

FORT LAUDERDALE CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 5, 2012

Agenda

<u>Item</u>		<u>Page</u>
	<u>City Commission Reports</u>	1
	1. Events and Matters of Interest	1
	2. Beach Cleanup from Hurricane Isaac	1
	3. Streets in South Middle River; WaterWorks 2011	1
	4. Crime and Traffic	1
	5. Trash	1
	6. Crime and Police Department In-Car Digital Video Camera Project (Department of Justice Grant)	2
	7. Traffic Pattern; Courthouse Construction	2
CF 1	Quarterly Investment Report for Period Ending June 30, 2012	2
BUS-1	Regulation of Utility Markings	2
BUS-2	Possible Rescheduling of November 2012 City Commission Meetings And Joint Workshop with Budget Advisory Board	5
BUS-3	Code Enforcement Lien Amnesty Program Proposal	5
BUS-4	Proposed Lien Settlements – Special Magistrate and Code Enforcement Board Cases	7
BD-1	Communications to City Commission and Minutes Circulated for Period Ending August 30, 2012	7
BD-2	Board and Committee Vacancies	10
MGR-1	City Manager Reports	10
	1. E911 Call Taking and Dispatch and 800 MHz Radio System Conflict Resolution Update	11
	2. America's Backyard; 111 Properties; Special Magistrate Order	11

CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE MEETING

1:35 P.M.

September 5, 2012

Present: Mayor John P. "Jack" Seiler
Commissioners 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 Mike Dodson
Sergeant Ed Wenger

Absent: Commissioner Bruce G. Roberts (excused)

City Commission Reports

Events and Matters of Interest

Members of the Commission announced recent and upcoming events and matters of interest, including announcement of an open house for the Beach Community Redevelopment area.

Beach Cleanup from Hurricane Isaac

The City Manager responded to Vice Mayor Rodstrom's concern about the time being taken to cleanup drifting sand on the beach as a result of Hurricane Isaac. He estimated another week.

Streets in South Middle River; WaterWorks 2011

Vice Mayor Rodstrom requested attention be given to the streets in South Middle River where WaterWorks 2011 has been underway.

Crime and Traffic

Vice Mayor Rodstrom requested information from the City Manager as to the City's plans to address these two topics because she has been receiving an increased number of complaints.

Trash

Mayor Seiler indicated he has noticed the need for trash pickup in various neighborhoods including South Middle River, Middle River Terrace and Sistrunk. He suggested coordination with the Sheriff and, or juvenile facility. The City Manager advised that he spoke with the Sheriff's Office some eight months ago, however there is no established work program. Mayor Seiler asked about the City establishing a program for people who have committed petty crimes. Commissioner Rogers suggested the City look into establishing a volunteer program for youth who need to work community service hours. Commissioner DuBose believed it is citywide. There should be an educational campaign to look at the problem in the long term. Perhaps the School Board should be involved. Another idea would be adopting a road segment. Albert Carbon, Director of Public Works, indicated the function has been transferred to Parks and Recreation, but about fifty individuals per week are referred from the Prosecutor's Office. The

City Manager agreed to followup. Vice Mayor Rodstrom suggested the individuals wear t-shirts that identify they are working on behalf of the City. Mayor Seiler requested a followup report.

Crime and Police Department In-Car Digital Video Camera Project (Department of Justice Grant)

Commissioner DuBose felt more emphasis is needed on this matter. Just upon entering office, the City had received funding from the Department of Justice for cameras in police vehicles. He now understands that the funding was not allocated to the Police Department. He has requested clarification from the City Manager. Commissioner Rogers discussed efforts in District IV and elaborated upon the information that will be organized and forthcoming on a quarterly basis.

The City Manager understood that the funding was a Department of Justice technology grant and was limited to being used for technology. He is looking into how the funds were used. A report will be furnished. Commissioner DuBose requested the minutes from the discussion at the time. As to crime in general, he requested something comprehensive from the City Manager and perhaps scheduled as an agenda item.

