

**APPROVED
CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE
VISIONING COMMITTEE MEETING
4:00 P.M., TUESDAY, APRIL 13, 2010
CITY HALL, 100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR, FORT LAUDERDALE, FL**

MEMBER		CUMULATIVE FEB 2010/JAN 2011	
		Present	Absent
Tim Smith, Chair	P	3	0
Stanley Eichelbaum, Vice Chair	P	3	0
Peg Buchan	P	3	0
Alan L. Gabriel	P	3	0
Desorae Giles-Smith	A	2	1
Gloria Katz (left at 6:20 p.m.)	P	3	0
Charles B. Ladd	P	3	0
Dan Lindblade	P	3	0
Gary T. Sieger	P	3	0
Wiley D. Thompson, III	P	2	1
Randall Vitale	P	3	0

Staff

Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison, Public Information Office
 Gerry Burrini, Staff Liaison
 Ted Lawson, Assistant City Manager of Operations
 Phil Thornburg, Director of Parks and Recreation
 Wayne Jessup, Deputy Director, Planning and Zoning
 Peter Partington, City Engineer, Public Works
 Hal Barnes, Engineering and Design Manager for Public Works
 Renee Cross, Planning and Zoning
 Liz Davila, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m. by Ms. Shannon Vezina. As of this date there were eleven appointed members to the Visioning Committee, which means six would constitute a quorum. Following a roll call it was determined that a quorum was present.

Communication to City Commission

The Visioning Committee wants to notify the City Commission they passed the following motions:

1. Create an informational webpage on the City's website which communicates the purpose of the Visioning Committee, posts the Committee's meeting dates, posts the Committee's meeting minutes and requests feedback from the community to be sent via email to visioning@fortlauderdale.gov.
2. Allow for addition of Public Comment during the meetings of the Visioning Committee, commencing 1.5 hours into the meeting, lasting for a maximum of 30 minutes and allowing a maximum of 3 minutes per individual.

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Ms. Buchan, to approve minutes of March 9, 2010, meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to send thank you letters to all speakers who presented at the March 9, 2010, meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Chair Smith asked Ms. Vezina to send the letters out under the Committee's name. He also suggested sending a copy of the minutes to Dr. Hanbury of NSU, drawing attention to the fact that Dr. Hanbury offered his assistance to the Committee. Ms. Vezina noted that she already sent thank you letters from herself to all of the outside speakers who attended at the last meeting. She will send the second letter on behalf of the whole Committee.

Chair Smith noted that Mr. Sieger had asked for tracking figures on grants and Ms. Vezina said she had some information on that. For FY 2007-2008 the City administered 22 grants for a total of \$18M. For FY 2008-2009, it was 36 grants for a total of \$22.6M. So far this year, \$5M has been granted. Ms. Vezina said she will try to get information for Mr. Sieger on how much the City had applied for versus how much was received.

Still referring to the March minutes, Chair Smith brought up a question about the percentage of the City fleet that is energy efficient. Ms. Vezina will provide a specific breakdown for the next meeting.

Chair Smith asked for a report from Mr. Vitale on his attendance at the "Making a World-Class City" seminar in Miami. Mr. Vitale reported that it was very insightful. The mayor of Charleston, former mayor of Pittsburgh and an urban planning design specialist from the University of Pennsylvania were speakers. The design specialist connected Mr. Vitale with a person who had finished a 13-year long visioning process for the Philadelphia waterfront, and that individual will be in Florida later this year and has

offered to present to the Committee. Mr. Vitale will make his written report available to the Committee.

[Mr. Vitale read the Committee mission, upon request of Chair Smith.]

III. New Business

Chair Smith commended Mr. Ted Lawson on the staff presentations at the March meeting.

Presentations on State of Fort Lauderdale: Quality of Life – Phil Thornburg, Director of Parks and Recreation

Mr. Thornburg passed out the Vision and Core Value Mission Statement for the Parks and Recreation Department. He informed the Committee that his Department created the document three years ago, using a cross-section of individuals from that Department. They use the documents daily to see how they are meeting their goals.

