

**APPROVED**  
**CITY OF FORT LAUDERDALE**  
**VISIONING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**4:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2010**  
**CITY HALL 100 N ANDREWS AVENUE, 8<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR,**  
**FORT LAUDERDALE, FL**

MEMBER		CUMULATIVE MAY 2010/JAN 2011	
		Present	Absent
Tim Smith, Chair	P	5	0
Stanley Eichelbaum, Vice Chair	P	5	0
Peg Buchan (arr. 4:12 p.m.)	P	5	0
Alan L. Gabriel	P	5	0
Desorae Giles-Smith	P	4	1
Gloria Katz	P	5	0
Charles B. Ladd	P	5	0
Dan Lindblade	P	5	0
Gary T. Sieger	P	5	0
Wiley D. Thompson, III	P	4	1
Randall Vitale	P	5	0

**Staff**

Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison, Public Information Office  
Gerry Burrini, Public Information Office  
Liz Davila, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**COMMUNICATIONS TO CITY COMMISSION**

A motion offered by Mr. Lindblade and seconded by Mr. Vitale, that the Visioning Committee would like staff to draft an RFP for a professional consultant to assist with the Visioning Process. The Visioning Committee drafted an RFP that they would like to provide to staff as a reference document for the RFP that staff will put together.

**Call to Order / Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 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.

Chair Smith noted an agenda change: the public comments will begin at 4:30 p.m., instead of 5:30 p.m., as the speaker could arrive only at 5:00 p.m.

**Motion** by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Vice Chair Eichelbaum to approve the minutes of the April 13, 2010, meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

**Motion** by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Sieger to approve the minutes of the April 20, 2010, meeting. Ms. Katz noted two corrections: 1) the names were mixed up on page 9 in the next to last paragraph. The minutes should read: "It was decided they should give Mr. Siemen 20 minutes to present," instead of "Mr. Ladd." 2) On the top of page 10, "Mr. Siemen has a website" should be "Mr. Steinberg has a website." In a voice vote, the **motion** to approve the minutes as amended passed unanimously.

### **Chairman's Report**

- **General Announcements**

Mr. Sieger brought up the question of how much money the City applied for in grants, and how much was received. Ms. Vezina replied that the amount received was addressed at the last meeting. There was a question regarding the number of grants applied for and they do not have the capability of tracking that going backwards. She believes there is a system now going forward.

Ms. Vezina commented that the documents she distributed were relative to the questions that had come up about revenue and expenses for the Parking Department. She extracted pages from the City Budget pertaining to the Parking Department. The question was Mr. Ladd's and he commented that these figures answered his question.

Chair Smith returned to the Chairman's Report. He asked Ms. Vezina to report on how many members were available for a second meeting in May and she replied that she had 5/yes, 1/might, 1/maybe and 1/no and did not receive responses from 4 others. Chair Smith they would discuss that later in the meeting.

Chair Smith reported that he had good meetings with the Mayor and four Commissioners and will report about that later in the meeting under the agenda item "RFP."

### **Liaison Report**

- **Follow-up from April 20 Meeting**

Ms. Vezina informed the Committee that there was a page now on the City website for the Visioning Committee. Under "What's New" on the City's home page, there is a point that says "Share Your Vision for the City of Fort Lauderdale" and that links to the page. She also set up the email address for the public to submit emails to the Committee, which is [visioning@fortlauderdale.gov](mailto:visioning@fortlauderdale.gov). Chair Smith asked if a press release could be done to get the word out to the community and Ms. Vezina responded that could be done. The Committee agreed it was a good idea.

- **Public Input**

Ms. Vezina mentioned that she did receive one email from a resident for input for the Committee and Chair Smith asked if there is a folder for them, to which she replied in the affirmative. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum asked if the emails could be routed before the meeting rather than taking up Committee time to read the emails. Chair Smith agreed that would be a good idea going forward, but since there as a little extra time, he suggested reading the one. Ms. Vezina said the email was from Shelley Skaug, who wanted to see Los Olas either closed to traffic on Friday and Saturday evenings or at least made into a one-way street. Ms. Skaug made additional comments about the difficulty walking down that area or eating in sidewalk cafes. Chair Smith said they need to keep reminding citizens that the input they are seeking is related to the process of visioning, not the visioning itself at this point.

Chair Smith announced he has a copy of the General Obligation Bond Issue for 1985, when the first visioning project occurred. He will give the copy to Ms. Vezina if anyone wants to see it.