Mayor Seiler also requested that the neighborhood police meetings be rotated through the districts. He asked that the meetings be better publicized.

Traffic Pattern; Courthouse Construction

Mayor Seiler asked whether adjustments could be made to the traffic patterns in the courthouse construction area.

CF-1 – Quarterly Investment Report for Period ending June 30, 2012

No discussion.

BUS-1 – Regulation of Utility Markings

The City Manager advised that staff has been working closely with Commissioner Roberts on this matter. Information in Commission Agenda Memorandum 12-2014 is the outcome of a series of meetings Commissioner Roberts has had. He highlighted the proposal shown in the memorandum.

Stephanie Denham, Senior Management Fellow, responded to Commissioner Rogers with respect to the paint technology, use of non-permanency products as specified by state statute and enforcement. Language would be included in City contracts strongly encouraging contractors to follow state statute (556). If not, the contract would be deemed a non-responsible bidder on all future projects for a period of one year and then progressively. Vice Mayor Rodstrom did not want to extend the penalty further than the project for which the contractor is cited. The City Manager explained that by the time a violation is determined, the contractor already has the contract. There is some discussion about including this provision in the City's RFPs. Vice Mayor Rodstrom preferred to furnish the information upfront in the RFP. The City Manager explained the process in more detail, articulating how and why the markings occur. Commissioner Rogers felt the contractor should not be penalized if there is an inconsistency between the plans and the actual. The City Manager indicated that call would be between the engineer and architect that designed the plans and the contractor. Commissioner Rogers felt there should be some appeal process. In response to Vice Mayor Rodstrom, the City Manager

was not aware of any other cities taking the route recommended today. He explained that cities are preempted by the State and the only violation in the state statute is a \$500 fine. He believed if the City's approach works, it will be a model for other cities. Vice Mayor Rodstrom felt three years is over-regulating. Some discussion ensued on the enforcement aspect as well as revenue from the current \$500 fine structure.

Mayor Seiler opened the floor for public comment.

Sergio Clavijo, South Florida Liaison for Sunshine 811, indicated that Sunshine 811 is a not-for-profit organization created by state law. Twenty percent of the fine goes to the clerk of the court and the remaining eighty percent goes to the local agency that issues the citation which in this case would be the City of Fort Lauderdale. It is similar to a traffic citation. The City Manager did not think that the City has issued any citations. The law currently allows for the City to issue citations for enforcement of Chapter 556. In response to Vice Mayor Rodstrom, he was not certain that the Broward Sheriff's Office could act on behalf of the City. Sunshine 811 has trained Fort Lauderdale Detective Eugene McCoy to enforce Chapter 556 in the city. Sunshine 811 is willing to enforce Chapter 556 in the city. A citation form has been developed and is ready to be used. Vice Mayor Rodstrom thought this may be a good starting point. Mr. Clavijo indicated that Sunshine 811 was created in 1993 by Chapter 556 and has been charged with implementation of the chapter. He went on to comment that Sunshine 811 does not consider the markings graffiti, but actually life safety markings because there is an issue of safety involved. Sunshine 811 has a data base as to who should be notified. The owner of the underground facility is responsible for placing the marks. Sunshine 811 administers the process and distributes the information but has no enforcement authority. The City Manager explained that the enforcement is not simple. There is real investigative time required in determining if a violation has occurred. It costs more than the fine revenue. Because of the magnitude of contracts involved and competition in bidding for them, there is no concern about a fine of \$500. The marking is supposed to occur when the contractor is ready to dig but it is occurring before a contract is even awarded. Also, the special paint does not wear off as easily on permeable pavers as asphalt.

