

**APPROVED**  
**CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMITTEE**  
**MEETING MINUTES**  
**8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA**  
**WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 2010 – 3:00 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**

| <b>Members</b>                  | <b>Attendance</b> | <b>Present</b> | <b>Absent</b> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| E. Clay Shaw, Chair             | P                 | 8              | 1             |
| Dr. Claire Crawford, Vice Chair | P                 | 8              | 2             |
| John Aurelius                   | P                 | 11             | 1             |
| Peg Buchan                      | P                 | 8              | 2             |
| Sandra Casteel                  | P                 | 4              | 2             |
| Beauregard Cummings             | P                 | 3              | 2             |
| Patricia DuMont                 | A                 | 11             | 1             |
| Patricia Hale                   | P                 | 10             | 0             |
| Cindi Hutchinson                | P                 | 10             | 1             |
| Stephanie Jean                  | A                 | 3              | 2             |
| Barbara Keith                   | P                 | 11             | 2             |
| Ina Lee                         | P                 | 9              | 1             |
| Jo Ann Medalie                  | P                 | 11             | 1             |
| Donna Mergenhagen               | P                 | 11             | 1             |
| Charlie Palmer (3:18)           | P                 | 4              | 1             |
| Wingate Payne                   | P                 | 10             | 0             |
| Mary Rizor                      | P                 | 8              | 3             |
| Lisa Scott-Founds               | A                 | 6              | 3             |
| Lewis Tunnage                   | P                 | 9              | 3             |
| Dennis Ulmer                    | P                 | 12             | 0             |
| Birch Willey                    | A                 | 8              | 2             |

As of this date, there are currently 21 members appointed to the Committee, which means 11 would constitute a quorum.

**Staff**

Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison, Public Information Department  
Maxine Singh, City Commission Liaison  
Carrie Sarver, Assistant City Attorney  
Liz Davila, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to the City Commission**

None at this time.

### **Call to Order**

- **Roll Call**

Chair Shaw called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Roll was called and it was determined a quorum was present.

- **Approval of Minutes from April 14, 2010 Meeting**

Ms. Vezina noted that Ms. Singh's name had been accidentally omitted from Staff.

**Motion** made by Mr. Tunnage, seconded by Mr. Cummings, to approve the April 14, 2010 minutes as corrected. In a voice vote, the **motion** carried unanimously.

### **Old Business**

- **Sponsorship and Fundraising Activities**

Mr. Aurelius recalled that at the previous meeting he had felt the Committee "needed professional help;" since that time, he advised there has been some direction from the City Attorney's Office. One concern expressed by the Committee is that the City contract gives a 13% commission; there was some feeling that, "depending upon the involvement of the fundraiser," this should be lessened or phased out. He felt, however, that considering the need for professional assistance, the Committee should "get over that hurdle," as fundraising is a much larger job than it was originally understood to be.

Attorney Sarver explained there is currently a City contract in place to use Jan Beth Idelman Inc. for existing events, including the 4<sup>th</sup> of July, New Year's Fireworks, Jazz Brunch, and others. She noted that there has been no official action taken by the Committee to use Ms. Idelman's services; it is the City's opinion that the Committee could retain her services under the contract, but its terms are for 13% and state that her role would be "to solicit and secure anchor and title sponsors for pre-approved new events," as well as soliciting partners for in-kind services, creating sponsorship packets and coordinating the distribution of these packets to potential donors, serving as a liaison between sponsors and City Staff, facilitating outreach efforts, and providing progress reports to Staff.

She explained that while the Committee may use these services under the City's contract, they would have to take official action by making a motion to agree to the contract. Attorney Sarver added the 13% is non-negotiable under the contract.

She recalled that the Committee had discussed making an amendment to use Ms. Idelman's services based upon "certain scenarios and percentages;" if this is the direction they choose, she advised they make a motion to recommend that the City Commission take this action, as the Commission is the only body with the authority to amend the contract. If this step is taken, the City Attorney's Office must draft this recommendation per the Committee's direction.

Ms. Hutchinson asked if the Committee could also make a motion to use Ms. Idelman's services. Attorney Sarver confirmed this is correct, and clarified that under the terms of the contract, Ms. Idelman would receive the full 13% from sponsors that she "solicits and secures."

Chair Shaw asked what would happen if a Committee member has solicited a sponsorship without Ms. Idelman's assistance. Attorney Sarver stated she would need more information before she could make a determination.

She added that the existing contract is vague, and was originally done through the City's Procurement Department for smaller events; however, Staff is of the opinion that the contract may be applied to the Committee if they wish, and the City Attorney's Office has determined that if it is used, the 13% must be applied as well.

