

**FIRE-RESCUE BOND
BLUE RIBBON COMMITTEE MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING**

City of Fort Lauderdale
100 North Andrews Avenue
8th Floor Conference Room
Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 33301
January 17, 2008

Board Member	Attendance	1/2008 through 12/2008 Cumulative Attendance	
		P	A
Thornie Jarrett, Chair	P	1	0
Dianne Shuler, Vice Chair	P	1	0
Don Bastedo	P	1	0
Kevin Blair	A	0	1
Mary Graham	P	1	0
Steve Kirsch	P	1	0
Allan Kozich	P	1	0
Delores McKinley	A	0	1
Patrick McTigue	P	1	0
Douglas Ruth	P	1	0
Norman Thabit	P	1	0

Staff

Albert Carbon, Director Public Works Department
Frank Snedaker, Chief City Architect
Mark Friedman, City Construction Manager
Robert Bacic, Battalion Chief
Eric Geen, URS Program Director
John Herbst, City Auditor
Jamie Opperlee, ProtoType Services Recording Clerk

Guests

Sherman Whitmore, Gibson Partners
Lieutenant David Carter, Vice President, Fort Lauderdale Professional Firefighters
John Kelapire, SBC

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chairman Jarrett called the meeting of the Fire-Rescue Bond Blue Ribbon Committee to order at 6:03 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: December 6, 2007

Motion made by Member Shuler, seconded by Member Bastedo, to approve the minutes of the Board's December 6, 2007 meeting. Upon voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Jarrett had asked the auditor to provide the Board with an explanation of the audit process.

Mr. John Kelapire, SBC, said he was near completing the audit. He would submit the draft report for Mr. Herbst to distribute to various people to allow them the opportunity to respond. Mr. Herbst would then put the responses together to add to the final report. This final report would then be submitted to the City Commission. Mr. Kelapire explained to Member Ruth that he would make recommendations in the report as appropriate. He anticipated the report would be complete in March.

3. Staff Liaison Report

Station 46:

Mr. Carbon reported they had worked for nine months to move station 46 to Mills Pond Park, and he was disappointed that the Planning and Zoning Board had voted to defer the request for a land use amendment because this would further delay the schedule. Mr. Carbon asked the Fire Bond Committee to state their support for moving this station to Mills Pond Park.

Mr. Carbon stated the Planning and Zoning Board's reason for deferral was the loss of park land. Mr. Snedaker explained the Parks and Recreation Board had seen a presentation on this, but had not made a finding or recommendation.

Member Graham stated there was concern that the Parks and Recreation Board had not given their approval for this to the Planning and Zoning Board, so the item was deferred to allow the Parks and Recreation Board time to meet again and make a determination. Member Graham was disappointed there was no cursory site plan or parking layout provided to describe how the 1.3 acres would be used. Member Graham reminded the Board that the County must give concurrent approval for the land use amendment as well.

Member Graham wondered why she had not received a summary describing which of the remaining stations could be rehabbed vs. what must be built new. She also wondered why staff had not returned to the Parks and Recreation Board to obtain their approval. Member Graham also noted that "up until now, Planning and Zoning has always given everything that [has been] put before us the nod to go; you've never been kicked back."

Mr. Carbon said Member Graham had indicated at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting that she was “not in favor of the project as stated...” Mr. Carbon wanted the Fire Bond Committee to declare “that either this Committee’s in favor of moving this station to Mills Pond or not.” Mr. Carbon stated the request at the Planning and Zoning Board was for a land use amendment, which did not require an explanation of what would be done on the land.

Member Graham stated, “Up until then, I have always voted for every relief, every parking variance, every setback variance, in an effort to see this Committee move forward, given the limited funds we have.” She believed someone “dropped the ball” after the September presentation to the Parks and Recreation Board by not returning to seek their approval, or “it was just a foregone conclusion that Planning and Zoning will vote for this.”

Member Graham was aware that other stations were being packaged on much tighter sites to comply with the downsized program, and wondered why staff did not “present something to show what the 1.3 acres would be used for.” Member Graham was disappointed that Mr. Carbon believed she was “the person standing in the way of Planning and Zoning approving your land use amendment” and said, “Nothing could be further from the truth, because I’m one vote.”

Member Graham said she had stated at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting that she would “not allow any applicant to be given some special, preferential treatment when it comes before Planning and Zoning; it needs to be the same process for everyone.” She was also aware that it was not required to provide backup to “help sell” the land use amendment to the Planning and Zoning Board, but pointed out that “only putting in what’s required, unfortunately, got you where you were last night.” Member Graham was willing to attend the Parks and Recreation Board meeting to see the presentation regarding the project, and to hear that Board’s reaction to the plan.

Member Graham confirmed for Chairman Jarrett that the lack of approval from the Parks and Recreation Board was a major reason the Planning and Zoning Board had not approved the land use amendment.

Chairman Jarrett asked if there was a problem getting the Parks Board’s approval. Mr. Snedaker did not know, and explained the plan was taken to the Parks Board in September as an informational item and they were scheduled to return to make a formal presentation in January. Member Graham felt that presenting the land use amendment request to the Planning and Zoning Board first might be putting the cart before the horse. Mr. Snedaker stated, “The Parks Board does not recommend to the Planning and Zoning Board. The Parks Board recommends to the Commission; the Planning and Zoning Board recommends to the Commission. Both those recommendations would move forward concurrently.” He was concerned because the project was now a month

behind being presented to the County, and they could not start the construction documents until they had an idea what the County would do.