Commissioner Rogers suggested language in the RFP. Bidders should be required to indicate whether they have been issued a citation in the past which would impact their ranking. He agreed with Vice Mayor Rodstrom that a five-year prohibition is too harsh. In response to Commissioner DuBose, the City Attorney explained this has been preempted by the state and this is the only penalty that can be applied. Such a RFP provision could be construed as a penalty which state statute prohibits. An entity must have a contract with the City and violate it before the City can exercise any authority. Further dialogue between the City Attorney and Commissioner Rogers ensued on the legality of his suggestion. The City Attorney believed the recommendation is about the best possible.

Suzanne Montgomery, representing AT&T, enumerated the various roles that AT&T plays with respect to Chapter 556. AT&T is concerned about the broader impact of this measure at it may have on AT&T as a contractor to the City. She agreed the proposal may be too big of a first step. Enforcement measures in AT&T were strengthened in 2010 and not much has been done throughout the state to see if they would work. If \$500 is not sufficient, the Legislature should be asked to increase it. Also in 2010, language was added to encourage use of material that does not last long (low impact), although longer lasting material is required in some cases. Contractors are supposed to call for a thirty-day window for only the area where work is intended during that thirty days. AT&T is also opposed to contractors making markings to prepare to submit a bid. It costs AT&T money to send out an employee to make a marking.

AT&T would favor any measure that could identify those calls. In general AT&T is afraid of unintended consequences. She thought prohibiting a contractor from being awarded a contract for a period of time is the ultimate penalty and is likely preempted by state law. Mayor Seiler agreed that the recommendation is too much, however, there must be some penalty for repeat offenders because as it stands, they continue with the next project and the City has expended perhaps \$1,000 to collect \$500. Ms. Montgomery felt the Legislature should be asked to increase the penalty. In response to the City Manager, Ms. Montgomery indicated that she does not know if AT&T would support such a request for a statewide solution as they have not looked into it. Commissioner DuBose elaborated upon the difficulties in accomplishing a statewide approach. He would be reluctant to take this issue up at the state level.

Commissioner Rogers returned to his idea of addressing this in the RFP. He felt a violation could be considered only a weight in determining the outcome as opposed to a prohibition. A penalty of one, two or five years, on the other hand, is a sure prohibition. He argued it could be a factor that is weighed and may not have a bearing depending on how well the bidder does in other areas of the RFP. The City Attorney explained that the reason the argument can be made is that it is a contract provision violation and at the time the City is in privity with them. He did not think the other approach would be a winning argument. Staff has determined it is not cost-effective to enforce but he did not think it has been determined that it would be an effective deterrent if it was enforced. In further response, he advised that there could be a provision in the contract for liquidated damages to cover the cost for the City to clean up the pavement. However, there are people placing markings on the pavement that do not work for the City. In response to Vice Mayor Rodstrom, the City Attorney advised that the recommendation to deem a contractor not a responsible bidder on future projects for a period of time from the violation was intended to be job specific.

Joe Heatherly, representing Florida Power and Light Company (FPL), noted his involvement with Sunshine 811 and pavement markings for thirty-five counties in the state. He also serves on the Sunshine 811 board. He discussed a particular case where a contractor who had not yet received the award submitted a request for all utilities to be located. Ultimately the contractor never proceeded with the work. He explained that when a contractor requests underground facilities be identified, utilities are required by law to respond. FPL alone receives from 500,000 requests in a year in a slow economy and 50,000 of those are for FPL excavations. FPL is required to maintain a marking for thirty days and the contractor can only request markings for work they will complete within thirty days. FPL monitors the process statewide and is aware of who is not following the law. Sunshine 811 conducted an unscientific study of paint products to determine those that will last at least thirty days. They have issued a \$15,000 grant to the University of Central Florida for a paint study. The results are expected by the end of the year. He felt a \$500 fine should be sufficient and pointed out that it is the same process as a \$50 traffic citation for example. Sunshine provides the citation with pertinent information. He did not think there would be need for further research in determining a violation because of the information that is in-place. The City Manager explained the issue is whether a contractor called within the thirty-day period. For projects that do not go forward, the City has to track down the contractor and prove they made the request which takes time. Mr. Heatherly advised that with their data base, the complete information about an address is available within minutes. He could not answer Commissioner Rogers' question of whether fines are passed along to the contractor from the locator on the site, but in the case of FPL, their contracts specify that fees would be borne by the locator. He felt that would be reasonable.