The Parks and Recreation Department finished their master plan for the next 5 to 10 years about 18 month ago. That process took two years, and involved lots of surveys and meetings with the public. A firm from Orlando assisted them with the process. Eleven recommendations came out of the master plan that the Department uses as their mission and vision. Some of these are:

1. Increased health and wellness facilities. This is particularly important to bring people in the urban environment to help combat obesity and other health matters. Another aspect of that is to provide more wellness programs ranging from the youth to the elderly.
2. Develop a bicycle/pedestrian master plan. The City has nice paths, but they are hard to access. Perhaps there could be a bus loop to connect the parks or there could be routes going by the parks.
3. Expand water access and nature-based programs. Not only is it important to provide access to the waters for viewing, but also for getting on them via some type of boat, such as a canoe or kayak. There is a big nature program underway at Snyder Park. Also, the plan calls for more collaborative efforts with the State and County Parks.
4. Expand at will recreation opportunities. This is becoming more prevalent as people become busier. In addition to set activities, provide drop-in recreation and wellness programs.
5. Increase programming downtown in Riverwalk areas. There is a big master plan now concerning the Riverwalk, and they are working very closely with the new CEO of Riverwalk in expanding opportunities there.

6. Enhance partnerships. Continue what they are doing with the schools, hospital districts, and state park. If the Parks and Recreation does not provide a program, they need to find out who does and get that information to the public.
7. Integrate Sustainable Practices. The Department has been trying to take the lead on that, and they are focusing on their recycling and sustainable programs.
8. Expand neighborhood and community special events. He commented that Mayor Seiler is doing a wonderful job in that respect. They want to focus on smaller community events.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Thornburg what the bigger challenge would be in the next ten years: finding funding to add parks or maintaining and operating the parks. Mr. Thornburg replied that as far as facilities go, they are fairly close to where they need to be, with the exception of two areas that are underserved in the Southeast and Northeast. As the population grows, the question will be how the public will access the parks, but the funding will also be a challenge to continued growth. Grant dollars are drying up also, making it hard to fund new programs for youth.

Mr. Ladd inquired if they have funding for Feldman Park, and Mr. Thornburg replied affirmatively. He added that the contract award for work at Feldman Park will be on the next Commission meeting agenda, and they hope to have it open by the end of the year.

Mr. Ladd broached the subject of who should be running the Huizenga Plaza, and wondered if the Parks and Recreation Department had given any thought to running it. Mr. Thornburg replied that they work with the DDA, as the DDA owns the property. He hopes that through the new Riverwalk Trust and their focus on events and revitalizing that area, and along with the study about to wrap up with the master plan, that all three entities can work more closely together on the entire Riverwalk area.

Mr. Ladd stated he is interested in hearing about experiences with the small neighborhood parks that have no real improvements except maybe a grassy area. He mentioned that he has seen cars driving on a park in Coral Ridge, and it now sits vacant, except for the occasional kids throwing balls. Mr. Thornburg responded that that park, among probably 10 or 11 others, was purchased through a bond and those are on a timetable for development as funding becomes available. It will be developed at some point, probably in a year at the most.

Mr. Ladd then asked about the cost of maintaining those grassy areas until they can be made into usable parks. Mr. Thornburg commented that in the short term those parks are being utilized for Frisbee and ball throwing, and they are trying to at least keep those parks opened up and visually attractive. In the long term, with the County's

restrictions and with the grant dollars, all the parks obtained through the County need to be developed in five years.

Mr. Ladd was curious if there would be enough money for maintenance once the parks are built. Mr. Thornburg replied that they are holding steady at this point, but with some of the other parks that will be more developed than Coral Ridge, the maintenance costs will go up.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum asked if there was any matrixing against other cities in terms of acreage per cost, labor dynamics and so forth. Mr. Thornburg responded there were four or five other cities they compared to which were on the water and had comparable operations, and he can obtain that information for the Committee.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum also wondered if they had ever used zero-basing the budgeting to build what is necessary to create the activity and Mr. Thornburg replied that would be a City policy budgeting decision.

Beyond traditional sports, Vice-Chair Eichelbaum was curious what kinds of activities are being done to attract youth to the parks. Mr. Thornburg commented that they do a lot through the schools, especially when the parks are next to schools. They also hire a lot of teachers for after-school programs and summer camps. If kids are hanging out in the park, the park staff approaches them and invites them to join a program.

