

APPROVED
SPECIAL
PROPERTY AND RIGHT-OF-WAY COMMITTEE MEETING
CITY HALL 8TH FLOOR
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM
THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010 – 10:00 A.M.

Committee Members Present

Peter Partington, Chair
Mark Darmanin, Utilities
Anthony Fajardo, (10:43)
Carol Ingold, Supervisor, Parks and Recreation
Tony Irvine, City Surveyor
Michael Maloney, Code Enforcement
Tom Terrell, Public Works
Robert Dunckel, City Attorney's Office

Staff

Victor Volpi, Liaison, Senior Real Estate Officer
Dennis Girisgen, Land Development Manager, Engineering
Captain Mike Gregory
Monica Santisi, Engineer, Public Works
Carrie Sarver, Assistant City Attorney
Liz Davila, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None at this time.

Call to Order

Chair Partington called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m., and stated this was a meeting of the City's Property and Right-of-Way Committee, a City Staff committee with the responsibility of advising the City Commission on matters affecting the dispensation of City property.

As of this date there were eight appointed members to the Committee, which means four would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call, it was determined a quorum was present.

<u>ITEM ONE:</u>	<u>RED LIGHT CAMERAS</u>
<u>ITEM TWO:</u>	<u>REVOCABLE LICENSE</u>
ADDRESS:	Various sites

The vendor requires a revocable license to access City-owned properties to install red light cameras. Robert Zaitooni, National Design and Engineering, ATS, would like the Committee's positive recommendation to access to various City properties to complete the project.

Mr. Volpi stated that the contractor was present and would give all the sites and make sure they all have the same plans.

Mr. Dunckel stated he had the revocable license drafted and found six sites.

Mr. Partington directed them to go back to first principles looking at locations on City property for these installations which would proceed by means of a revocable license. Mr. Dunckel stated his affirmation.

Mr. Partington stated the Committee would be making a recommendation on conditions or approval of the revocable license, which, in turn, would go to the City Commission.

Mr. Dunckel stated it would be on the May 4, 2010 agenda. He added that the Committee needed to ascertain whatever conflicts there might be at the locations to make appropriate adjustments if necessary in the revocable license or in the drawings.

Mr. Dunckel stated that Carrie Sarver, Assistant City Attorney, would be working with him on some of the property and right-of-way issues.

Mr. Partington inquired if there was anything in the recently enacted State legislation that would cause the applicant to revisit the locations. He added that he knows they are not currently allowed in State right-of-way, but inquired if that would affect anything.

Robert Zaitooni, National Design and Engineering, ATS, stated that the bill had gone to the Governor and they do not see any issues regarding how it would affect the way [ATS] does business. It has not been determined how DOT (Department of Transportation) would permit the items on their right-of-way. There has not been a policy drafted from Tallahassee and in talking to local district offices they do not have any idea at this time. He added a permit would be required to be in the right-of-way. He believes the issue of the easement acquisition was going to "go away" once the law becomes effective. Currently, to monitor a State road, a private easement is required.

Mr. Partington inquired if that is what they are doing now when dealing with the City and the City's private property.

Mr. Zaitooni stated Mr. Partington was correct and [ATS] would then require a permit from DOT to be within the right-of-way, in which the City may be the applicant. He does not yet know what the directive will be from DOT.

Mr. Partington inquired if it was possible or likely that they would go through the exercise of getting the revocable license on City property and then change direction two months from now and actually try to install the items on State right-of-way.

Mr. Zaitooni stated he did not believe it would affect these sites. [ATS] would not move them after they are installed. These particular installations on City property would remain on City property.

Mr. Dunckel added that even if it did affect them, [ATS] would still need the revocable license to make the installation in the first place.

Mr. Volpi stated there were six exhibits. Mr. Dunckel explained that in the process of producing the exhibits, he and Mr. Irvine had reviewed them and could not determine where the right-of-way line was. At some point they were revised and that would have become a second submittal. He added that one or two of them had not yet been drawn and would be referred to as the first submittal but the right-of-way line was inserted in red to be readily discernible.

Mr. Volpi mentioned that the copies he made would not indicate the red. Mr. Partington instructed the Committee to look at the plans that indicated second submittal.

Mr. Volpi stated that he and Captain Gregory had reviewed the six exhibits and Captain Gregory "said yes to every one of these six."