Ms. Casteel offered the example of a sponsor secured without Ms. Idelman's assistance, and for whom someone from the Committee is "already promising to assist." Attorney Sarver stated it is her understanding that the 13% would not be applicable under the existing contract in this case.

Ms. Idelman asked if she could address the Committee, and explained that she has worked with the City for several years as a civic volunteer before responding to the RFP for fundraising. Her services include marketing and promotions, and she noted that the industry standard is 20% commission. She had understood the RFP to include work on both new and existing events, and had included the upcoming Centennial in her proposal; when the RFP was approved, she had voluntarily resigned from the Committee in order to prevent the perception of a conflict of interest, which had furthered her assumption that she would be working with the Committee on Centennial events.

Ms. Idelman pointed out that she has attended Committee and fact-finding group meetings, as well as meeting with the media and with potential sponsors. She advised she had raised \$76,000 for the City's New Year's Eve celebration and brought in a \$24,000 sponsor for Jazz Brunch, although she noted that signing a sponsor is only "the tip of the iceberg" and a good deal of follow-up work is necessary.

**Motion** made by Vice Chair Crawford, seconded by Ms. Hutchinson, to accept working with Ms. Idelman on the basis of that contract, and that she get the full 13% on everything that they raise as a Committee.

Chair Shaw cautioned that the motion as stated goes “beyond the contract,” which specifies a 13% commission for sponsorships in which Ms. Idelman’s services are involved. He felt the motion should simply state that the Committee accepts the existing City contract.

Attorney Sarver reiterated that the contract is vague, and advised that a concern could arise if Ms. Idelman makes no contacts for the Committee but her sponsorship materials are used. She explained she wished for the Committee to “have all the information now to address that” in order to prevent any later disagreements. She advised that an argument could be made that while Ms. Idelman did not have direct contract or “make the call for the money,” she may have contributed follow-up services that could arguably entitle her to the 13% commission.

Ms. Vezina asked how the contract addresses in-kind donations, in which funds are not donated but follow-up work is necessary. Chair Shaw offered the example of work with the *Sun-Sentinel*.

Mr. Palmer advised that another City entity accepted cash donations only rather than in-kind services, and provided an approved list of potential donors. Attorney Sarver agreed this is “a great suggestion,” and reminded the Committee that the contract states Ms. Idelman must provide bi-weekly progress reports, in which she could advise Ms. Vezina of her direct contacts and provide a “paper trail” in order to prevent any disputes.

Chair Shaw felt if the Committee took no action with regard to Ms. Idelman’s services, this would allow the legal status to “stay as it is;” otherwise, he cautioned that any action could be “stepping out of bounds” and creating a dispute that could result in “something that’s going to be litigated later.” He strongly recommended that the Committee take no action at all, but noted that the reports cited as part of the contract, however, are necessary now.

Mr. Palmer offered the example of a time capsule, which could prove to be a very expensive project but with which the City’s fundraiser was not involved, and asked how the contract would be applied to this case. Attorney Sarver advised that the Committee should “be aware” of examples such as this one, explaining that if Ms. Idelman regularly attends meetings and “does anything outside,” this could cause confusion. If it is the Committee’s intent to vote to clarify any of the contract’s language, she again suggested that it be done in the form of a recommended amendment, with proposed language drafted by the City Attorney’s Office, which clarifies the Committee’s intent “in certain scenarios.”

She stated again that under the terms of the current contract, Ms. Idelman receives 13% if she assists with securing partners. She felt the City Commission is looking to the Committee to determine how they wish to use Ms. Idelman's services.

Vice Chair Crawford pointed out that Ms. Idelman is "already involved at the front end," and that a fundraiser often "closes the deal and does the follow-up." Mr. Palmer observed that this raised two issues: the fee for these activities as opposed to the fee they would pay for a fundraiser.

Ms. Mergenhagen asserted that 13% is "a good deal," particularly if in-kind services and development of brochures are included. Ms. Buchan agreed, noting that she and Mr. Aurelius have contacted two hospitals who have agreed to be sponsors, but the Committee not prepared to deliver the benefits of a sponsorship. If this task is "handed off" to Ms. Idelman, Ms. Mergenhagen felt she is deserving of the commission; however, Attorney Sarver advised this is considered in-kind services, and Ms. Idelman would perform this service without receiving a commission on this transaction.

Mr. Palmer stated the Committee and Ms. Idelman should create a list of potential donors to attach to the contract so Ms. Idelman would concentrate on working with these donors; she would not be given a commission on potential donors who are not on the list.

