

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

City of Fort Lauderdale
100 North Andrews Avenue
8th Floor Conference Room
Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 33301
September 16, 2010 - 6:00 p.m.

Committee Member	Attendance	1/2009 through 12/2009 Cumulative Attendance	
		P	A
June Page, Chair	P	6	0
Steve Kirsch, Vice Chair	P	6	0
Frank Anderson	P	4	2
Nadine Hankerson	P	2	2
Thornie Jarrett	P	5	1
Allan Kozich	P	5	1
Patrick McTigue	P	6	0
Sam Monroe	A	3	3
Frederick Nesbitt	P	6	0
Douglas Ruth	P	3	3

There are currently ten appointed members to the Committee. Therefore, attendance of six members constitutes a quorum.

Staff

Albert Carbon, Public Works Director
Frank Snedaker, City Architect
Mark Friedman, Construction Manager
Chantal Botting, Battalion Chief
J. Opperlee, ProtoType Services recording clerk

Communications to the City Commission

None

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Page called the meeting of the Fire-Rescue Bond Blue Ribbon Committee to order at 6:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: August 2010 Regular Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Nesbitt, seconded by Mr. McTigue, to approve the Committee's August 2010 minutes. Committee unanimously approved.

3. Staff Liaison Report

Station 3

Mr. Friedman stated a correction to the financial summary for Station 3. Change order 4 had been negotiated to approximately \$8,600. He distributed a spreadsheet showing all Stations that had been constructed with the exception of 49, which was awaiting installation of turtle lights. Mr. Friedman said this sheet had revised numbers from the financial report. He confirmed Station 3 was operational and occupied.

Station 49

Mr. Friedman stated the only remaining item at Station 49 was to change out some of the lights to be turtle-complaint. The lights should be delivered and installed the second week in October. Station 49 in the meantime was occupied and operational.

Station 35

Mr. Snedaker stated Station 35 was out to bid and the bids were due by October 6; they may extend the deadline because the final site plan had been delayed until the first meeting in October. Mr. Snedaker reported there had been a few questions on the bid; they had issued one addendum and he anticipated issuing one more based on the questions they had received.

Station 46

Mr. Snedaker stated the drawings were 90% completed. They anticipated going out to bid in October

Station 13

Mr. Snedaker said they were in contact with the State; they had provided updated information and were waiting for the State to respond.

Station 54

Mr. Snedaker had spoken with representatives at Bay Court, who still hoped to go through with the trade. He said Bay Court was dealing with the bank regarding the property.

Station 8

Mr. Snedaker said they were looking for land.

Mr. Carbon said at the request of Commissioner Rogers, he had met with Hospital District representatives to lay out their plans and the District was supposed to get back to him regarding shared space at the Hospital.

4. Committee Report to the City Commission

5. Member Discussion Items

Feasibility Study

Chair Page said the consultants had grouped the Committee's comments into categories instead of addressing individual questions.

Mr. Ruth said it did not seem the consultants had answered many of their questions. Chair Page said it did not seem the consultants had put extra thought into the response after their meeting. Mr. Kirsch stated the document looked like "notes on our original meeting; I don't think they addressed any of our questions that I recall." Chair Page asked if the report was acceptable to the Committee.

Mr. Carbon said the consultants had met their contractual obligation; they might travel here once more to attend a City Commission meeting.

Mr. Ruth had mentioned that he wanted to see comparisons with other cities and that had not been included. Mr. Kirsch remembered asking the consultants to address how future growth would be handled. Mr. Anderson said the report indicated they could accommodate 35% growth with the current Station models.

Mr. Nesbitt thought the consultants had answered their questions and done what they had been asked to do. He did not feel there were "any cities like ours" for a comparison because there were so many variables. Mr. Nesbitt said the consultants had answered

their questions: what size should the stations be, where should Station 8 be built and the question about Ocean Rescue. He wanted to accept the report and forward it to the Commission.

Mr. Kirsch wanted to add the Committee's comments before forwarding the report because he did not feel the consultants had done what they were supposed to do. He did not understand how the plan would accommodate growth for the next 30 years. Mr. Kozich said the contract called for considering growth for the next 20 years. Mr. Kirsch felt this question had not been answered.

Chair Page confirmed with Mr. Carbon that the purpose of the study had been to determine the size and locations of Stations 13, 54 and 8, and some other facilities, such as Ocean Rescue. She asked if the scope of the study had included future growth any further than these three stations; Mr. Carbon said this had not been part of the study.

Chair Page felt the consultants had done what they had been asked to do and had answered the Committee's questions in a minimal fashion. Mr. Anderson agreed, and said it had been worth the money they had allocated for it.

Motion made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Nesbitt, to include the five pages of additional correspondence sent by the consultant in the final report to the City. In a voice vote, motion passed 7 – 2 with Mr. Ruth and Mr. Kirsch opposed.

Mr. Carbon agreed to send the report to the City Commission by their second meeting in October as a report, not as a presentation document, including the five pages as an appendix.

Chair Page asked Mr. Kirsch if he wished to indicate to the Commission that not all of the Committee's concerns had been addressed. Mr. Kirsch agreed to review the scope and provide feedback at their next meeting.

Other Items and Announcements

Chair Page asked if anyone would attend either of the Blue Ribbon events at Station 49 or 13 at 11:30 A.M. on October 7 and 8.

Mr. Anderson stated he and Commissioner Rogers had toured Station 49 and were thoroughly impressed.

Mr. Anderson wondered why when bids were issued the City did not include a percentage to set aside for SBEs, WBEs and MBEs. Mr. Carbon said the City had never created a policy on requirements for that. He noted this was discussed every two years or so and the Commission had never acted regarding it. He said it seemed about time to revisit it.

Mr. Carbon said the argument that usually killed the conversation was when a Commissioner stated if a contractor were local, he should be bidding less.

Mr. Anderson wanted the Committee to suggest to the Commission that they institute an SBE, WBE, MBE program. He said the large, national general contractors were coming in and getting jobs at a far lower rate and when the jobs were complete they went away.

Chair Page questioned whether it would be more expensive to use local people. Mr. Carbon pointed out that a local contractor would contribute to the local economy.

Mr. Nesbitt remembered there had been a suggestion regarding fleet purchases to give preference to local car dealerships. The Commission had rejected this idea, stating they wanted open, fair competition based strictly on price. Ms. Hankerson felt they should still ask.

Mr. Nesbitt felt this might be a good policy, but he was not sure the suggestion should come from this Committee.

Communication to the City Commission

None

6. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 6:51 p.m.

Next regular meeting: October 21, 2010

Attachments:

Financial Report
Minutes – August 19, 2010 Regular Meeting
Fire Station Monthly Reports

[Minutes prepared by J. Opperlee, Prototype, Inc.]