Mr. Dunckel stated there was no problem looking at the first submittal for North Federal Highway at NE 8th Street and first submittal at NE 15th Avenue and Sunrise Boulevard. He added that the balance of the intersections needed a second submittal to be able to figure out where the right-of-way line is and whether it is in public right-of-way or private property.

Mr. Partington directed them to start with North Federal Highway at NE 8th Street.

1. North Federal Highway at NE 8th Street

Mr. Terrell stated that under normal circumstance where there is a contractor who works for the City of Fort Lauderdale to install equipment, the City would not generally supply the power.

Mr. Dunckel stated he did not know how the contract was structured with regard to who pays for the power source. Mr. Zaitooni recalled that the contract states that to benefit both Fort Lauderdale as well as American Traffic Solution to get the program "up and

running,” it is in the best interest of the City of Fort Lauderdale to help them acquire temporary power through tapping into the City power.

Mr. Irvine inquired that according to the contract, would they start by tapping into the City power and then eventually provide their own power.

Mr. Terrell stated his other concern being that they would go into a building to tie into power and proceed with the revocable license. Even if they did a nice installation with disconnects, if a car “hammers one of these things” it could cause problems inside the building. He added they need some sort of protection.

Mr. Zaitooni stated they had inline fuses. Mr. Terrell stated that fuses do not always work and there was the possibility of a mistake being made during the installation process. Mr. Dunckel stated the standard indemnification clauses were there.

Mr. Partington stated that as a matter of City policy, they are permitted to facilitate and help the installation.

Mr. Irvine stated that he had some questions and concerns.

Mr. Zaitooni explained that before they install the equipment, [ATS] would have their registered land surveyor go into the field and mark the right-of-way line exactly where it is so that they do not intrude or encroach into DOT right-of-way line. They would make sure the brackets and cameras are inside the property they are designated to be in.

Mr. Irvine stated he wanted to see the tie from the right-of-way line, not from the curb. Mr. Zaitooni stated the reason they tie into the curb is that it is a permanent marker that does not move, unlike a marker that can be mowed down. He requested that Mr. Girisgen enforce on the permit an offset from the property line.

Mr. Zaitooni stated they would comply with the decision of the Board. He added that although [the offset] was not shown [on the exhibit] they had calculated it in.

Mr. Partington stated that the permit involved would be a building permit not an engineering permit. Mr. Girisgen stated they could request the building to put in an engineering stop so they would be able to look at the dimension cover Mr. Irvine is concerned about. He added that he did not want to have a separate engineering permit that would encumber the process.

Mr. Girisgen explained that putting in “a stop” meant that it would get routed to [Engineering] before it’s final approval.

Ms. Santisi stated she spoke to Zoning and they had an issue because the plans show that the cameras were slightly encroaching over the right-of-way line.

Mr. Zaitooni stated that was a schematic. He added that when the camera is put on the plans, with respect to everything else, they look a little bit exaggerated proportionally. He stated it does not happen in the field, it is shown that way for the matter of presentation. He stated that Planning and Zoning asked them to get the boundary surveys from the City Surveyor, which they did. They prepared the boundaries and a site plan, which shows the offset to the property line in the documents. He added that he had the documents for all of the sites where the City property is involved and could submit those documents.

Mr. Partington stated they would put an Engineering sign-off into the building permit process.

Mr. Dunckel stated that the structure of the revocable license anticipates, whether it be first submittal or second submittal, was attached as exhibit A-1 through A-6 for the six locations. He stated that the exhibits should show the offset, the tie from the right-of-way line, as opposed to what is shown now. He inquired how much time it would take to produce those so they could be attached to the Commission agenda which would go out later that day, but which they could supplement later. Mr. Zaitooni stated he would provide it the next day.

Mr. Irvine stated that his concern came about by looking at a CAD survey. When he measured from the right-of-way line to the face of curb and calculated their offsets, it was not "crystal clear" that it was clear of the right-of-way line.

Mr. Zaitooni stated they had run into this situation with installations in other cities in the State of Florida, to the point where FDOT inspectors came out with a plumb bob and found them two inches over the right-of way. They had to move the pole and the entire foundation. He stated the land surveyor would have the site staked before the sub-contractor "puts a shovel to the ground." He pointed out that "it costs a lot of money and it would be on him, not the City of Fort Lauderdale."

