

APPROVED
CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2010 – 4:00 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance

Members	Attendance	Present	Absent
E. Clay Shaw, Chair	P	2	1
Dr. Claire Crawford, Vice Chair	P	3	0
John Aurelius	P	3	0
Peg Buchan	P	3	0
Sandra Casteel	P	3	0
Beauregard Cummings	A	1	2
Patricia DuMont	A	0	3
Patricia Hale	A	1	2
Cindi Hutchinson	A	1	2
Stephanie Jean	A	0	3
Ina Lee	P	3	0
Jo Ann Medalie	P	2	1
Donna Mergenhagen	P	3	0
Charlie Palmer	P	3	0
Wingate Payne	P	3	0
Mary Rizor	A	2	1
Lisa Scott-Founds	A	1	2
Lewis Tunnage	P	3	0
Dennis Ulmer	P	3	0
Birch Willey	P	2	1

As of this date, there are currently 20 members appointed to the Committee, which means 11 would constitute a quorum.

Staff Present

Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison, Public Information Department
 Maxine Singh, City Commission Liaison
 Kathleen Gunn, Assistant to City Manager
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None at this time.

Call to Order

- **Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 4:13 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

Ms. Vezina advised that Chair Shaw was unable to attend today's meeting in person for medical reasons, but the Committee was allowed to vote on whether or not he could participate via conference call. He would not be able to vote on any actionable items, but would be able to address the Committee and would be counted as present.

Motion made by Ms. Payne, seconded by Ms. Lee, to allow Chair Shaw to attend today's meeting via conference call. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

- **Approval of Minutes from June 9, 2010 Meeting**

Motion made by Ms. Payne, seconded by Ms. Medalie, to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2010 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Centennial Projects

- **Prioritize Centennial Projects**

Vice Chair Crawford stated the Committee needed to vote on two items that would go before the City Commission on August 16. She explained that at this meeting, there are "motions to recommend," which meant the Committee would "vote on talking about the motions and the motions will pass or fail."

She presented the members with a list of motions, noting that it might not be simple to "vote yes or no" on some specific items. The Committee must choose the items with which they wished to proceed.

Vice Chair Crawford emphasized the need for the Committee to proceed with projects that are achievable within the remaining time frame, and to consider the funding available. She also advised that "bottom line numbers" are not available for all items, particularly "community improvement projects." She encouraged members to speak up with any questions or concerns regarding the projects, and recommended that they not vote on a particular item until each member has had a chance to read all available information regarding that item.

She informed the Committee that they now have both a historian and a poster for the Centennial, as well as exhibits, heritage markers, and "signs for our parks." The list of motions includes both small and large projects. She explained that the Executive Committee has met twice, and did not wish to summarily dismiss items without a vote by the membership.

- **Marketing Coalition Update**

Motion made by Mr. Aurelius, seconded by Ms. Buchan, to approve the Centennial poster.

Mr. Ulmer noted that the poster should spell out Fort Lauderdale rather than "Ft. Lauderdale."

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

Ms. Lee reported that Smuckers would like to be recognized by the City as the official jam/jelly of the Centennial via City proclamation. In exchange for this recognition, Smuckers will bring in Willard Scott as the celebrity guest aboard a Centennial boat in the Winterfest parade. Mayor Seiler has given his approval for the proclamation, and no monies are necessary. Ms. Gunn added that this resolution will be announced at the August 17, 2010 City Commission meeting.

Motion made by Ms. Payne, seconded by Ms. Mergenhagen, to approve the proclamation.

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

Vice Chair Crawford noted that funds must be approved to print the Centennial poster. Ms. Lee explained that the posters will be given to sponsors as well as possibly sold. The cost is \$5,000.

Motion made by Mr. Aurelius, seconded by Ms. Mergenhagen, to approve up to \$5,000 to print the Centennial poster.

Ms. Lee advised it cannot be anticipated whether or not the resale of the poster may earn back the \$5000 necessary for printing, as there is not yet a merchandiser for Centennial items.

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

Ms. Lee informed the Committee that the *Sun-Sentinel* is not donating advertising space, but has prepared a proposal for "what they will do" for \$27,000. The marketing group recommends the allocation of up to 80% to the

Sun-Sentinel and at least 20% to minority publications. The estimated cost of both is \$40,000.