Chair Smith brought up the RFP, noting that he has examined the RFP that Ms. Buchan had prepared and said it was a good effort. He has also obtained copies of RFPs from other cities to see how they were written. After reading those, he attempted to draft another proposal, which was a blend of the three, and he passed out copies of that to the Committee.

Mr. Ladd commented that he thought the draft should emphasize how to get input. He also brought up their mission, and said they rarely read the last line of it which says: "Produce a vision plan for the next century that will back the City Commission and policy and decision making." He reiterated that input, how they get input, and diversity are important, but is not the only purpose of the Committee. Mr. Ladd said it is not just about setting up a procedure, but is also about producing a vision. Chair Smith expressed the view that they should do the first thing first.

### **Public Comment**

Richard Mancuso commented that the intent of the Commission in the second line should read, "And organize a broad-based community focus process that produces a vision plan." He does not believe the Committee is supposed to create the plan, but rather the community creates the plan. He suggested checking with the Commission on the meaning.

GeniaEllis informed the Committee that the email address has already been distributed to all the neighborhoods in the City, and it is on the City's webpage.

Alan Tinter with the IBI Group wanted to see what is going on and requested a copy of the RFPs. Chair Smith gave him a copy of his latest effort, noting it is not the final product.

Cecilia Ward (formerly Cecilia Holland) of JC Consulting stated she was attending to observe, and she applauded the City for keeping the citizens involved.

Rikel Lann introduced himself as a friend of Mr. Dressler, who suggested he attend to see what is going on.

Chris J. Beck noted he is very concerned about the process, hoping the Committee would avoid getting into a “if we build it, they will come” exercise, and market the City for the future. He urged the Committee to look beyond the citizenry to the experts. He boiled it down to two questions:

- What business is the City in (other than short-term)?
- What does the Fort Lauderdale brand stand for?

Responding to a question from Chair Smith, he expounded that he thinks Fort Lauderdale still looks like “spring break” to others in the world.

Michael Madfis remarked that many young people in their 20s do not plan to stay here, and they do not care about the City. The City needs to figure out how to get to the youth.

### **New Business**

- **Guest Speaker: Harris M. Steinberg, FAIA, University of Pennsylvania**

Mr. Vitale noted that he had included a bio for the speaker in the Committee packets. He introduced Mr. Steinberg, Director of PennPraxis, who is an architect by training.

Mr. Steinberg informed the Committee that PennPraxis started eight years ago and is a vehicle for faculty and students of the University of Pennsylvania to do real-world projects. One of these was the Central Delaware Riverfront project.

Within 13 months, they had to come up with a vision for part of the city that was important in many ways, including socially, environmentally, and historically. There had been previous failed attempts to accomplish this goal.

He stated that his talk to the Committee will be on “The Role of the Public and the Press in the Creation of the Civic Vision.” His group was not a stakeholder in the project, but the process was about harnessing the citizen energy through transparency.

He showed a PowerPoint presentation outlining the project. Their first challenge was how to take seven miles of riverfront and think about a 21<sup>st</sup> century city within the backdrop of an area that was not planned due to economic issues. There was not only

a physical disconnect, but also a psychological and historical disconnect. There were battles going on between neighborhoods and developers for development rights that resulted in a fractured political environment.

He informed the Committee of the commerce history of the waterfront, including shipping and rail. At the time their study began, the waterfront was highly privatized and they wanted to recreate a balance between public access/good and private gain. There were gated communities and the “threat” of casino-building. There was pressure from real estate speculators along the waterfront.

Philadelphia has a strong City Council, with the Councilmembers having “Councilmatic prerogative.” Any development happening in their district has to go through their respective offices. In the Riverfront project, the respective Councilmember was looking for a planning process.

Some highlights of the process were:

- They worked with the editorial offices of two main newspapers/tabloids.
- William Penn Foundation (a local foundation) put a significant amount of money into the project (\$2M) in the beginning, and still contributes.
- Smaller foundations also contributed.
- \$3.6M went to consultants, public outreach, meetings.
- The Mayor had to sign an executive order for funding to happen.
- The process was completely citizen-driven.
- The goal was to balance expert opinions with values from citizen process to form principles to create the vision.
- All meetings were open to the public and transparent:
  - 4,000 people participated in over 200 meetings.
  - Meetings were held in different areas.
- Media was critical, with extensive coverage.
- They used an alternative media website, PlanPhilly, published by PennPraxis, so that all meetings were online:
  - The website gets 18,000 unique hits a month.
- The meetings became the “only place in town” to have discussions and be heard.
  - Lots of unrelated issues came up.
- Values and principles were critical to creation of the vision.
- They brought in “experts” from around the world to educate people:
  - Basic principles came out of deep dialogue.
- They had design charettes for 80 invited people, putting pencil to paper.
- 1500-2000 people participated within first four months (casino issue drove a lot of interest).
- Significant media response including television and press, gave the project the “civic force field” so special interests could not shut the process down.
- They gave citizens urban building guidelines to use as tools (such as block size).