Commissioner DuBose felt there needs to be some bite in the approach. He believed there is consensus approval of the recommendation, perhaps a little less. He pointed out that the task

force headed by Commissioner Roberts has vetted this matter. Commissioner Rogers was inclined to agree with an upfront approach; a way to determine if the party is responsible and a liquidated damages provision in the contract. It could be treated like a code violation with the final hammer being some prohibition for the contract but he did not know what would be appropriate for the period of time. There should also be an educational component. Vice Mayor Rodstrom was concerned about the lack of coordination between staff and Sunshine 811. She felt three years is too long. She was also concerned about the lack of enforcement of the existing law (Chapter 556) available. She wanted to first hear from Commissioner Roberts. Mayor Seiler felt the one, three and five-year recommendation is too harsh, and wanted to see some variation. He did not think there should be a prohibition for first-time offenders, but rather just a fine. He was concerned about repeat offenders. For a second offense, he suggested a one-year prohibition, and two years for the third offense. He also liked the idea of a liquidated damage clause in the contracts. The City Attorney agreed to work with procurement staff with respect to a liquidated damage clause. Commissioner Rogers was agreeable with the Mayor's suggestions.

Mayor Seiler suggested a draft be presented when Commissioner Roberts is present. He reopened the floor for public comment.

Fred Carlson, Central Beach Alliance, felt there are products either available or soon to be available that could be sprayed on existing paint to white-out the marking. As such, this discussion may soon become moot.

BUS-2 – Possible Rescheduling of November 2012 City Commission Meetings and Joint Workshop with Budget Advisory Board

There was consensus approval to: 1) not change the November 6, 2012 meetings and request that the agendas be light; 2) not change the November 20, 2012 meetings and 3) request the City Manager notify the Budget Advisory Board that November 7, 2012 would be a preferred date for the joint workshop with the board.

The City Clerk noted that the first meeting in January falls on the New Year's Day holiday and she will be bringing this forward on an agenda for a decision.

BUS-3 – Code Enforcement Lien Amnesty Program Proposal

The City Manager reviewed the recommendation contained in Commission Agenda Memorandum 12-2098. It was clarified how this differs from current practice where cases come before the Commission periodically with negotiated settlements. Negotiated settlements would be suspended during the amnesty period unless someone is seeking more relief than the amnesty permits. A general discussion ensued as to how the program would actually work. The City Manager noted that recent settlements have been based upon this.

Commissioner DuBose asked about absentee landlords who own several properties and have a history of not being a good neighbor. The City Manager advised that this was not taken into consideration. He suggested the residential component be bifurcated into homesteaded and non-homesteaded. The City Attorney pointed out that there are people who live in a home that is not homesteaded; it may be a second home. It may be possible to accomplish, but it would be a challenge.

In response to Mayor Seiler, the City Manager explained the logic in distinguishing between commercial and residential had to do with commercial properties being more visible and have a greater effect on the overall character of the city. Mayor Seiler disagreed and suggested the reduction rate for both categories be capped at five percent (of the Just Market Value as determined by the Broward County Property Appraiser's Office for 2012). He noted that the first residence in a neighborhood has as much impact on the neighborhood as a commercial building. Commissioner Rogers suggested a graduated scale over time segments in order to motivate people to come into compliance sooner. However, the City Manager indicated that the program as recommended will be difficult enough to administer.

Commissioner DuBose reiterated his concern about absentee landlords that would also impact a neighborhood.