Vice Chair Crawford stated she would like the motion to include the phrase “up to \$40,000.”

Ms. Lee made a **motion**, which was seconded by Mr. Palmer, for the Committee to approve an advertising budget up to \$40,000, of which up to 80% will be allocated towards the *Sun-Sentinel*, and at least 20% will be allocated towards minority publications. She clarified that the funds in question must be raised by the Committee.

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

Ms. Lee continued that she had described the photo montage project to the Mayor at a recent marketing group meeting. While he was in favor of the project, one potential barrier is the City’s sign ordinance. The Mayor’s suggestion was that an exemption be sought during the time frame of the Centennial. The marketing group agreed that instead of making the photo montage a year-long project, specific start and end dates would be assigned in order to allow for an exemption.

Wil Shriner, guest, explained that the program would show facts, trivia, and photos from Fort Lauderdale’s past 100 years. The system would project images onto buildings in all four Districts. Images could be tailored to specific neighborhoods and other areas of the City. Sponsors will be sought to offset funding, and an RFP will be issued seeking an editor to put the visual displays together.

Ms. Payne asked if the issue of possible “liability for driver distraction” had been considered. Mr. Shriner said the displays would not be visible in high-speed areas and would be “mostly at traffic lights.” Ms. Vezina added that the City’s Risk Department would vet all suggested locations.

Ms. Buchan asked if it is possible to vote “that we like the concept as long as sponsorship is found” but do not recommend implementation without funding. Vice Chair Crawford replied that if the Committee “got together the numbers we needed for fundraising,” they would be able to raise sufficient funds. Ms. Buchan disagreed, however, stating that there are different ways to raise funds for different concepts, and she felt this concept “could raise the money on its own,” as sponsors would be willing to pay to have their names associated with the various photo montages. Ms. Lee pointed out, however, that due to the sign ordinance, sponsors’ names or logos could not be included, as this would amount to advertising.

Ms. Buchan said this would mean the Committee would pay for the montage project, as they would not be able to give sponsors recognition. Ms. Gunn clarified that the sponsors' names could not be included in the montages themselves, but could be recognized "in other publications." Ms. Buchan reiterated that while she thought the project sounded like a good one, she felt it should be able to "elicit its own sponsors." She concluded she was not comfortable with the Committee "voting to have a \$25,000 photo montage."

Ms. Mergenhagen suggested that since the project would be mobile and mounted on a van, it might be possible to include advertising on the sides of the vehicle.

Jan Beth Idelman, guest, stated she was also concerned that official sponsors could not be included, and asked if it might be possible to find "a way around" the sign ordinance if sponsors' logos are not used.

Chair Shaw pointed out that the City Commission may be able to grant a variance for the project. Ms. Gunn advised, however, that the City Attorney had cautioned that the sign ordinance has been litigated twice, and was not certain that a variance could be granted. Chair Shaw stated that he was an author of the sign ordinance and the City Commission may make an exception for the Centennial if they wish. Ms. Gunn explained that she was relaying the concerns expressed by the City Attorney's Office.

Vice Chair Crawford returned to the issue of fundraising, noting that the Committee could not proceed without fundraising, and must "assume we will raise the funds." Ms. Buchan reiterated that her concern is that the project have its own specific sponsors so the Committee would not be "taking money that we generate by doing other things" to fund it. She concluded she was not in favor of trying to "raise the money elsewhere."

Ms. Lee said she felt all fundraising is "for the overall good of the Centennial," and pointed out that this project would be a way to promote the celebration to the entire City. She did not believe it should be treated differently than the advertising in local newspapers or other individual projects.

Motion made by Mr. Aurelius, seconded by Mr. Tunnage, to recommend approval to the City Commission of the portable historical photo montage lighting project, not to exceed \$25,000.

Ms. Mergenhagen proposed an **amendment** that the Committee request the City Commission approve and support a sign code variance as a critical component of this project. Mr. Aurelius felt that this would be "anticipating a problem" and the Committee should approve the concept of the project before attempting to "nail down these problems." The **amendment** died for lack of second.

Ms. Gunn added that the City Attorney was also not comfortable with limiting the project to weekends, but felt it should be “tied to specific events.” She suggested this should be brought to the City Commission’s attention as differing from what the City Attorney had offered.