Mr. Partington requested that Mr. Zaitooni "walk him through" the installation for North Federal Highway at NE 8th Street. Referring to the exhibit, the contractors explained the installation step-by-step.

Mr. Terrell stated that it was a structural installation, tying the electricity into the panel box used for air conditioning units and that it has ample power. He added that the process was not much different than a security camera installation.

Mr. Partington inquired if the revocable licenses have a defined area for the easement. Mr. Dunckel stated that the exhibits show the licensed area, rather than a legal description. The license would reference the drawings.

Mr. Darmanin inquired regarding the possibility of a modification to the drawing in the permit process. Mr. Dunckel stated one way would be to leave text in the revocable license allowing for a substitution, and the other way would be to take it back through the process and amend the revocable license with the new documents.

Dan Newman, ATS, stated that after the project is complete, they would turn in a red line drawing. If anything changed, it would be turned into the City.

Mr. Dunckel stated it would be referenced as being on file with the office of the City Engineer.

Regarding maintaining the property, Mr. Terrell stated there should be a call-ahead. Ms. Ingold inquired regarding how much advance notice they would get.

Captain Mike Gregory stated they were contractually obligated to make repairs to their equipment for failures within a 48-hour time frame.

Ms. Ingold stated the notice would probably go to the head of Park Rangers.

Mr. Partington stated that the language in the agreement states that the Office of the City Engineer shall approve all repairs and replacements.

Ms. Sarver pointed out for clarification that the agreement does not say "prior." She added that Mr. Dunckel wants to clarify the language further to say "and prior to making any such repairs, give notice to the City."

Mr. Dunckel stated regarding this location, there would be a notice requirement of 24 hours Monday through Friday to the head of the Park Rangers.

Mr. Zaitooni stated he believed the language Ms. Sarver was referring to might have been for cases where they would have to move something. An alteration would have to go through the permitting process again.

Mr. Irvine stated for regular monthly maintenance he did not believe [ATS] should "be forced to deal with us" on a regular basis. Mr. Dunckel stated "not in regard to the Engineering Office, but in regards to giving notice to the Park Ranger."

Judd Sopoci, Project Implementation Manager, Florida ATS, stated that the contract does state they are under a tight time frame as far as when all permits are received and notice to proceed gives them five days to build the sites.

Mr. Terrell stated that Park Rangers were referenced because it is a park. The cemetery would have a different contact.

Ms. Ingold inquired if the contractor would be doing work on a routine basis, if their staff would need to go through any special background check. She referenced an article in the Herald that stated sexual predators are not allowed near any park. Ms. Carver stated the ordinance pertains to residence.

Mr. Zaitooni stated that ATS employees go through a strict background check but he was not certain if subcontractors go through a background check.

Mr. Terrell stated his contracts have language regarding background checks and he can provide that for the City to use.

Mr. Irvine stated that sensitive sites needed to have the background checks but it was not necessary for workers at completely innocuous sites.

The Committee decided to go through the sites one-by-one and make a motion at the end of the discussion. Mr. Dunckel would call the items by order.

Ms. Ingold inquired how the sites were selected. Captain Gregory stated it was due to the high frequency of traffic accidents at the locations and also that once under contract with ATS, they were able to go out and survey the intersections, monitor them, video record them and then count the number of violations that occurred.

2. NE 15th Avenue at Sunrise Boulevard (Publix)

Mr. Dunckel stated the item was labeled first submittal. He added it would be revised to show the tie from the right-of-way. He described the project using the exhibits. As far as revocable license, this item's installation is within City-controlled public right-of-way as opposed to City-owned real property.

Mr. Darmanin stated there were some utilities.

Regarding the cameras, Alfredo Arroyo, D&E Manager, ATS, stated that the City right-of-way ends at the back of the sidewalk so they put the pole on Publix property. There was discussion about the video detection. Mr. Partington stated that since they were putting the detectors into the City right-of-way, the licensed area would have to encompass those as well.

Mr. Girisgen stated a concern if the road were to be resurfaced. The sensors were shallow enough they could get damaged. Mr. Zaitooni responded that in the event a city or county decides to resurface, [ATS] is liable for their own detectors.

Mr. Partington stated there was still "a loose end" regarding whether the detection devices were in the State's right-of-way. Mr. Irvine agreed. He said the detectors could be relocated further north or go to DOT and get clarification. Mr. Zaitooni stated they would "do their due diligence" and talk to DOT.