Mr. Sieger wanted to know if acquiring park land is tied to the comprehensive plan in a ratio of some sort. Mr. Thornburg replied that there is a ratio of "3 acres per thousand" that is used, but they are probably using close to 4. Mr. Sieger wondered if that counted golf courses, beach, and school areas, and Mr. Thornburg responded that he is counting what his Department has control over, which would include the beach, but not the golf courses. Chair Smith asked how many beach acres are maintained by the Department and Mr. Thornburg replied that he will send that information back to the Committee.

Mr. Ladd asked if the impact fee that was passed four years ago on residential development has had any meaningful impact money-wise for the Department. Mr. Thornburg answered that there is close to \$1M now in that fund now, and probably \$600,000 - \$700,000 of that is new money. That will go towards developing the new parks they have acquired. None of it can be used for maintenance or reconstruction, but it can be used for acquisition.

Presentations on State of Fort Lauderdale: Quality of Life, NCIP and BCIP Programs – Hal Barnes, Engineering Design Manager, Public Works

Mr. Barnes informed the Committee that to improve the quality of life in the neighborhoods, the Commission created two matching grant programs: NCIP, Neighborhood Capital Improvement Program and BCIP, Business Capital Improvement Program. The Commission allocated \$450,000 annually to NCIP, with the maximum grant amount being \$35,000 per association per neighborhood. With the BCIP, \$90,000 is allocated annually and the maximum grant amount is \$22,500. The matching portion of these grants can be provided by in-kind, cash, sweat equity, Saturday events, or federal funds.

The purpose of the grants is for improving safety and security, traffic, neighborhood identification, and aesthetics. Some projects that have been done already are sidewalks, neighborhood identification signs, gate houses, decorative street lighting and signposts, traffic circles and median islands. At any given time, they probably have 40-50 projects underway. They award 15-20 neighborhood projects a year based on funding levels, and up to 4 business grants per year. This past year they had 19 NCIP applications and 13 were awarded. They had two BCIP applications and both were awarded.

[He brought a summary of the program and made guideline books available that can be picked up.]

Mr. Ladd confirmed that the money comes from the Commission and asked Mr. Barnes if he had more money, what he would do with it. Mr. Barnes replied that from the neighborhood perspective, they could award every application.

Chair Smith asked if the BCIP was less competitive, and Mr. Barnes remarked it is normally, but for the 2011 cycle, they are offering several avenues for businesses to expand their applications which will make BCIP more competitive.

Mr. Barnes informed the Committee that when the projects come in, there are two ways they can handle them. One option is to turn it over completely to the City, who would do all the design, permitting and construction. For neighborhoods that opt for NCIP-GP, the City is then a funding source and the neighborhoods handle the design right through bidding and bringing in their own contractors. Some neighborhoods decide to go that route if staff is busy.

The biggest BCIP project so far has been Sunrise Lane, over \$400,000, even though the grants did not come all at one time. From the NCIP standpoint, it is hard to say what the biggest project is because they often combine projects with other neighborhoods or with a BCIP project.

Mr. Vitale questioned where the rest of the money goes if they only awarded two BCIP grants in the past cycle. Mr. Barnes said they try to award four grants, but if they cannot, the money sits in reserve accounts until it is either used for maintenance or earmarked for other sources.

Ms. Buchan commented that she does not see a lot in the Northwest area and wondered what type of outreach NCIP does in that area. Mr. Barnes replied that half of the applications come from the Northwest area, because they can do CBDG funding as their match. The other half is mostly from the Eastern and Southern neighborhoods that have to match with cash or sweat equity.

