Code Enforcement Board Cases

No objection.

II-A – Replacement of Hydraulic Elevator Jack Cylinder and Sleeve – Von Mizell Center – Emergency Purchase

No objection.

III-A – Communication to City Commission and Minutes Circulated for Period ending February 2, 2012

Affordable Housing Advisory Committee

Motion made by Ms. Spangler-Bartle, seconded by Mr. Walters, to let the City Commission know the Affordable Housing Advisory Committee is enthusiastic about the development of a strategic housing plan for the City, and would be willing to help in any way possible; the Committee would also like to encourage the City to educate the community about affordable housing in order to prevent the spread of “Not In My Back Yard” issues in the community.

Commissioner Rogers suggested and there was consensus approval for the Committee to move forward on both items.

Audit Advisory Board

Motion made by Mr. Oelke, seconded by Mr. Owen, to send a communication to the City Commission to ask for staggered two-year Board member terms; three members would be appointed one year and two members would be

appointed the next year. In a voice vote, motion passed 4-0.

Consensus approval. City Attorney will draft the appropriate legislation.

Budget Advisory Board

Motion made by Mr. Snead, seconded by Mr. Russo to inform the City Commission that the Board was encouraged by the budget methodology presentation from the City Manager's office and encouraged the Commission to continue to support it. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-0.

Motion made by Mr. Cobb, seconded by Mr. Russo to approve the Memo of Understanding that had been revised by Mr. Feldman and the Board this evening. The Board also noted they wanted the City to work on an ordinance amendment as well. In a voice vote, motion passed 8-0.

Commissioner Rogers questioned whether biographic information of board members should be posted on the City's website. Mayor Seiler thought it should be left to the discretion of each board.

Stanley Hawthorne, Assistant City Manager, explained that the Board would like their responsibilities codified for clarity. The current language is perhaps fifteen years old and in need for updating.

With respect to the memorandum of understanding (MOU), Mayor Seiler noted that with it being a non-binding expression of intent, he did not understand why there is provision for signatures. The City Attorney indicated that it is not legally enforceable. The City Manager explained that the MOU would be updated annually and become the Board's charge. Essentially, the Board would like some of their authority expanded in the ordinance. Mayor Seiler was concerned about updating the code annually. The City Manager explained that the Board is concerned about a change in the Board's relationship with a future commission or administration. Mayor Seiler preferred and there was consensus approval of an annual MOU update in lieu of an ordinance change.

Community Services Board

Motion by Ms. Birch, seconded by Ms. Shirley, to invite the City Manager to the next meeting, in order to share with the CSB the reason behind privatizing the Housing and Community Development Division. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

No objection.

Northwest Progresso Flagler Heights Advisory Board

Motion made by Mr. Ernest-Jones, seconded by Mr. Strawbridge, that the CRA Advisory Board fully supports the Flagler Village Civic Association's efforts to pursue streetscape enhancements to NE 3rd Avenue and North Andrews Avenue; and to incorporate certain amendments to the proposed layout, including the undergrounding of all utilities or the provision of sleeves for future undergrounding; and that comments on the streetscape enhancements be forwarded to the CRA Board and the appropriate County agencies. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

No objection.

Visioning Committee

Motion by Mr. Smith, seconded by Vice Chair Gabriel, to send a Communication directly to the City Commission that the City Commission move ahead with all due speed now that the Phase 1 Report is finalized and has been sent to them, and that they agenda the approval on February 7, keeping in mind that time is of the essence, as some of the seasonal residents leave shortly, with the understanding that the new reworked process does not diminish any of the public engagement that was in the original plan. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Susanne Torriente, Assistant City Manager, advised that the Committee has completed Phase One, but she did not think they will be finalizing anything until their charge is concluded. The Committee is ready to start Phase Two, but it is not funded. With the understanding that the Commission needs to first see Phase One, Vice Mayor DuBose requested an advance copy before it is scheduled on an agenda. The City Manager explained that they are trying to finalize the scopes for future phases. He and Ms. Torriente will be meeting with the chair this week. Once Phase One has been provided, Mayor Seiler indicated the Commission will discuss the future phases.

Short Term Residential Use Committee

Motion made by Mr. Mastriana, seconded by Ms. Ellis, to send the Committee's final report as a communication to the City Commission. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Ellis, seconded by Mr. Mastriana, to send a second communication to the Commission requesting direction as to whether the Committee should continue to meet and advise the City Commission, or if the Commission prefers to retire the Committee and

reconstitute it at a later time as new information becomes available. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

The City Manager indicated that this item was provided over the weekend; it will be scheduled on the February 21 agenda and the Committee will be in attendance.

III-B – Board and Committee Vacancies

In response to Commissioner Rodstrom, the City Attorney advised that the City's nepotism policy pertains to employment, not board and committee appointments.

Community Services Board	Joseph E. Scerbo (Mayor Seiler – New)
Education Advisory Board	Wayne Neunie (Vice Mayor DuBose – New)
Nuisance Abatement Board	Sal Gatano (Consensus - Reappointment) Tom Wolf (Consensus - Reappointment) Lorraine Saunders (Consensus – Alternate – New)
Planning and Zoning Board	Michael Ferber (Commissioner Rodstrom – New)
Sustainability Advisory Board	Robert Walters (Commissioner Rogers – Architect Category - New)

Note: Please see regular meeting item R-04.