Mr. Dunckel recalled from his email correspondence, that [ATS] would not do anything to conflict with State right-of-way. Mr. Zaitooni responded, "absolutely."

Mr. Dunckel stated that within the revocable license, [ATS] was charged with getting all other required permits.

Mr. Irvine expressed concern that after [ATS] goes through the license and permit process that DOT could ask for their permit. He did not want to see "the whole thing die" for want of five or six days. Mr. Dunckel said he did not see it "dying," but not being implemented until they got the proper FDOT approval. In the meantime, the City would be giving permission in a proprietary sense to go forward.

Mr. Irvine stated they should condition it because if the right-of-way from return to return is DOT's, this could not be built. FDOT would not permit until the law changes.

Mr. Dunckel responded, "not necessarily." If it did turn out they had to wait until July 1, they would go ahead and reconfigure and he would also include flex language that would allow for substitution of the exhibits on file with the City Engineer.

Mr. Partington stated the license would reference a drawing rather than an area. Mr. Dunckel stated the revocable license would make specific reference to this particular circumstance. Mr. Partington stated it was in the best interest of the company to check the issue so they do not do an installation they could not then put into operation because DOT tells them they did not get a permit from DOT.

Mr. Zaitooni stated that ATS would opt to go to DOT and clarify the issue and return to the Committee with an answer.

Mr. Partington stated that if DOT says they could not put the wireless detection devices where they plan to place them, [ATS] has a workaround because they could put the detection onto a pole. Mr. Zaitooni responded it would require approaching Publix again. He added it would probably do damage to the site. Mr. Partington pointed out it was the company's responsibility, not the City's.

Mr. Irvine stated he did not think they should stop or slow down the license process. He raised the issue as an Engineering permit issue so that the Committee "flags it now." He added they could still approve the licenses and not stop that part of the process. He would like to see DOT sign-off.

Mr. Partington stated that the process they were on would appear to allow [ATS] to go forward with the installation, but it was possible the detectors were in DOT's right-of-way. Somebody, by means of a legal challenge, could find that out and arguably try to argue and invalidate the whole installation because DOT never approved "whatever it is" in the right-of-way.

Mr. Dunckel questioned if Mr. Irvine expected someone to spend \$5,000 to avoid a \$125 ticket that does not result in points on their driver's license and does not take their car away. Mr. Irvine stated it could be that after 12-18 months of tickets someone with enough money and anger decides to challenge the issue.

Mr. Dunckel stated regarding this particular intersection, that Mr. Irvine wanted a condition of the revocable license to be a sign-off from FDOT or a permit from them. Mr. Irvine responded affirmatively.

Mr. Zaitooni stated he did not think they would get a sign-off from FDOT unless there was a law in place. He stated they have the FDOT right-of-way maps and that the right-of-way line is going the other way and they are 10 feet behind the right-of-way line. He stated they would like the opportunity to check that and get back to the Committee. He asked the Committee to not make a decision that day.

Mr. Dunckel stated he could not have the revocable license attached to an agenda that is distributed to the City Commission later on that day. What he could do, was to condition this particular site on verification from FDOT that it is not FDOT right-of-way or if it is, a permit, or relocation.

Mr. Irvine stated he would be more comfortable if somebody at DOT, the district surveyor or their general counsel, would send an email to address the issue.

Mr. Dunckel stated this needed to be resolved before the Commission meeting. Mr. Partington stated that would be ideal and could they push this item off to Mr. Girisgen and the engineering permit since there were items going into City right-of-way.

Mr. Irvine stated that was his intention. Mr. Dunckel stated the worst case scenario for this particular location would be requiring them to relocate.

Mr. Partington stated he was comfortable if the record shows the Committee was recommending that Mr. Girisgen satisfy himself that [ATS] demonstrated they are not putting anything into DOT's right-of-way when he approves the engineering permit.

Mr. Darmanin inquired regarding this site and the others, if the company is a member of Sunshine 811, and would somebody in the company mark out the system that is in the roadway. He added that if an excavator came out, they would rip it apart.

Mr. Partington stated that this was something they really do not like to do, on 14th Avenue particularly, because the City is allowing a private service installation in the right-of-way when they are not one of the utilities covered by some agreement with the City. He added they have done it, but do not like to, because of the reasons Mr. Darmanin stated. There is no good record of where this is, and then somebody could "go down there and dig this up." If that happens, it is a problem for the City because they are a partner in the installation.