Infrastructure and Transportation - Peter Partington, City Engineer, Public Works

Mr. Partington noted he would be speaking about major issues with infrastructure as follows:

- **Transportation Concurrency.** Transportation facilities are to be in place concurrent with development. At this point, concurrency is met by development by paying transit impact fees, which go to the County who uses them to expand and support public transportation in the County and City.
- **Gas Tax.** Revenues from gas tax are declining, as well as construction bids.
- **Highway Improvements.** Fort Lauderdale is fairly much built out, so the scope for doing significant new highway improvements is severely limited. The one still on the drawing board is the Northwest 7th Avenue/ 9th Avenue connector, and is currently under the microscope to see if the cost can be reduced. Priorities are greenways, shed use, pedestrian, cyclists and pathways. One project is a bike path on A1A and the first phase of that will be done as part a Department of Transportation project. The second one is Flagler Drive and others are in the planning stage.
- **ADA program.** Bringing facilities into compliance with the ADA is ongoing.
- **Electricity (FPL).** The City just renewed the franchise with FPL for 30 years. Undergrounding of overhead lines is a big project. There is a second hearing of a related ordinance the first week of May for neighborhoods to have that done, although they will have to pay for it.
- **Aging infrastructure.** The City has over 50 bridges, some of which are over 50 years of age, and have great maintenance needs.
- **Waterworks program.** It is a \$500M program, and \$400M worth of work has been done for sewers and expansion to water treatment plants.
- **Storm water master plan.** This was presented to the Commission several months ago and the Commission asked the consultants to do a rate study to look at how different levels of service with respect to storm water would affect water rates.

- Water treatment and supply. The availability of raw water will be an issue in the future.

Mr. Gabriel asked about the supply of natural gas and Mr. Partington said he could find a contact for him from Teco. Mr. Gabriel also asked if the City is required to change the sewer discharge that is going out into the ocean. Mr. Partington replied he is not sure of this answer. Chair Smith commented that they do “deep well injection.”

Mr. Ladd wanted to know how much revenue the parking division raises annually, and where the money is spent and Mr. Lawson said he could give him that information. Mr. Ladd mentioned that he brought it up because there were big investments made in parking garages in the City and it is a lot of land both at the beach and downtown that could generate a lot of revenue. Mr. Lawson reported they have just hired a consultant and if the Board can wait, he can get more current information. Chair Smith added that it is an enterprise fund and the money generated has to be spent on parking related matters.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum remarked that the Committee is Visioning, and somewhat capital based. Infrastructure is usually the negator of vision. He wondered if there is anything that will subject the City to a lot of fiscal concern. Mr. Partington remarked that the aging infrastructure is the major capital need, and is being projected forward in allocations. He does not see it as catastrophic, but rather as an increasing need, which is brought to the Commission at regular intervals.

In response to a question from Chair Smith, Mr. Partington remarked that bridges are probably at the top of the list. Even though the vast majority of bridges belong to the City, the Department of Transportation has traditionally funded repair and replacement. If the gas tax downward trend continues at the State level, it could be a threat. The DOT inspects the bridges at regular intervals and prioritizes their repair accordingly.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the City has aging buildings needing renovation. Mr. Partington remarked the City has a Facilities Maintenance Division that includes buildings, and the needs are known and plugged into the Capital Improvement Program. He remarked that the replacement of the Police Department building is discussed at every cycle of the Capital Improvement Program.

Mr. Vitale asked what would be the useful life of a bridge and Mr. Partington answered that it depends on how well it has been maintained, with 70 years being the maximum useful life.

Mr. Lindblade asked Mr. Partington to comment in general about the future of water. He responded that the major issue is going to be where to get raw water. To a lesser

extent, there will be financial demands for treatment of the deeper aquifer, and an increased need to treat waste water. Mr. Lawson added that the City is looking into some pilot money for desalinization. Also, the City is looking at the C51 Reservoir Project in shunting how water is captured.

Mr. Ladd mentioned he has been involved with many projects and has observed many projects that have been supplied privately, and he wonders if any individual or body has the overall perspective to oversee rebuilding of the infrastructure. Mr. Partington remarked that he will outline the process and let Mr. Ladd draw his own conclusions. The process is the preparation of the City's Capital Improvement Program: all departments bring their needs to that process each year, which then go through a prioritization process according to available funding. Ultimately, it is brought to the Commission.

Mr. Ladd emphasized that this is a huge issue and wonders how to go about building a better city. There were comments that some Departments can stop a master plan from being implemented. Chair Smith said that each Department has its own Master Plan, but there is no City Master Plan, and he believes the Committee has a say in that. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum noted that the Committee will be more about the grand view, but also about the operating budget.