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

Ms. Lee concluded that artistic approval for the Centennial banner is pending, and the “poster party” has been moved to the Museum of Art and will be funded by Nova Southeastern University.

Ms. Lee departed the meeting at this time (4:58 p.m.).

Vice Chair Crawford stated the Committee would move on to approval for capital improvement projects. She suggested that they discuss all four such projects before voting on them, as new information was available for some projects.

Ms. Buchan reported that the \$145,000 cost associated with the 17th Street Causeway Bridge includes a lighting control program that would change colors, feature holiday themes, and make the bridge a “more visible landmark.” This is intended to be a legacy project, which would last beyond the Centennial year itself.

She noted that FDOT currently pays the cost of lighting the bridge; however, they have stated they will not continue to do so if the lighting is changed. Ms. Buchan advised that there are local companies who can replace the lighting during the Centennial year, and can provide the electrical designs required by FDOT.

Ms. Payne asked if simply changing the color of the lights on the bridge has been considered. Ms. Buchan agreed this was also a possibility. Mr. Palmer and Ms. Medalie suggested that this would be a City rather than a Centennial project, similar to the beach wall lighting project.

Mr. Aurelius felt the Committee should approve the project and ask the City Commission to request a feasibility study by a City engineer. Ms. Buchan pointed out that City Staff had informed her the Committee must raise \$10,000 for such a study.

Ms. Gunn advised that she had followed up on the project, and a feasibility study would be necessary in any case, as the bridge is not owned by the City. Any changes the City could make to the bridge lighting must also be maintained by the City, which would engender costs not previously contemplated. Mr. Palmer reiterated that City engineers should deal with the electrical issues related to the project.

Motion made by Mr. Aurelius, seconded by Ms. Payne, to ask the City Commission to review the proposal to retrofit the 17th Bridge with updated lighting in honor of the Centennial, and ask the City engineer to bring a report back to them.

Chair Shaw agreed the project was a worthwhile one, but cautioned the Committee that the City Commission must be able to justify its cost during a tight budget year. He also proposed that the Engineering Department could provide advice on alternatives, including changing the color of the bulbs.

Ms. Buchan proposed an **amendment** to the **motion**, which would include the statement that the project would be “a legacy of the Centennial.”

Chair Shaw added that it would be important for the Committee to raise the funds necessary for the project; with that in mind, he pointed out that local companies were likely to offer their services if the City provided “seed money to get it started.”

The **amended motion** was restated as follows: **motion** to ask the City Commission to review the proposal to retrofit the 17th Street Bridge with updated lighting as a legacy project in honor of the Centennial, and get the City Engineer to bring back a feasibility report, together with a cost estimate. Mr. Tunnage **seconded** the **amended motion**. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Medalie moved on to the Gator Bridge project, stating that she is waiting for a response from the company that would wrap the bridge. She did not expect it would take more than a week to execute the project once all the necessary approvals have been obtained.

Mr. Aurelius suggested discussion of the item be postponed until more information is available. Ms. Gunn said she has followed up on some of the “bureaucratic steps” necessary to meet the Centennial deadline for the project, but is also awaiting further information. She noted, however, that tabling the discussion did not help the Committee prioritize its projects, and emphasized the importance of timing on larger projects such as the Gator Bridge.

Ms. Idelman said the project would be a fun way to commemorate the Centennial over a shorter time period than the 17th Street Bridge project. She pointed out that the Committee may be able to find a company that is willing to sponsor this specific project, and suggested that a motion on the project could include a reference to dedicated sponsorship.

Motion to table made by Mr. Aurelius, seconded by Mr. Palmer. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 8-3 (Ms. Buchan, Ms. Casteel, and Ms. Medalie dissenting).

The Committee moved on to the Sistrunk monument. Ms. Gunn advised that Mr. Cummings had met with an artist whose work was included in the information regarding the monument; she felt the Trailblazers may be willing to work with the artist, although she noted if the City contributes to the project it could require an open bid process. She added that the cost of the monument would depend upon the type, such as a statue or legacy wall.

Motion made by Mr. Palmer to recommend the project to the City of Fort Lauderdale.

Ms. Buchan pointed out that information is still needed regarding the project. Mr. Palmer stated his motion is intended to recommend that the City work with the Trailblazers.

Ms. Gunn explained the intent is to place a monument in Sistrunk Park or along Sistrunk Boulevard. Ms. Buchan reiterated that more information was necessary to vote on this project.