Mr. Irvine inquired how many voltages would run in the conduit that runs along 14th Avenue and across the easement to the pole. Mr. Zaitooni responded 120 volts. Mr. Irvine responded he had a definite concern regarding someone digging there and hitting it. Mr. Partington inquired why they would have to go all the way to 14th Avenue to pick up. Mr. Zaitooni replied that the location is where the power company would give them power from. Mr. Irvine stated there was another way to deal with it.

Mr. Zaitooni stated that FPL has a methodology that if you bury a tape 12" above a conduit, you stop if you see the tape.

Mr. Girisgen inquired if there was anything preventing them from registering with Sunshine State One-Call and then hiring a locator to mark those out in the field during construction. Mr. Darmanin replied there is a cost. Mr. Zaitooni stated their technicians do their own marking right now in most states. Mr. Girisgen inquired, aside from marking, if they intended to register with the Sunshine State One-Call system. Mr. Partington stated that if they were ultimately allowed into DOT's right-of way, it would be a good idea for them to register. At the moment, everything was going into private property, so the issue was not so pertinent. Mr. Zaitooni stated they would address joining the 811 Sunshine.

Mr. Terrell inquired if at 11th Street and 15th Avenue, which is actually closer, could FPL not give 120. Mr. Zaitooni answered it would be at a \$25,000 cost and a six-week wait for them to install.

Mr. Zaitooni stated he did not believe the City allowed open trenching of the roads. Mr. Partington responded that encasing had been a standard response to this scenario. Mr. Girisgen stated he was open to not encasing it if they register with 811. Mr. Partington

recommended leaving it to Mr. Girisgen and the engineering permit. Mr. Darmanin disagreed stating that Mr. Girisgen was asking the Committee to give him guidance. Mr. Partington stated the guidance was evidence that they had registered with 811 or he could require them to encase. Mr. Darmanin stated it should be one or the other and he suggested 811.

Mr. Irvine stated that with time sensitivity, they needed to allow some flexibility. Mr. Partington stated there was agreement that if they register with 811 it would be sufficient for Mr. Girisgen to sign-off on the engineering permit for this particular installation. He inquired if the Committee was also recommending that he sign-off if they encase and if he was comfortable with how they were going to do it.

Mr. Zaitooni stated that if the revocable license contains a requirement for them to do that ultimately, he was comfortable. Mr. Dunckel stated he was prepared to draft it as either an encasement or 811 at the discretion of the office of the City Engineer and that either one was acceptable. Mr. Darmanin wanted to see it as an 811.

Mr. Zaitooni stated there was also an option to go overhead. Mr. Terrell said they could still have the service from FPL on the same pole and install their own pole to go overhead.

Mr. Dunckel stated he was planning to draft it, that if underground, it would be required to go 811. Mr. Darmanin stated that once they registered with 811, it was not for just one site, it was for all of them. Mr. Terrell stated most of these would be installed on private property, which 811 does not.

Mr. Partington confirmed with the Committee members that they were comfortable with the site. Mr. Dunckel stated the point raised about 811 that anything underground would have to be registered and there is a cost factor. Mr. Darmanin responded it was not so much the cost factor for registering the utility or the service, but that they get charged if there is a call in the area they have the utility in. It is then their responsibility to mark for whoever is going to excavate in that area. As it currently sits, if they do not mark their utilities and somebody goes in and digs, no matter what it is, if they get ripped out, currently they pay for it to get replaced no matter who does it or why, regardless, under any conditions. They have some recourse if they paid 811 to go out and mark it and then go out and mark their locations so that if somebody digging that location rips it out, they have some recourse to collect on those damaged materials.

Mr. Dunckel stated they would require 811 for any underground installation in City right-of-way. Mr. Zaitooni stated it was time for them to go out and register for that but he did not want it to hold this project up. Mr. Partington stated that for this particular location, the revocable license could say 811 would be required if installation is underground on 14th Avenue. Or installation could be overhead to get around not registering with 811 at

this point in time, which they strongly recommend “down the road.” Mr. Zaitooni stated he understood and they would definitely register.

Mr. Darmanin stated that as soon as they place one service underground and register with 811, all of their facilities were covered. Mr. Partington stated it was a benefit for them to register.

3. SR 84, SW 9th Avenue, NE quadrant of the intersection

Mr. Dunckel referred to the exhibit showing the chain-link fence. The installations would be on the right-of-way side of the fence as opposed to the cemetery side.