Mr. Partington noted that for the 20 years he has been here, the City has been fairly successful in their infrastructure projects.

Infrastructure and Transportation – Wayne Jessup, Deputy Director, Planning and Zoning

Mr. Jessup introduced his topic, transportation. He noted a paradigm shift in Broward County and even statewide, focusing on transit instead of vehicles. The City adopted a Downtown Master Plan in 2003 identifying the need for transit within the downtown area. DDA took up the mandate and proceeded to develop the Wave, which will be operational by 2012. In addition, the MPO and State Department of Transportation have started looking at state of the art ways of moving people in southern Florida.

A number of programs underway that involve Fort Lauderdale are:

- Identification of major east/west corridors connecting the western reaches of Broward County into Fort Lauderdale and then out towards the airport.
 - One is Central Broward East/West Corridor, which will be light rail or rapid bus.
 - A stretch along the same corridor from 441 down to US1 as a short-range model for rapid transit within three years that will connect with the Wave.

- An east-west rapid transit bus from Sawgrass down Oakland Park Boulevard to Federal Highway, touching the boundaries of Fort Lauderdale a few places on the East.
- Florida Department of Transportation is looking at the feasibility of putting a commuter on FEC and the anticipated opening is 2020. This would have four stations, one near 13th or Sunrise, one in the Sistrunk area, one at the intersection of Broward Boulevard, and one at 17th Street. This could also interface with the Wave.

Mr. Jessup commented that the future of Fort Lauderdale will be very different when these transportation changes are implemented.

[Vice-Chair Eichelbaum left the room at 5:17 p.m.]

Ms. Katz wondered if Florida gets the funds to make those changes happen, if there would be many opportunities for TODs along that railway. Mr. Jessup responded that they have been looking at where those planned stations would be. He noted that the downtown area is already a TOD; it is an RAC with mixed-use development. Two RACs intersect near Sistrunk and it is already designated, so that has potential. Around 13th Street, they may have to look at changes in land use and zoning. The other location is probably near the hospital, and how they might interface with the residential areas surrounding it. Mr. Jessup commented that it all seems reasonable and they would have to do public outreach to see what the communities think.

Mr. Ladd was curious if there were any areas left in the City that are deficient and do not have a master plan.

[Vice-Chair Eichelbaum re-entered the room at 5:20 p.m.]

Mr. Jessup said that the major areas all have master plans, but there may be residential areas in flex zoning which may be looked at in a different light than they are traditionally looked at. In response to a question, Mr. Jessup affirmed that Northwest has a master plan. Cypress Creek does not have a specific plan, but it may relate to the TOD kind of concept. He said all the corridors are subject to looking at in that light because they are turning more urban residential areas that have to integrate into a more diverse kind of use. Eventually they will find some models that will work for that type of redevelopment.

Mr. Ladd commented that they are lined with strip retail, and Mr. Jessup remarked that the transit plans will help develop those areas. Those major intersections can become more walkable urban centers integrating greenways, where traditionally they were linear corridors.

Ms. Katz contributed that the NPO has already been working with cities on those nodes where they are already making plans for the corridors with parks, ways to modernize and create economic development. Mr. Ladd added that those will be huge opportunities for the City in the next 20 years, and the Planning Department has the best grasp of all the Departments on what has to be done.

Chair Smith reminded the Committee that there are lots of master plans in the City. He wondered how important the beach master plan is in terms of the “big picture.” If all citizens disagree on points of that plan, he was curious if the residents’ plan would take precedence, or the city-wide master plan. He asked that to be put on the agenda for next meeting.

Mr. Jessup spoke about the New River Public Ground Plan, on the River from 7th Avenue to Stranahan House. The framework is done and now they are looking at the public ground, the Riverwalk, parks, and connections from adjoining streets. He invited the Committee to attend a Public Workshop that evening at New River Trading Post at 6:30 p.m. where they will present concepts and get public input.

Visioning Process was next on the Agenda, but Chair Smith moved up the item on VisionFortLauderdale.com.