City Commission Reports

E911 Call Taking and Dispatch Services

Commissioner Roberts provided a verbal status report on the Broward County Consolidation Communications Committee and the subcommittees. There are two models: 1) Broward Sheriff's Office and 2) County. A board of directors would oversee both and have the authority to hire and terminate the executive director. As to voting and veto power, the Subcommittee is considering the same arrangement as the School Board interlocal agreement, that is, fifty percent of the cities and seventy-five percent of the population would be needed to prevail. As to funding, he believed the full committee will agree that it must be independent, not co-mingled and strictly dedicated. He provided a chart on the consolidated call/dispatch allocation methodologies which is attached to these minutes. The communications system is predicted to be about \$42 million for the county and 502 positions. Eighty-two positions would be saved. The County would pay for capital infrastructure. Based on population, Fort Lauderdale would be assessed nine percent of the \$42 million. It appears the City would pay more than it pays with the current system. If based on population only, the City might be close to its current payment or a little less but he was certain there would not be a consensus for such a basis. The subcommittee appears to be moving toward taxable value for which Fort Lauderdale would pay the most.

Commissioner Rogers questioned how discussion went from a basis of number of calls to taxable value. The City Manager believed the driving force is method of collection. They are looking at a municipal service taxing unit (MSTU) based upon ad valorem values. Commissioner Roberts explained a millage rate would be assessed to the municipalities and it

would be counted toward the municipal millage rate cap. The City Attorney confirmed that the County would create a MSTU by ordinance and the municipalities would also join by ordinance; it would count toward the municipal millage cap. The City Manager added that the County Commission would establish the MSTU millage rate annually. Commissioner Roberts noted that the original goal of concluding in time for next fiscal year will not be met. All of the municipalities have to decide. Plantation is only observing at this point. In response to Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner Roberts indicated it is a voluntary buy-in by the municipalities. Commissioner Roberts indicated another issue on this topic is that of first unit response. Currently, the City's fire-rescue, under mutual aid, responds five and a half times out more than the City receives. Fort Lauderdale would become a donor city. There is also the question of how many employees on a vehicle. Vice Mayor DuBose emphasized that the City must emphasize that it has exposure in areas where other cities do not. In response to Commissioner Rogers, Commissioner Roberts indicated that he believes there is consensus that this approach is correct. Commissioner Rogers pointed out that the City's exposure could increase if cities drop out. Commissioner Roberts recommended the City explore other options, although he did not want to give a wrong signal. He wanted to be clear that the City is sincere in its participation.

Mayor Seiler asked about the status of an interim approach. The City Manager indicated that staff is working with the Sheriff's Office in establishing a price. The Sheriff's previously quoted cost of \$4.3 million is low and would require the City to reduce its police districts from three to two and make changes to fire dispatching. The Sheriff's adjusted price is \$4.9 million. He believed it may be better to perform the service itself. An analysis is close to completion. A second option is to privatize, which may be even less costly. Preliminary conversations have taken place. Tom Harrington, Assistant Police Chief, provided additional detail as to private service companies and examples in Georgia. It has not been done by a community the size of Fort Lauderdale. Mayor Seiler did not want to be the test case without experience in a similar community. The City Manager indicated another option would be for the City to create its own region and there has been outreach to other cities, being sensitive to the committee process underway.

Commissioner Roberts concluded by commenting that there is a genuine effort on the part of every agency at the table. The City Manager pointed out that the underlying question has not been resolved as to whether E911 call taking and dispatch service is a County responsibility.

Transportation Enhancement and Scenic Highway Grants

Commissioner Rodstrom asked that this topic be monitored closely because items may be deleted from the legislation.

Grand Prix; Special Event

At Commissioner Rodstrom's request, there was consensus approval to schedule the Grand Prix special event presentation on a future agenda.

Richard Mancuso; Recognition

In response to Commissioner Rogers, Mayor Seiler suggested some time be taken before meeting with the family of Richard Mancuso and deciding upon appropriate recognition.

17th Street Causeway Bridge, Resurfacing and South Federal Highway Repavement Projects

Commissioner Rogers provided a verbal status report on these projects. The Causeway work is to be completed by fall and South Federal Highway by July 21, 2012.

Homeless; Panhandling Legislation

Commissioner Rogers indicated that the Wells Fargo Building's property value has been significantly reduced because it overlooks Stranahan Park. Consequently he wanted to move forward quickly with the panhandling legislation education, and finding other feeding locations for the homeless.

Resolutions; City's Position on Various Matters

In response to Commissioner Rogers, Mayor Seiler asked the Commission to alert the City Manager after the agenda packets are received on Thursday if he or she has a concern about any resolution setting forth the City's position on an issue that is scheduled for consideration at the regular meeting.

Earth Hour and Earth Day

Vice Mayor DuBose asked the City Clerk to schedule resolutions on these topics according to past practice.

Early Cost Recovery for Electric Utility Charges for Nuclear Power Plants

Vice Mayor DuBose noted that the Broward League of Cities withdrew support in order to further vet the resolution for early cost recovery relating to electric utility charges for nuclear power plants.

School Resource Officers

Vice Mayor DuBose advised that the Broward League of Cities has formed a task force concerning school resource officers and he will be serving on it.

Advisory Boards; Telephonic Participation including Voting

Vice Mayor DuBose indicated that the Insurance Advisory Board could not move forward with an important issue at their last meeting due to lack of a quorum. He wanted to address telephone participation. The City Attorney advised that this has been vetted a number of times. Members of the Commission may participate by telephone, but they cannot vote and they are not counted toward a quorum. Therefore participation by telephone would not help in that situation. The City Clerk suggested alternates. Mayor Seiler asked that this topic be scheduled on the February 21 conference.

Events and Matters of Interest including Planning for Neighborhood Police Meetings

Members of the Commission announced recent and upcoming events and matters of interest. Commissioner Rogers suggested the neighborhood police meetings be held quarterly, rather than monthly due to sparse attendance, and an agenda should be distributed. Commissioner Roberts thought specific meeting dates should be set and earlier notification provided.

City Manager Reports - none

There being no other matters to come before the City Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.