Ms. Payne felt if any Committee members elect to raise funds on their own, they should let Ms. Idelman and Mr. Aurelius know, as they may have already approached the potential sponsor.

Ms. Lee noted that while many members have had some experience with fundraising, Ms. Idelman is already contracted with the City; it would be her job to deal with media, such as the *Sun-Sentinel*, as "part of the package." She added that Ms. Idelman has worked to create professional sponsorship materials and "has already been doing her job."

Mr. Aurelius added that if the Committee wants a professional fundraiser, "she's here," and they do not have the option to engage a different professional. He continued that 13% is "on the lower end" of possible commissions. He agreed that Mr. Palmer's suggestion of a registry would be helpful, as would biweekly reports. He felt the Committee should adopt Ms. Idelman's services as contract vendor.

Attorney Sarver recommended that the Committee make a motion that they wish to use Ms. Idelman's services under the City's existing contract, in order to ensure that the matter is clear and is in the record.

Ms. Vezina recalled that at a recent City Commission meeting, the Mayor had requested that the Committee provide a monthly update to the Commission. She offered to include a Committee consensus to work with Ms. Idelman on sponsorships in this status report. Attorney Sarver added if there is a particular donation with no follow-up later on, the Committee can work with Ms. Idelman to reconcile the issue.

Ms. Idelman stated she has had no such disagreements to date with the Parks and Recreation Department, and reports to that Department regularly as well.

It was agreed that the Committee was in consensus with regard to accepting Ms. Idelman's services as part of the City contract.

Ms. Lee advised that "anything dealing with dollars and sponsorships" should go to the fundraising group, in which Ms. Idelman participates. Mr. Aurelius stated he was "ready to put [Ms. Idelman] to work" and the fundraising group plans to meet the following week to put together details on how to proceed, as well as to address any concerns.

### **Liaison Report**

- **Recent Commission Action**

Ms. Vezina stated that all Committee members have been re-appointed. The Committee item scheduled for the April 20, 2010 City Commission meeting regarding the "contract with the artist" was deferred, and will hopefully be added to the Commission's Agenda as quickly as possible.

She recalled that the Committee had requested \$75,000 in funds from the City Commission at the April 6 meeting. These funds were approved and are available in the Committee's budget.

Vice Chair Crawford departed the meeting at this time (3:41 p.m.).

The RFP for the historian is out for bid. If any members know individuals who may be interested in responding, Ms. Vezina advised she could provide a contact name and email for the RFP.

Chair Shaw advised he had spoken to the Mayor regarding the amount of time it takes to have an item added to the City Commission's Agenda; the Mayor has replied there will be a standing place for Committee business on the Agenda in the future.

Ms. Lee stated she was concerned that the Committee will have to send out an RFP for tasks such as licensing to sell merchandise for the Centennial. Ms. Payne suggested perhaps another Department already has such a contract. Chair Shaw pointed out that the Committee may be an exception, however, as the City Commission will address the approval of the Centennial poster, which involves “rights [and] royalties.” Mr. Aurelius offered to look into this issue and bring back a more definitive answer.

- **Update on Pending Items**

Mr. Aurelius observed it was his understanding that the item regarding the poster was pulled from the City Commission Agenda due to concern that black community history is not being addressed. Ms. Payne added that City Commissioner DuBose is working with the Trailblazers on a legacy memorial recognizing black trailblazers of the City.

Mr. Cummings explained the Trailblazers met with the Commissioner, and he had put forth a proposal for a legacy, as had the Trailblazers. They will meet again to finalize this project.

Ms. Lee stated that there have been meetings with the Trailblazers for input on the content of the poster, which was then passed along to the artist and has since been included in the poster, although she noted it has not yet been finalized. The next step will be reaching out to the City Commission with the prospective artwork. Ms. Vezina added the issue will be addressed with Commissioner DuBose so the Committee can proceed with the poster.

Ms. Rizor remarked that the Committee should review the film provided by the Chamber of Commerce, and recalled that the company responsible for the film had offered to make modifications so the film would be applicable to “all ethnic groups during that time.” She felt they should consider any such changes in advance so the Committee is not “held up” when modifications are necessary.

### **New Business**

- **Comprehensive List of Centennial Projects**

Chair Shaw explained this was a list of items on which the Committee is working, and asked if any of the members wished to discuss specific projects.

Mr. Palmer commented that he was attempting to expand the concept of a time capsule, including where it would be placed. He suggested both a 50-year and a 100-year mausoleum, or one of the two, for a total cost of roughly \$100,000. Statues may be added for an additional \$100,000.