VisionFortLauderdale.com – Action Item

Chair Smith reported that he has secured the domain name visionfortlauderdale.com, so that nobody else gets it first. Hopefully this will provide an avenue for the public to have a way to communicate with the Committee. They will need the Commission’s blessing, a web design, a point person, and monitoring of communication on the site. His suggestion is to ask the City Commission to let that domain go live after the site is created. People are already sending emails to him and to Ms. Vezina with ideas and feedback.

Mr. Vitale suggested also reserving visionfortlauderdale.org and visionfortlauderdale.gov. They would point to the same site.

Mr. Sieger believed that was a good idea, but he proposed the major concern ought to be the process, how everyone in the City can participate. He wanted to go back to the RFP which would include the internet-based process as well as neighborhood processes. He suggested talking about getting a consultant to start delivering some answers for them. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum agreed with Mr. Sieger.

Mr. Ladd commented he has been through processes like this and you end up with a workshop. It will take time to do an RFP, solicit a consultant, consultant will have biases, and he does not see harm in getting the website up to get some ideas.

Ms. Vezina offered the availability of the City website, as it is free of charge and available to the Committee "tomorrow." She stated she could get a visioning page up with an email address if they just want to get the ball rolling.

Ms. Buchan stated she thinks the RFP is the way to go. She is concerned about opening up a floodgate of public viewership before the Committee has identified the process they are going use to disseminate that information.

Chair Smith pointed out someone would have to monitor the ideas, and suggesting just banking them for the time being.

Mr. Thompson agreed that the process is the most important issue at this time, and perhaps Ms. Vezina's solution was an efficient one. Ms. Vezina clarified that people would not be able to post content on the page, but they can send an email. Ms. Vezina can post information on the page, but not a blog.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum suggested a study group or fact-finding group on how to handle the communication at the same time of following Ms. Vezina's suggestion of an interim step. Chair Smith commented that some people think that is the purview of the consultant to be hired. Mr. Ladd and Mr. Vitale remarked that would like to see Ms. Vezina's suggestion followed as an interim step, while Ms. Katz thought the Committee was jumping the gun, as the Committee does not yet know their own issues. Mr. Lindblade commented that he likes the idea of having a facilitator help the Committee through the process and does not want to piece meal it through. He mentioned he has had members of the public calling him at his office to give comments and suggested those types of inputs could be forwarded to Ms. Vezina. Mr. Gabriel contributed they should at least facilitate input and capture their comments, and suggested having a presence on the City web page.

Ms. Vezina can set up an email for the committee and it could be included as correspondence in the meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Vitale, to create an informational webpage on the City's website which communicates the purpose of the Visioning Committee, posts the Committee's meeting dates, posts the Committee's meeting minutes and requests feedback from the community to be sent via email to visioning@fortlauderdale.gov. In a vote by show of hands, the **motion** passed 6-4, with Mr. Thompson, Mr. Lindblade, Ms. Buchan and Ms. Katz dissenting.

Chair Smith brought up the matter of having a public comment time in the meeting. After a short discussion, the following motion was made.

Motion made by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to allow for addition of Public Comment during the meetings of the Visioning Committee, commencing 1.5 hours into the meeting, lasting for a maximum of 30 minutes and allowing a maximum of 3 minutes per individual. In a vote by show of hands, the **motion** passed 7-3 with Mr. Gabriel and Ms. Katz dissenting.

Chair Smith asked members of the audience to stand and introduce themselves. They were: Miranda Lopez from the Northwest area; C. J. Beck, 14-year City resident; Steve Glassman, City resident since 1994; Mr. Houser, Professor of English at Broward College; Gina Ellis, City activist from the beach area; Richard Mancuso, City resident since 1983; Alan L. Tinter, Senior Traffic Engineer with the IBI group; Marilyn Mammano, President of Fort Lauderdale Civic Association; Bruce Wigo, President of International Swimming Hall of Fame; Gerry Burrini, Administrative Assistant for Public Information Department.