Member Graham stated, "There were people that were ready to make a motion last night [at the Planning and Zoning Board meeting] to outright reject the land use amendment. The deferment came as a way to just give you a chance to get all your ducks in a row." Mr. Snedaker said these people were ready to vote before hearing staff's argument and responses to the comments made by the two speakers. He believed staff's responses would have answered the questions the speakers raised.

Chairman Jarrett hoped there would be no issue with the Parks Board. Mr. Snedaker agreed that no one wanted to give up park land, but acknowledged that the City must consider the responsibilities of all departments, and the responsibility to provide fire and rescue services to newly-annexed communities dictated that this was a good location. Mr. Snedaker said the Parks staff fully supported this; they would get new buildings, increased security and refurbished fields as part of the project.

Member Thabit said his objective as a Board member was to see that the fire stations were built. He had no objection to locating the station in Mills Pond Park, and wanted the Board to continue on their course.

Motion made by Member Kozich, seconded by Member Shuler, to state the Fire Bond Committee's support for moving Station 46 to Mills Pond Park. Upon voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Chief Bacic explained that the presentation he had made to the community included comparison of response times from the current and proposed locations to demonstrate the need for a station at this location.

Member Shuler said residents who attended the meetings had been very supportive, and were informed that the land would be deed restricted for use as a fire station. Chief Bacic had provided renderings of Fire Stations 29 and 54 plans as examples.

Station 88/53:

Mr. Geen stated that the contractor at Station 53 had promised to work diligently to obtain a temporary certificate of occupancy for January 15, but he had failed to meet this deadline. There were twelve items that must be addressed, and the revised date was January 29. Mr. Geen noted that there was very little work to be done; the remaining items were mainly inspections.

Lieutenant. Dave Carter, Vice President, Fort Lauderdale Professional Firefighters, asked if this contractor would be barred from bidding on future Fire Station contracts.

Mr. Carbon stated this was not possible, but considering the problems the contractor had experienced, he did not believe he would wish to bid on any others.

Mr. Carbon informed Member Thabit that the City rated contractors upon completion of projects, and kept a running log of projects on which contractors worked that could be consulted for future projects.

Lieutenant Carter asked if there were provisions in the contract that would put the cost burden of the station's delay on the contractor instead of on the City. Mr. Carbon replied that due to changes, the City had added days to the contract, and the new completion date was February 20. After that date, the penalty to the contractor was \$500 per day for the first 30 days, and additional penalties after that.

Station 47:

Mr. Geen informed the Board the contractor had been granted an extension to February 20, and was working hard to finish by January 31. Mr. Geen explained that ATT had provided an incorrect location for the conduit to the communications room, and would rectify this at their cost. Mr. Geen thought the application for a temporary certificate of occupancy would be made around February 7.

Mr. Geen had visited station 47 that day, and discovered that WaterWorks 2011 had installed a wet well within the fire station perimeter. Mr. Snedaker had asked them to work on Saturday to expedite this, and they would then leave to allow access to the site.

Member Thabit asked if this station would stay within budget. Mr. Carbon felt it would be close; he estimated it would total almost \$5 million.

Station 29:

Mr. Snedaker reported that they were in redesign now; he anticipated 90% drawings by mid-February, to be in permit review by the end of February and to be out to bid in April. There was a meeting scheduled on February 12 at George English Park to present site plans, floor plans and elevations. The size of station 29 had been reduced from 16,000 to 10,200 square feet. They had reduced the two extended bays to two shorter bays, and the living quarters had been moved to a two-story structure adjacent to apparatus bays. This reduced the overall height of the living areas and made the station more livable for the firefighters. It was also less expensive to build.

Station 49:

Mr. Snedaker informed the Board Station 49 was being design by PGAL. The updated schematics were due at the end of January. From there, they would establish a firm schedule.

Station 3:

Mr. Snedaker stated they had resubmitted for DRC approval and were scheduled for the first DRC meeting in February. After that, they would move it to the Planning and Zoning Board and the City Commission, and he anticipated it would be put out to bid in July.

Mr. Carbon explained to Member Graham that since they already had Planning and Zoning and City Commission approval for the larger facilities, when they received the plans for 29 and 49, they would present these to Greg Brewton, who would make a decision whether it must be presented again to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Snedaker explained the design for Station 3 was one-story. Wherever possible, they would construct a one-story station because these were cheaper to build than a two-story.

Stations 13 and 54

Mr. Carbon said the structural engineer had examined the plans for station rehabilitation, and estimated it would cost \$750,000 for the structural upgrade, per station. Stations 13 and 54 were possible stations to renovate. The total estimate to renovate each station was approximately \$2 million, compared to approximately \$3 million to build new stations.

Member Graham was concerned that the costs were not coming down. Mr. Carbon said they had figured in 4% inflation to 2008. He said they were moving forward with the three stations and fire staff was ensuring the stations would meet their current and future needs.

Station 35:

Mr. Carbon reported the minister had a construction manager who wanted to redevelop the entire site and they were considering many options.

4. Member Discussion Items

Chairman Jarrett commented that they must wait for the final figures to create their report. He wanted more detailed information regarding the possible rehab of stations 13 and 54 and felt they would not be rehabbed. Chairman Jarrett felt they should include a request for additional funds in their report.

Chairman Jarrett wanted the Board to be kept informed about issues that arose on the job site. Mr. Carbon said Mr. Geen's "issues" list was just that. He said they were working with Mr. Geen and URS to have a more seamless process.

Board Elections

Motion made by Member Graham, seconded by Member Thabit, to elect Mr. Jarrett as Chairman and Ms. Shuler as Vice Chair. Upon voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

5. Adjournment

The Board's next meeting was scheduled for February 21, 2008.

With no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

Attachments:

Financial Report

Minutes – December 2007

Construction Monthly Reports