- The streets became very important, as well as parkland (300 acres), to keep balance between development and public space.
- They wanted amenities to attract 21<sup>st</sup> century knowledge workers who can live anywhere to do their jobs.
- Development community initially opposed the proposed street grid as being unconstitutional.
- 1500 people showed up to see the final plan at the convention center.
- WRT was the planning arm.
- They met with the water department, board of transportation, and experts on sustainability.
- They tried to integrate the past as well as ecological design with new development.

Mr. Steinberg showed before and after pictures of the area.

Chair Smith asked about the zoning in the area, and Mr. Steinberg said it used to be primarily industrial, but is changing now.

The Mayor who was elected during this process was very supportive and interested in the project. There is now a new Waterfront Director and an advocacy group created from civic associations that were part of the process. The role of the Foundation, PennPraxis being seen as a neutral party, the press and civic engagement gave the project its civic voice. He related that the project is a template for growth.

Mr. Thompson mentioned that one of the Committee's goals is inclusion of minorities and he asked Mr. Steinberg if the minority groups were represented and if so, how did they go about getting that representation. Mr. Steinberg responded that the area cuts through a range of socio-economic ladder, but not a racial ladder. Most of the participants came because they were in close proximity or had interest in planning, and they did not have targeted outreach to specific ethnic groups.

Ms. Katz commented that the Committee is looking at a whole city, which is different that the seven-mile project described. She asked who "led the charge" of developing the seven principles by the end of four months. Mr. Steinberg replied that the project was led by his office, but the main partner in the civic engagement piece was the Penn Project for Civic Engagement, which was headed by Dr. Harris Sokoloff.

Chair Smith asked how Mr. Steinberg was selected and he answered that he was asked in a roundabout way by the Foundation. The Mayor signed the Executive Order stating that PennPraxis would be the prime consultant to the advisory group, and the Foundation could then "sign the check" to make it happen. Chair Smith asked who he answered to and he replied ultimately it was the Foundation, although there was a lot of back and forth with other individuals.

Mr. Vitale inquired how they were so successful getting media coverage. Mr. Steinberg replied he had prior media connections that he put to use.

Mr. Sieger was interested particularly with the vision of a park for downtown where economically they could not develop, and the "sunken" I-95. He stated that looking into the future required bold thinking. He questioned how the project would be implemented over the next 50-60 years, and how is the development of the plan binding. Mr. Steinberg answered that the binding contract was the integration of this plan into the City's master plan. He added, although, that interested citizens are necessary to see that it continues in perpetuity. Practical steps can be taken such as zoning, and building it into the civic "DNA." They also received funding from the Foundation to immediately start some changes that people can see. Current support from City Administration is very helpful.

Chair Smith asked if they had benchmarks or follow-up meetings. Mr. Steinberg responded that the advocacy group has the responsibility for doing that. The press also keeps scrutiny on it.

Mr. Ladd asked what the strategy is for the development of the parks. Mr. Steinberg replied that it is conceptual at this point. The goal was to get 100-foot setbacks when possible, and the new zoning calls for that. The exact strategy to acquire those is being worked out, whether it is through conservation easements or other means. The possibility of going to the federal government was discussed.

Mr. Ladd remarked that a master plan has been done for most neighborhoods in Fort Lauderdale and most areas already have consensus for ultimate build out. He wondered how a group can make the step from the details to the broader program or vision. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum commented that he was not aware that the City had plans for most neighborhoods, and it was suggested maybe it was for "some" not "most." Mr. Ladd informed Vice-Chair Eichelbaum that Wayne Jessup could provide him with the master plans. Chair Smith reported that in the 1990s, 10 neighborhoods were given \$100,000 for master plans, but there are still 40 or 50 yet to do.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum continued that his concern was the book-shelved report, and that the Philadelphia plan was urban design-oriented, where the Fort Lauderdale one is a citywide project, meaning education, public service, and education. Mr. Steinberg remarked that theirs was a physical vision intended not to be book-shelved. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum wondered if there was an economic study of the burnout possible by dramatic changes at Penn's Landing. Mr. Steinberg replied that the Simon Plan was no longer viable. There were 13 acres left out of the original 36. They did economic model studies for funding mechanisms and did not look specifically at Penn's Landing.