Visioning Process – SAVE (not discussed)

Visioning Process - Visioning Efforts in Other Cities/American Speaks

Chair Smith reported on America Speaks, a company that holds Citizen Congresses, which are weekends with invited stakeholders. He said that when he called the company, they said they would send two people down to spend time with the Committee for \$1,000. When he asked about what they charge for the weekend events, he was informed that the last one they did for 1,000 people was \$120,000.

He researched what the American Assembly charged in 1995 for a one-day event, with 300 people, and it was \$27,420, including donations and \$14,695 paid by the City.

[A short video by America Speaks was shown.]

[There was a 5-minute break.]

Chair Smith reminded the Committee that there had been a recommendation to meet twice a month, with the next meeting to fall on Tuesday, April 20, 2010, at 4:00 p.m. Since the regular meeting room would not be available on that day, Chair Smith had asked Ms. Vezina to check on the availability of the Beach Dockmaster's Office, and it is available. The meeting will be held there.

Visioning Process – RFP (not mentioned)

Visioning Process – Structuring

Chair Smith turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Eichelbaum for a presentation.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum explained that he had begun talking about a process at the last meeting and since then has spoken to several people, contacted many cities and redevelopment agencies for information.

One of Vice-Chair Eichelbaum's big concerns is that there are so many projects that are book shelved, and the Mayor informed him that "virtually no money" is available right now. He believes Fort Lauderdale is much different than many cities and should be attacking economic opportunity right now. Research firms are refusing to take on projects now due to the economy. He asserted that the challenge is how to do something meaningful, get funding to the opportunity, and get buy-in from the true change agents. Most importantly, he wondered how the Committee can get more input from the community.

Highlights of his presentation follow below.

Direction of the Visioning Committee:

- The Committee has a diverse group with high intellect.
- Committee has been struggling with purpose and aspirations.
- Met with Rob Dressler about Sunshine Laws.
- Met with Jack Seiler and George Hanbury and had great sessions.
- Met with Mitch Berber on funding issues
- Overall, encountered enthusiasm for the project but concern for funding.

Problems with visioning right now:

- No studies are being undertaken across the country.
- No primary research available in current market conditions. Cities are in trouble with infrastructure funding depletion.
- Must guard against nitpicking of governance.
- Sunshine Laws relegate the Committee to monitors of the process, not doers. Have to structure something to allow the Committee to accumulate the information, refine it and apply it to the City.
- Must contract actual work out at a high price for meaningful study.
- Is the Committee doing big things or making a roadmap for the future? He thinks they are doing both.

The potential:

- Visioning is usually about achieving quality of life. Fort Lauderdale has it, but just need to figure out how to pay for it.
- The planning industry is down and cities are using machetes instead of scalpels to cut projects. Conventions and seminars are not happening.
- The country needs a bell weather study to understand what cities need to do.
- Fort Lauderdale can be proactive right now. It has the stability, good industry, university structure, airline structure, diverse work force, plus an attachment to Latin America.
- Get the best practices on the table, figure out where the City is headed, inform the communities, and then select and refine.
- Do a master study of this community that is economics based, societally based, and infrastructure based. Get businesses to invest in the study.

[Gloria Katz left the meeting at 6:20 PM]

Suggested process:

- America needs another “hot market” for tourism. Fort Lauderdale is on the brink of that. Fort Lauderdale is also on the brink of a hot market for commerce and great education.
- He has talked to airline executives who are willing to invest in research.
- Brookings Institute, Rand Corporation, and McKenzie are the best organizations for doing urban studies. Rand Corporation did one for St. Louis. Fort Lauderdale cannot do the study on its own, and should approach one of those three companies.
- Second choice would be to go to a major university that has academic prowess to deal with it. Mr. Hanbury said his university would not have the objectivity to do it.
- Third choice would be a more local college.
- The company doing the study would present their hierarchy and recommendations for community evaluation, additions, and refinements to community input groups. Then the community groups would come in with targeted information.
- There will still be major fundraising efforts.
 - Break up the committee into special interest / professional interest, and each person becomes a gatekeeper to that area to bring the donors to the table.
- With consideration of where Fort Lauderdale is today, the study would talk about what industries the City should be cultivating. The funders would get sub reports for segments such as boating, tourism, and education for their contribution.
- We should be the aggressor in recruiting industries.