Mayor Seiler suggested the matter move forward with the revised percentage and the City Manager come back with a recommendation to address absentee landlords. Some discussion ensued about the challenges from a legal standpoint in addressing absentee landlords that may own several properties in multiple limited liability companies (LLC). Commissioner Rogers pointed out that in these situations, the individuals do not resolve the violations until they wish to sell the property. Then they negotiate and the amount is usually less than what is being proposed in this program. He felt the goal is to resolve these outstanding matters. In further response to Commissioner DuBose's concern about absentee landlords that have multiple properties, Mayor Seiler asked the City Manager to consult the League of Cities to see what other cities are doing. The City Manager advised that this is an issue around the state and some cities are becoming aggressive. Commissioner DuBose was not comfortable moving forward until this part is addressed. Mayor Seiler did not want to stop the program if the repeat violators are less than half a dozen. Jenni Morejon, Deputy Director of Sustainable Development, was hopeful that data could be collected that would clarify this. The housing market has changed dramatically since the first amnesty program in 2004. It is now much more about turning over properties to new homeowners or homebuyers that are going to make the investment. Ms. Morejon indicated that code enforcement staff could followup to ensure that people are not just doing the minimum and allowing their properties to go back into non-compliance. Commissioner DuBose did not want to give these bad neighbors an opportunity to enrich what they do through this program. Commissioner Rogers commented that it does not take long for the fine amount to accrue to a huge amount and it is not realistic to think that anyone could ever pay the number. Commissioner DuBose wanted the information before going forward. In response to Mayor Seiler, Commissioner DuBose indicated that there are several properties under one name. There is crime occurring at these properties. Ms. Morejon indicated that information could be provided on September 18. She mentioned that there is a mechanism in the code already for repeat offenders. Mayor Seiler asked the item be scheduled for that date. He asked for the number of repeat offenders when this is brought back on September 18 so that there can be assurance they are not granted amnesty. Commissioner DuBose explained there may be problem property owners where complaints have not been filed, therefore more detail will be needed. Commissioner Rogers felt in such case, the lien should be against the person and any property they own and the City should move forward with foreclosure. Commissioner DuBose was surprised to know this could be done because he was aware of an instance where other properties were left.

In response to Commissioner Rogers, the City Attorney cautioned that the City will not likely receive the full lien amounts and elaborated upon circumstances. The City Manager noted the \$2.5 million in return is an approximation.

BUS-4 – Proposed Lien Settlements – Special Magistrate and Code Enforcement Board Cases

No objection.

BD-1 – Communications to City Commission and Minutes circulated for period ending August 30, 2012**Beach Business Improvement District Advisory Committee**

The BID unanimously supports marketing on the beach as a world class tourist destination and must utilize their funding to this end. As a result of the \$56,160 in increased non-discretionary fees assessed by the City for Indirect Administrative and Information Technology charges, the BID will no longer supplement City cleaning services for the beach.

The City Manager indicated that a memorandum was provided on this matter. The Committee wishes to scale back the beach cleaning service in order to see the effect. The Committee was proposing reducing cleaning services long before the City performed its cost allocation study. The Committee is looking for relief with respect to the cost allocation as the City has increased their fee relating to administrative costs. Vice Mayor Rodstrom pointed out that the City does not have to pay for these cleaning services because the Committee pays for it. She requested the cleaning cost detail. The City Manager explained that the Committee's budget for next year is basically \$100,000 to hire a manager and \$518,000 for promotional activities and cleaning.

See further discussion below.

Economic Development Advisory Board

Motion made by Mr. Calloway and seconded by Mr. Riehl that a member of the Economic Development Advisory Board be appointed or designated to participate on the City's homeless task force; the EDV Board also recommends that a conference be organized where City, County and homeless experts address the homeless issue and talk about solutions for Fort Lauderdale and Broward County. Motion passed 10 – 0.