Chair Smith wondered if they prioritized, and Mr. Steinberg responded that they did an action plan that was for the first ten items that needed to be done in the next ten years.

The first was governance, second was zoning, third was master planning - getting the tools in place.

Chair Smith asked if they had CRAs there that helped with financing and Mr. Steinberg answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Lindblade was curious to know if there was anything he would have done differently and Mr. Steinberg said they were very fortunate to have succeeded. He built a small staff of excellent professionals and consultants, and they made mistakes, but given the charge, the climate and the conditions, he thinks they did well. There are principles and lessons one can learn, but whether or not the project can be replicated is a different matter. Mr. Lindblade felt it could be replicated, as it was organically based. He wants to make sure that the Committee learns from others' mistakes. Mr. Steinberg noted that they had 4 people working full time on their project, and that is a different scenario.

Mr. Steinberg returned to the question about going from a physical plan to the identity of the City. He recommended hiring a firm that does scenario planning, and helps a community position itself to respond to economic, social, and environmental drivers of change.

Chair Smith inquired if there had been consensus about the identity of the riverfront when the process was started and Vice-Chair Eichelbaum wondered if there is consensus now. Mr. Steinberg replied that the consensus grew out of the process, but it is not complete.

Ms. Katz discussed dealing with perhaps getting a university on board. She said that the Committee is struggling with what their first step should be and asked Mr. Steinberg what he would suggest as a first step. He said that in light of their deadlines and deliverables, he would recommend they go back and ask for more money. Bring in as many good minds as they can from the University.

Mr. Ladd commented he has heard similar tales "from the North" and the one advantage they have here in Florida, is that they do not have huge swaths of the City that are obsolete. There is dynamism in Florida opposed to cities in the Northeast that are losing population. The advantage is they can dream things and they can happen. But on the other hand, they do not have the government aggression that is common in the northeastern cities.

Mr. Steinberg remarked that he understands civic engagement to be the biggest piece of their process. Chair Smith concurred, commenting that they have not defined what the vision plan and model plan are, and part of the Committee's duty is to figure out what they are. He added they have to reach out to 130,000 people in a 33 square mile area, bring them all in and get a lot of input. Mr. Steinberg suggested that organizing the outreach is critical and to what end. Chair Smith said the Committee agrees they need a consultant to help them, but do not have the funds.

Mr. Steinberg explained that the process they used at Penn was highly intensive, small group work.

Ms. Giles-Smith informed the Committee she went to Philadelphia last year and noticed public art everywhere. She asked if art was a part of the design he worked on and was it built for the residents or tourists. Mr. Steinberg responded that public art is embedded in the vision and they have a Chief Cultural Officer who was liaison to the Delaware Waterfront Corporation during the master planning phase. He added the project was meant for the residents, and one of their principles was "Making it Real Philadelphia." Real cities do attract tourists, but it is mainly for the residents.

Chair Smith asked if he had topics for each of the 200 meetings they had or how they were arranged. Mr. Steinberg replied that they charted off the areas they had to cover in flow-chart fashion. One of the first things they did was introduce himself and his staff to the civic groups before any public meetings. So it was a campaign of sorts. The first person hired was a communications manager.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum admired the process they went through, and asked how much of his process does he think was wasted. Mr. Steinberg said he did not think it was wasted, even though it was an intense experience. It is not an off-the-shelf kind of program. The Committee has to figure out their charge, what kind of resources do they have, do not worry about the cost, and check into the universities and consultants who do scenario planning. A broad-based outreach effort is critical.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum wondered how to sell potential to the people. Mr. Steinberg commented that empty nesters and younger people are moving back into the areas of the city.

Mr. Ladd remarked that the issue becomes whether the mule is driving the cart or vice versa. The Committee has the visioning call and their first reaction is to say let's let the people decide what they want, but maybe nothing comes out of it. Mr. Steinberg replied it is something like raising children, "you present options and you edit." There has to be leadership, but also room for the civic voice. It helps to have a sense of urgency about something to get people interested in change, whether it is the threat of a casino, climate change or something else.