Mr. Terrell inquired if they would go into the panel just inside the fence. Mr. Sopoci replied they would bore directionally due west to a pole box.

Mr. Arroyo added they would try to get as close to the fence as they could.

Mr. Dunckel inquired if there were any utilities. He stated it is private property, but some of it is outside the fence. Mr. Darmanin stated, “As long as it is not in the right-of-way then we are okay.”

Mr. Irvine stated he wanted to reiterate his comment about showing an off-set from the right-of-way line. Mr. Dunckel stated that should apply for all six exhibits.

Mr. Irvine stated the Cemetery Board would have to be contacted for maintenance inside the fence. Ms. Sarver commented that the Board meets monthly.

Mr. Dunckel inquired if the City owns the areas that are not burial plots. He stated “they” are vested with administration of the cemetery and the Perpetual Care Trust Fund. Mr. Irvine stated that the City owns the underlying plat parcel and they only allocate the cemetery plots.

Mr. Volpi inquired what document do they allocate out the plats. Mr. Dunckel inquired it is a certificate, not a deed. They are trying to avoid it becoming a fee simple transaction in real estate.

Mr. Partington inquired if Julius would be comfortable being authorized to speak for the Cemetery Board and giving approval “in principle.”

Mr. Irvine stated this would likely go to City Commission ultimately for a decision.

Mr. Darmanin stated he does not have record of any private utility there.

Mr. Girisgen inquired if there were any requirements regarding permits. Mr. Partington responded no, and none regarding Mr. Girisgen.

4. West Sunrise Boulevard at NW 15th Avenue (Carter Park)

Mr. Dunckel stated he was looking at a second submittal but did not know what the offset was. The exhibit shows cameras slightly encroaching over the right-of-way line but there would be adjustments to make sure that does not happen. The installation would be outside of the fence, north of the fence.

Mr. Irvine stated concern since the location is a park. He added they have been granting easements to cover the electric feed. It could be written in, after-the-fact based on the field installation, that an easement document be prepared for that utility. Mr. Dunckel asked Mr. Irvine to explain the rationale. Mr. Irvine stated the easement would cover the 110 power going from the building, across part of the park and down parallel to the right-of-way to the pole so that in the future if work is ever done, it would be marked up and there would be an easement on file.

Mr. Terrell stated if something were built, as far as utilities owned by the City that support the park, [the City] would locate them; however, it is not owned by the City.

Mr. Partington inquired how creating an easement would make it clearer in the future "there is something here." Mr. Irvine stated it was "a flag at least."

Mr. Volpi inquired why this was not requested for the cemetery. Mr. Irvine stated the cemetery has operations in place and infrastructure management in the cemetery. The park does not.

Mr. Darmanin stated there was an existing sewer utility easement. He referred to the exhibit.

Mr. Partington inquired if [ATS] had any objections to giving the City an easement with a description of where the installation was going. Mr. Zaitooni responded they do not have any objections. Mr. Irvine instructed Mr. Zaitooni to have their surveyor locate their points in the description document.

5. West Commercial Boulevard at NW 21st Avenue (Airport Property)

The Committee discussed the airport property. Mr. Irvine stated he was concerned about airport management sign-off.

Mr. Darmanin inquired what power they would be tying into. Mr. Terrell responded that it would be the little servers for the up-lights for the entrance sign.

Mr. Darmanin stated there were “utilities all over the place in there.” Mr. Terrell responded they definitely had to be careful underground.

Mr. Irvine stated that because it is FAA owned property, to get an easement was a challenge. He requested that [ATS] provide the engineering department with as-builts of what is installed and he would like State plane coordinates on the critical points, in feet.

6. South Federal Highway and State Road 84 (Welcome Park)

Mr. Irvine stated he wanted an easement on this installment with the same conditions including as-builts.

Motion made by Mr. Dunckel, seconded by Mr. Terrell, to recommend approval of the revocable license, subject to the conditions discussed by the Board for each location.

Mr. Girisgen inquired if they were precluded from requiring a bond for restoration of right-of-way during the permit stage under the terms of the agreements. Mr. Dunckel stated “that flows from City ordinance.” Mr. Dunckel added he would incorporate the provision from the code that is applicable to utilities and restoration of road.

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

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting adjourned at 11:53 a.m.