Vice Mayor Rodstrom did not think that Commissioner Rogers should be responsible for briefing the Commission on the homeless matter. She received an update from Cate McCaffrey, Assistant Parks & Recreation Director. Both Mayor Seiler and Commissioner Rogers asked the City Manager to coordinate a meeting on this topic as requested. Commissioner DuBose commented on a recent summit held by Congressman Hayes and Congresswoman Judy Biggert in regard to this issue that was well attended on multiple levels, including Ms. McCaffrey. There is an initiative coming from the federal level. He wanted Ms. McCaffrey to provide information on this as he thought it would be one of the better models. As to the remainder of the Board's request, Mayor Seiler indicated that there is no restriction on membership to the homeless task force.

Vice Mayor Rodstrom asked about using a portion of the City's United Way contribution for the City's match on the homeless housing and services grant (Broward County). In other words, it

could be shown as an option on the form for contributors to choose homelessness. The City Manager believed there is already a category for homelessness.

Historic Preservation Board

Motion made by Ms. Flowers, seconded by Ms. Graff, to request the City declare a moratorium on demolishing any building in any historic district until the ordinance re-write was complete. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

In response to Mayor Seiler, the City Attorney confirmed that the Commission and court can override the Board's decision on a certificate of appropriateness if the criteria is met. Jenni Morejon, Deputy Director of Sustainable Development, advised that the Board brought this forward also in April of 2011. At that time the Commission wanted to wait until the historic preservation ordinance came forward. The City Manager explained that part of the rewrite is to make the certificate of appropriateness process for demolition more restrictive. The rewrite is extremely complicated and staff is still working through it. He believed the Board would like a moratorium to be in-place in the meantime.

Commissioner Rogers favored going forward with a moratorium on any City-owned property in an historic district. In response to Mayor Seiler, Jenni Morejon, Deputy Director of Sustainable Development, believed that there are three historic districts: Stranahan House, Himmarshee area and Sailboat Bend. The City Manager noted that Sailboat Bend would also include the police headquarters, parks and recreation and fleet. Mayor Seiler requested a map depicting the historic districts.

Motion made by Mr. DeFelice, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to recommend the City follow Policy 1.11.3 of the Historic Preservation Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, which stated "All proposed impacts to historic resources shall be reported to the Historic Preservation Board for review and comment." In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Morejon explained that there is no criteria for placement of properties on the Florida Master Site File List. The definition of historic resources in the Comprehensive Plan calls out properties on the Florida Master Site File List. By indicating any impacts to properties on the list does not tie in with the zoning code that specifically calls out local landmarks and historic district properties. Therefore, the interpretation that any impacts to properties on that list would go to the Board for a certificate of appropriateness is more open than the zoning code. The City Attorney noted that anyone can put a property on the list. Ms. Morejon indicated that to use the list to move properties into a quasi-judicial approval process is not what the Comprehensive Plan intended. Mayor Seiler did not favor a list if people could place other people's property on the list against their will. Ms. Morejon explained the Board is thinking that such properties would go to the Board for review and comment, not necessarily a certificate of appropriateness. Mayor Seiler requested those properties in the City of historic resources. Discussion ensued as to the merits of the Board's request as to review and comment of such properties. He agreed with historic resources identified by the Commission going to the Board for review and comment. Commissioner Rogers concurred with Mayor Seiler that a situation should not be created whereby an individual could further a grudge against another individual.

Commissioner DuBose left the meeting at approximately 4:26 p.m.

Motion made by Mr. DeFelice, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to ask, pursuant to “Policy 1.7.1 Preserve and Protect the Historic and Archeological Resources Owned, Acquired or Disposed of by the City”, how the City was protecting the archeology sites at Fort Lauderdale Beach and within the parks and other City-owned properties. He requested the City inform the Board how the City was moving forward to take care of properties that were not secure. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

There was no objection to this item. Ms. Morejon advised that there was coordination with the Parks and Recreation Department; staff is following up.