Mr. Vitale asked how important Mr. Steinberg thinks it is to have lots of information available to facilitate transparency and does he think the website is the best way to do that. Mr. Steinberg replied that it depends on the audience and how to reach them. He believes digital and electronic media is paramount, but there is still a market for loose-leaf binders in libraries and other places.

Chair Smith thanked Mr. Steinberg for his presentation, and announced a five-minute break.

## **Old Business**

Chair Smith acknowledged Miranda Lopez and provided her with the opportunity to speak, which she declined.

- **RFP**

Chair Smith began with his report of meetings with the Mayor and Commissioners. He can relay what they said in general terms, but in accordance with the Sunshine Laws, cannot attribute certain thoughts to specific individuals. He reported that he did reach all five of them. Overall they were all excited about the City creating a vision. Some are concerned about the process, the value that their constituents might or might not get, and where the money will come from and how much it will be.

All of them

- Want to find ways to supplement the budget, rather than the general fund
- Know there have to be professional services
- Think reaching out to the university is good (all)

Specific comments included:

- All the master plans should be brought to the table when ready to envision and all are referenced in the vision plan
- Preference for in-kind help from the community or donations, with getting money from the Commission as a last resort
- -Broward College is a great resource
- What is the end product going to be?
- Opposition to using general fund money for the effort instead of creative funding (using CRA, CDBG monies)
- Take money from NCIP and BCIP and put into visioning
- Need for an outside facilitator, shorter shopping list
- Policies and recommendations should be broad-based
- Could "go up to \$100,000"
- Very thrilled that the Committee is meeting twice a month
- Regardless of final product, there is value in the conversation
- Visioning Committee should not sell itself short, it has lots of brainpower
- Send the RFP to the local universities first to see if one of them would be the lead agency
- Concerns that usual suspects would be found and not enough effort made to benefit areas that are not usually benefited
- If would really be community-wide, would support it

The bottom line is they are all happy the Committee is moving ahead but they are concerned about the budget shortfalls. They all said the Committee would not be able

to get a big chunk of money from the City. Chair Smith concluded they are going to have to be creative raising the funds.

Mr. Lindblade wondered that since the Commission is not willing to provide more money, maybe they should postpone the project. He is not sure the Commission looks at it as seriously as the Committee does. He said he does not want to put a quote together after hearing Chair Smith's message.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum echoed Mr. Lindblade's disappointment, expressing his concern that this be a sincere effort. He mentioned that Rob Dressler and Mitch Burger have been helping him make contacts. He said that people see the visioning process as an investment, with the residual being a benefit to their own sectors. He reported that he met with Jack Pinkowski, a professor who put together the County visioning study. Mr. Pinkowski did a world-class study at Nova and is willing to participate and believes there is foundation funding they can tap. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum urged the Committee to bring Mr. Pinkowski to the next meeting. He then gave some background on Mr. Pinkowski, noting that he is unencumbered, as he has never worked for the government.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum continued that he got through to the Rand Corporation, and they were very enthusiastic about getting involved in the project and think there is foundation money for that. He is going to meet with them when the arrangements can be made. They also told him that McKenzie may be willing to do this "almost for free." He mentioned that they have been meeting with corporate leaders and explaining to them getting parts of the study. A suggestion was made that \$50,000 per firm was an acceptable contribution.

Mr. Sieger stated that he does not want this to be an on-the-shelf exercise either. He is disappointed at the City's response. He said he does not think the Committee knows how much money they really need. He suggested getting the RFP done, sending it to Rand and everybody and see what comes back. Then they can see which proposal is best and how much it is going to take, and then where they go from there.

Chair Smith agreed, but commented that he did not want the Committee to feel the City did not want to spend anything. He thinks they are willing to spend \$100,000.

Mr. Vitale agreed with Mr. Sieger that the Committee has to do its best to produce the best possible process and product and then go to the Commission and say, "this is what it is going to cost," and ask if they are on board. If not, readdress it at that point.

Mr. Ladd remarked that all of the Commissioners suggested working with the colleges and he thinks there is validity in starting there. Ask them if they can provide input and if they are interesting in participating. Rather than following the same approach with each university, Mr. Ladd suggested going through people they know first, for example, George Hanbury at Nova. He thinks it is preferable to do that before the RFP.

Chair Smith contributed that the RFP would provide a structure and answer a lot of potential questions.