Inside the time capsule itself, small containers could be sold to individual residents in which to place items; there would also be larger containers for City or neighborhood groups. He proposed placing the mausoleum in Stranahan Park, and noted the Committee could sell the containers at a profit if they need additional funds. Mr. Palmer proposed approaching the Seminole Indian Tribe to donate the money for the mausoleum and statues, and fundraising for the individual containers.

He concluded that an 8x8x8 mausoleum costs roughly \$45,000, and two of these would cost \$100,000 with installation. He was quoted \$88,000 for two life-sized statues. Containers are \$12 each for small sizes and increase in price according to size.

Ms. Buchan stated she had researched time capsules and found them to be a major fundraising opportunity. Mr. Palmer added that “stuffing” the mausoleum could be a fundraising event as well.

Ms. Payne pointed out that this project should be added to the fundraising group’s work to ensure there is no conflict with any “other expectations” of the Seminole Tribe.

Ms. Lee also cautioned that the Committee should determine its budget priorities regarding pricing and fundraising. Ms. Vezina reminded the Committee that this is the intent of the comprehensive list, and explained they can remove items and add new projects. They could then determine the costs of the projects and proceed.

Chair Shaw noted that the City Commission will need to appoint someone in charge of the New River Street Dance, as this event requires “a lot of work.” Ms. Hutchinson offered to follow up on this, as the events group plans to meet with City Staff to consider a budget for this particular event. The budget should be available by the next meeting. She added that while the Committee may have to invest money in this event up front, they will make money on the event in the end.

Mr. Palmer suggested asking the Junior League to “take on” the New River Street Dance. Ms. Hutchinson noted that City Staff is working on a list of equipment that may be used for this event, some of which may be provided by the Parks and Recreation Department at no cost. She estimated the event may cost \$200,000, but reiterated that the Committee is likely to “get it back” through use of sponsorships.

Ms. Mergenhagen advised that the installation of markers commemorating the Wade-In would be a City-wide event on July 4, which could ultimately include transportation and parking costs as well. Buses are necessary in order to fully

engage several neighborhoods throughout the City. Ms. Payne added that church choirs may be assembled to sing civil rights and patriotic songs at the event.

Ms. Buchan noted that the Committee has been given bids for the 17<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge. In addition, she reported that Ms. Buchan plans to have a baby in a Centennial-themed “onesie” on the cover of *Go Riverwalk* in June.

Chair Shaw requested more information on the Oral History Project. Ms. Vezina explained the historical education group is working on this project in conjunction with the Historical Society. Mr. Cummings stated there is also a project which will look at black achievements from 1900 to the present; theatrical presentations will be made at the Downtown library, the African-American Library, and at Dillard High School.

Ms. Lee called the Committee’s attention to the Projector Photo Montage, which would project photos onto different buildings throughout the Centennial year. This would feature a “traveling photo montage of a historical nature.”

Mr. Palmer stated there are three major legacy monuments under consideration, and the Committee should consider which of these would offer the best fundraising opportunity. Chair Shaw felt they should seek sponsors for each project, and the project with the most potential sponsorships would be a priority. Ms. Idelman agreed to look into this.

Mr. Palmer suggested considering a book or annual edition of a magazine, as he felt the Committee needed “take-home items” that residents may purchase. Mr. Aurelius agreed, stating that the marketing group should issue a “Centennial edition of something.” Ms. Lee pointed out that this would have to go out for RFP, as the Committee has been approached by different publishers who would like to raise advertising revenue; this has led the group to determine it would not be a good idea, as it had not been successful in other cities. Mr. Palmer asserted that the Committee “ought to have something.”

Ms. Lee explained that the video proposed at an earlier meeting would cost \$2000, but the use of photographs provided by the Historical Society would be an additional charge. She stated it is up to the sponsorship group to determine whether this could be an in-kind contribution with a sponsor, as the total cost of the video with photographs would be \$7000.

Ms. Buchan added that there are three options for this project: paying for the video and photographs, providing a sponsorship opportunity for the project; scrapping the idea entirely; and starting over again without the Historical Society’s photographs, for which they want \$75 per picture.

Ms. Lee suggested they allow Ms. Idelman to put together a sponsorship package for the Historical Society that will allow the Committee “unlimited access” to the photos.

- **Comprehensive Centennial Budget**

Ms. Vezina stated the budget has been put together and copies are available for those interested. It will be discussed at the next meeting.

**Other Matters of Interest**

- **Communications to the City Commission**

None at this time.

- **Confirm Date of Next Meeting**

The next Committee meeting is scheduled for June 9, 2010, at 12:00 p.m.

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]