Motion made by Mr. DeFelice, seconded by Mr. Morgan, to request the City designate all City-owned archeological sites. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

At Mayor Seiler’s request, Ms. Morejon agreed to look into this item in more detail.

Motion made by Mr. Morgan, seconded by Ms. Flowers, to request the Commission direct staff to move forward with designation of the egret mural on the Cumberland Building due to its exceptional importance and cultural significance. In a voice vote, motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Seiler noted that the mural has already been demolished.

Beach Business Improvement District Advisory Committee

The City Manager advised that at the last meeting when the cleaning contract was cancelled, it was in the amount of \$223,000. The administrative cost increase was \$53,000. The two are not tied dollar for dollar. Their total budget is \$684,000. Vice Mayor Rodstrom commented that their supplemental assistance on cleaning the beach makes the beach really sharp.

Planning and Zoning Board

Motion made by Mr. Witschen, seconded by Ms. Desir-Jean, that the City Commission explore the possibility of allowing Staff approval for Items such as #4 and #6, which relate to approval of new signage and the conversion of a former single-family home to office use within a residential office (RO) zoning district. The process of bringing these and similar items before the Planning and Zoning Board can be lengthy and discouraging to the development process. If Staff were allowed to evaluate the criteria for these items, they would retain the option to bring that Item before the Board for approval; and conversely, if an Applicant does not agree with Staff’s decision, they would also have the option to request Board approval.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Morejon summarized that this has to do with there being additional streamlining opportunities that the Board has identified. There are items that could be approved by staff and not considered by the Board. Call-up provisions could remain in place. Staff is developing recommendations in this area. Mayor Seiler liked the streamlining idea. In response to Commissioner Rogers, Ms. Morejon explained the process for proposed signage that does not meet the code and suggested it could be a call-up item. She cited some examples. The City Attorney noted that there would need to be established standards.

Police and Firefighters Pension Board

The City Auditor has received a letter from the Board's actuary and will forward it to the City Commission, along with a memo indicating his position with regard to the remarriage clause.

Mayor Seiler referred to the City Auditor's memorandum on this topic. The City Auditor indicated that in the history of the plan there has only been one remarriage, therefore the thinking is that the financial impact would be virtually nil. In response to Vice Mayor Rodstrom, the City Auditor indicated that it is a reasonably small group of widows and widowers, but one could probably infer that part of the reason for no remarriages is the loss of benefits. Mayor Seiler asked the City Auditor to report on the number of individuals in the group. Vice Mayor Rodstrom asked also for the associated cost if all of them decided to remarry.

The Division of Retirement has tentatively approved the Board's annual report, and the Plan will receive its 175 and 185 monies within the next two to three weeks.

No discussion.

The Board plans to send out an RFP for an actuary.

No discussion.

BD-2 - Board and Committee Vacancies

Note: Please see regular meeting item R-7.

EXECUTIVE CLOSED DOOR SESSION WAS HELD AT 4:42 P.M.

The City Commission shall meet privately pursuant to Florida Statutes 286.011(8), regarding the following:

**HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE v.
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE (CASE 11-28715)**

CLOSED DOOR SESSION ENDED AT 4:55 P.M.

Note: The City Commission reconvened at 11:54 p.m. to address City Manager reports.

City Manager Reports

MGR-1 – Discussion and Update on Various Matters

E911 Call Taking and Police Dispatch Services; Conflict Resolution

The City Manager announced that the conflict assessment meeting with Broward County has concluded. A joint meeting with the County Commission is being scheduled. He will include an item on the September 18 conference agenda to provide his recommendation for the next year.

America's Backyard; 111 Properties; Special Magistrate Order

The City Manager indicated that staff is close to having a solution for this matter that can be brought forward. There was consensus approval to allow him to request a 60-day extension from 111 Properties.

The meeting adjourned at 11:57 p.m.