Chair Smith commented that George Hanbury may be a little hesitant as he is not the President of the University at this time.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum declared that Mr. Pinkowski confirmed that Mr. Hanbury would be "online" for the whole project. He continued by saying that Rand Corporation shared with him that they have had Nova on their radar and would have interest in a discussion about working with them. He brought up the idea of what the PR value would be strategically for the community. Rand Corporation would add a lot of credibility.

Mr. Sieger commented he does not see anything wrong with sending out the RFP and simultaneously asking the universities if they have anything to bring to the table, rather than waiting for the RFPs to come back in.

There was a discussion about approaching Nova, particularly regarding their relationship with Vision Broward.

Ms. Buchan says either the City agrees with their process or lets them go. She proposed getting the RFP out, finding something that is really exciting, then going to the Commission with the cost, asking them if they are in or out.

Mr. Lindblade asked if the Committee is under any rules that govern an RFP process. In particular, he wondered if they would be "dead in the water" while they wait, or could they talk to potential bidders.

Ms. Vezina replied that it depends on the setup of an RFP how one responds to the potential bidders. There are four main criteria that go into selection of a vendor to be chosen for an RFP and the criteria can be weighted.

Mr. Gabriel told the Committee he is tired of talking and wants to get the RFP out. He proposed discussing the RFP at the next meeting and be done with it. He suggested sending the RFP to everyone at the same time and seeing what they offer.

Chair Smith clarified that the Committee can recommend a product, the City can put it "on the street," get it back in, and can send it back to the Committee for review.

Ms. Vezina shared that the Centennial Committee was very involved in the criteria going into the drafting of an RFP for a historian, and in the selection thereafter. The selection committee for the RFP included herself, one from the Procurement Department, one from Centennial Committee and one other additional staff member.

There was a discussion on who should be reviewing the RFP responses. There was general consensus that the entire Committee wants to review the RFPs. Chair Smith

concluded by saying that they have to find out if the RFP process is flexible and if they want to be the reviewing committee. Ms. Vezina noted the RFP itself would be vetted through a lot of people before it went out. Mr. Ladd offered that the "line of attack" would be to take a draft and ask the Commission to direct staff to review the format and prepare it for submittal to the public.

Chair Smith referred to "his" draft of the RFP, noting that most components are lifted from Ms. Buchan's draft, except the introduction. He added core subjects and an "educational component" of the visioning process such as a PowerPoint presentation to inform the potential bidders. Ms. Buchan noted that RFPs have to have deliverables, clear scope and evaluation criteria. Chair Smith reminded the Committee that he had asked them to come up with a list of core subjects.

**Motion** by Mr. Lindblade to send the Chair's RFP document and Ms. Buchan's RFP document through staff, legal and procurement, to have them put their mark on it and have it back to the Committee for final review. **Motion** died for lack of a second.

**Motion** by Mr. Lindblade, seconded by Mr. Vitale, to send communication to the City Commission asking the two RFP drafts be sent to staff with instructions to draft the RFP for the Committee's review. In a show of hands, the **motion** passed 7-4. In a roll call vote, the following were opposed: Mr. Gabriel, Mr. Ladd, Mr. Sieger, Chair Smith, and Mr. Thompson. (In the roll call vote, the **motion** passed 6-5.)

Discussion: Ms. Buchan asked the Committee if they would mind if she consolidated the two documents so that only one is sent to the Commission

Chair Smith suggested deciding the matter at the next meeting in two weeks, so that everyone has a chance to read his document.

Various members expressed concerns about sending multiple drafts of the RFPs.

**Motion** by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Sieger, to reconsider the motion. The **motion** passed in a roll call vote 6-5, with the following opposed: Vice-Chair Eichelbaum, Ms. Giles-Smith, Ms. Katz, Mr. Lindblade and Mr. Vitale.

Mr. Sieger spoke in favor of combining the two documents and then sending one document.

Mr. Sieger proposed the following friendly **amendment** to the original **motion**: that Ms. Buchan takes her original RFP draft and the Chair's RFP draft and combines it into one RFP draft and that RFP draft is what is sent to the Commission and staff. Mr. Lindblade accepted the amendment. In roll call vote, the **motion** passed 10-1 with the following opposed: Mr. Gabriel.

- **Confirm date of next meeting**

The next meeting will be May 26 at the Chamber of Commerce at 4:00 p.m. Ms. Vezina will inform the Chair if the RFP document has not been reviewed by then. If it has not, the May meeting will not be held, and the next Committee meeting will be in June.

**Adjourn**

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

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