Mr. Palmer **amended** his **motion** as follows: **motion** to table it until we come back with proper information. Ms. Buchan **seconded** the **amended motion**. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 10-1 (Ms. Payne dissenting).

Vice Chair Crawford asked if tabling the project would provide sufficient time to get more information. Mr. Aurelius asked if the Committee wished to “approve it conceptually” and ask for help from the City Commission in putting the project together.

Ms. Gunn said the project is located within a CRA, which may provide a source of funding; the CRA may pay for the project if the City Commission directs them to do so.

Motion made by Mr. Aurelius to approve the project to go to the City Commission, subject to their finding a financing source. The **motion** died for lack of second.

Ms. Payne pointed out that the Committee was “cutting out” a project from a specific section of the City and asking that it find its own financing source. She suggested there may be “fundraising capability” for the project from the community, and felt the project be tabled with a request that Staff, the Trailblazers, and other interested parties provide full information on the project at the September Committee meeting.

Ms. Gunn noted that this information is not currently available to give to the City Commission, and proposed that the “full concept” be presented to the Committee at its September meeting.

Ms. Payne said it was her understanding that a sculpture is not part of the project, which would consist of “a monument with names” that recognizes individuals in the community, with room for the addition of other names in the future. Ms. Gunn agreed that full details should be available by September. Ms. Vezina clarified that items tabled at today’s meeting would hopefully be presented at the first City Commission meeting scheduled in September.

The Committee moved on to the Centennial legacy time capsule project. Mr. Palmer cited some modifications to the original proposal, stating that the concept would provide a large monument to act as a time capsule, with a statue to be donated and placed atop the monument. He explained that a donated statue would circumvent the process of sending the item out for bid and selecting an artist. He felt the Seminole Indian Tribe may be willing to provide the statue. The monument itself would be a “prefab” structure and could be provided quickly.

He estimated the cost of the monument would be \$55,000, and it would be located in a City park or on the Riverwalk, where there would be “lots of visibility.” Its size would be approximately 6 ft. by 8 ft., and 50- or 100-year time capsules would be sold to the public. The historical figure depicted by the statue would be determined by the statue’s donor.

Ms. Payne asked if there would be one monument or two. Mr. Palmer explained the project would feature “one mausoleum with two compartments.” Ms. Payne observed the primary issue for her would be whether anyone has agreed to “handle the marketing” of the time capsule project. Mr. Palmer noted while no one has addressed this, he felt it would be “a great Junior League project” if the Junior League agreed to market it, although they have not yet been approached with regard to the project.

Ms. Buchan noted that no City has had a time capsule project and failed to make money with it. She characterized the project as one that “pays for itself” and is not difficult to market to the public. Ms. Idelman agreed it would generate community excitement as well.

Motion made by Mr. Aurelius, seconded by Mr. Palmer, that this project be tabled and sent to our fundraising fact-finding committee to determine financial feasibility and location. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Other Matters of Interest

- **Communication to City Commission**

None at this time.

- **Confirm Date of Next Meeting (3:00 p.m. September 8)**

Vice Chair Crawford suggested that the Committee meet again in two to three weeks, prior to the scheduled September meeting, to collect additional information and prioritize the projects they plan to recommend to the City Commission. Ms. Gunn emphasized the need for “complete timelines and real budget costs,” as well as the need to either raise funds for some projects or eliminate them from consideration. She concluded they should “make very realistic recommendations to the Commission that are achievable and fundable.”

It was suggested that the Committee meet during the fourth week in August at 4:00 p.m., and that the fact-finding group meet again before that time.

Ms. Payne advised that she and Mr. Willey are recruiting potential speakers for the Speakers’ Bureau. Training will be offered for individuals who are interested in history and are talented speakers. She asked that any such individuals reach out to her or Mr. Willey, or members could provide contact information for these individuals.

Ms. Buchan noted that most members of the Committee are not familiar with the historian who is now working with them, and do not know “what she is going to be doing for us.” She felt it would be important for the historian to hear the Committee at work so she could provide input and get to know the various ideas under consideration. Chair Shaw agreed with this. Ms. Vezina noted that the historian is scheduled to attend the meeting in September.

There being no further business to come before the Committee at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:51 p.m.

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