The types of issues coming out of the process:

- Creating a non-season economy
- Strengthening the downtown
- Best downtowns for perpetuity are academic-based
- Health
- The Arts
- Activities infrastructure and services needed to keep commerce
- Facilitate immigration populations into the work force
- Benefits of diversity

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum asked the Committee to think about where the City wants to be in 2020 and where is the target, what is the potential. The good news is that he thinks there is great potential. The bad news is that Mr. Hanbury shared with him that a recently completed Broward County Visioning Study that NOVA did was book shelved. Mr. Hanbury wondered how a study can be done for the City when the County use is 70% of the population using all the resources.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum concluded with this: "We have a jewel that I've not seen any place else. We are far better than the infrastructure I saw when I went to many major cities." He read a quote to inspire the Committee to look at the big picture: "A politician looks forward only to the next election. A salesman looks forward to the next generation."

Mr. Ladd commented that the best part of Vice-Chair Eichelbaum's presentation was the screen saying that Miami has caught up with Fort Lauderdale culturally. He thinks there are two issues that need answering. The first relates to Ms. Buchan's RFP which he thinks is great, except that it does not tell the person to be hired what questions they ask. That has to be figured out. The outreach is great and should be started now. Secondly, Vice-Chair Eichelbaum has suggested having a study done. Mr. Ladd wondered if the Committee would be asking all the citizens to read and sign off on it. He wants something with teeth and something that is simple to deal with.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum commented that the base study is done to determine the ten or so hierarchical issues. The study would provide the best practices with the realities of the economics. When they go into a session with the community, they can point out the shortcomings based on the realities. He asserted it would allow the community to operate from a maximum base of information, rather than a person raising his hand saying, "I want my potholes fixed."

Ms. Buchan applauded Vice-Chair Eichelbaum's enthusiasm. Without a lot more thinking, she was doubtful she could approach Brookings and ask them to assess the City before reaching into the City itself and using the talent already there. She took exception with Mr. Hanbury saying that Vision Broward was shelved, noting that it

brought the community together in a county-wide effort. A lot of wonderful things came out of that, but everything does come to a point where even a great study gets put on the shelf because what has been set out to do has been accomplished. She said a lot of information has already been collected and she would feel badly if the Committee ignored the information.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum responded that he missed a point. The good news was that the cost factor comes way down by providing that information (from local talent) to the research group. He believes getting neutrality and global information is beneficial.

Chair Smith commented that the Vice-Chair's presentation was a tremendous effort, but he sees it as a top-down proposal, missing the mark of what the City Commission thinks the Committee should be doing. He prefers to get out in the community and let things bubble up to the top. He continued to say, however, that he likes the idea of seeing someone come in from the outside and tell them how their marine industry is off base and how they could grow and prosper more, but that seems more like an economic development study to improve the bones of the City. The Committee needs to look for a broad vision that spans the entire 33 square miles of the City, bringing in all the neighborhoods and commercial nodes, rather than tailoring and targeting the major industries and downtown/beach areas. Those do have to be discussed, but they cannot leave out the 80% of the citizens who do not frequent or live in those areas.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum said that he respects Chair Smith's comments and thinks he is right on target. He remarked that he does respect the neighborhood issues and that a well-done project does get to those areas.

Mr. Ladd remarked that he does not think there is consensus as a group regarding what the end product is going to be. It would make sense for each member to write a paragraph or so on what they think the end product is going to be, and send it to Ms. Vezina so they can try to reach consensus at the next meeting. The end product should be described, not the specific solutions.

There followed a short discussion on whether or not the Committee was supposed to be putting together a process or an end product.

Mr. Vitale suggested they should think of how they are going to define themselves as a successful committee when they look back. No matter what form it takes, the group has to come up with some kind of output or goal.

After a short discussion, Chair Smith instructed the Committee members to come to the next meeting with a description of what a vision plan is and an outline of questions that

Visioning Committee
April 13, 2010
Page 18

each member would ask the citizenry. That way perhaps the Committee can come to a conclusion on what the vision is.

Chair Smith reminded the Committee that the next meeting would be held at the Beach Dockmaster's office on April 20, 2010, at 4:00 p.m.

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

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