

APPROVED
Visioning Committee
Greater Fort Lauderdale Chamber of Commerce
Wednesday, May 26, 2010 at 4:00 p.m.
512 NE 3rd Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

MEMBER		CUMULATIVE MAY 2010/JAN 2011	
		Present	Absent
Tim Smith, Chair	P	6	0
Stanley Eichelbaum, Vice Chair	P	6	0
Peg Buchan	P	6	0
Alan L. Gabriel	P	6	0
Desorae Giles-Smith	A	4	2
Gloria Katz (arr. 4:28 p.m.)	P	6	0
Charles B. Ladd	P	6	0
Dan Lindblade	P	6	0
Gary T. Sieger	A	5	1
Wiley D. Thompson, III	A	4	2
Randall Vitale	A	5	1

Staff

Chaz Adams, Staff Liaison, Public Information Office
Gerry Burrini, Public Information Office
Liz Davila, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Call to Order / Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 4:21 p.m. by Mr. Adams. 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 mentioned that there were two invited guests in attendance who are not on the agenda: Mr. Abbate, Chair of the Sustainability Committee, and Mr. Ropes, a board member of the DDA. They both expressed interest in working together with the Visioning Committee, and they will speak before the Chairman's Report.

Tony Abbate, Chair of the Sustainability/Green Committee, remarked that his Committee is also new and they are charged with developing a Sustainability Plan for the City. Mr. Abbate remarked that his Committee believes sustainability goes hand in hand with visioning. They are trying to set in motion processes that are citywide in terms of how the City functions as an organization, and also how the citizens learn about sustainable practices and ways of reducing energy, carbon emissions and dependency on fossil fuels in their daily routines.

The Sustainability Committee meets the last Monday of the month, and they are coordinating with the County's Sustainability group. They are preparing a draft report in June to flush out details to finalize their report by the end of September, as their Committee expires in December.

Chair Smith asked for highlights of what the report will look like in terms of recommendations and ideas, and Mr. Abbate made the following points:

- They have divided into focus areas, including:
 - Transportation
 - Waste
 - Public education and outreach
 - Quality assurance
 - Residential and commercial development practices (codes and green development)

Mr. Abbate reported that the largest carbon producer in the City other than transportation is the fuel plant, so obviously the Committee does not have control over everything. He continued that there is an advocacy function to everything they do. They will make recommendations to the City Commission to take advantage of the role of the City Manager as advocate at the State level to pursue some of the developed objectives.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum asked if the Sustainability Committee was working with the Riverwalk Trust and Mr. Abbate replied that they were not. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum explained that a very large committee has been working on a sustainability plan for that area and Mr. Abbate commented that would be a helpful resource and he will look into it.

Ms. Buchan asked how Mr. Abbate outreaches into the community. Mr. Abbate responded that they initially wanted a wiki-site, but the attorney vetoed it due to potential Sunshine Law issues. What they are doing now is breaking into sub-area groups that meet. He will submit names of anyone interested in an invitation to a group to the staff liaison.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Abbate to think ahead 25 years and try to imagine how things will be different. Mr. Abbate responded that he sees vision as value-driven. Some of those values are quality of life, organizational effectiveness, quality of service, innovations, creativity, and perceived values. He would like to see Fort Lauderdale as an innovative, creative, friendly, and ultimately, a subtropical City. He expanded on that by saying "subtropical" means more than palm trees: it is a whole lifestyle ranging from building development to cuisine. He concluded by noting that transportation is key, and development of a network of options other than car travel is important.

Mr. Lindblade remarked that they want to make sure they are training and educating, as well as leading the way. The whole community has to be connected to sustainability. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum noted that the RFP is going to be inclusive to the ongoing efforts of City planning, and he would hope the City would come forward with a list of initiatives.

Mr. Abbate suggested that his committee could share their report with the Visioning Committee and provide periodic updates with their interim report.

Chair Smith introduced John Ropes, a board member of the Downtown Development Authority. Mr. Ropes reported that they had a brief visioning meeting recently, when they compared how the City has developed compared to visions that were created in the '60s. Out of that, they discerned what the drivers are that will determine the future. A number of components are: education, the arts and sciences district and the residential area. The trend is toward reurbanization, and density is coming. They look at the downtown as a place where the infrastructure would be adequate for that density. They want an environment where people can walk, go to a drugstore, shop, recreate and come back to their residence. He hoped that the Committee would incorporate their vision for a livable, sustainable, green city.

It was noted that they need linkage between the Committees so they are all moving in the same direction.

Chair Smith asked about the riverfront, and Mr. Ropes responded they have to look at that in concert with the Riverwalk Trust. He thinks the area needs better lighting and more activities. He thinks the Urban Marketplace is a great idea, and whatever happens will be event-driven. He remarked that the process is never finished and it has to be a public/private joint venture. He also noted that he is not in favor of development at any cost, but rather, responsible and sustainable development.

Chair Smith was curious about occupancy in the area, and Mr. Ropes answered that prices are stabilizing and there is positive absorption. Mr. Ladd added that there are about 150 unsold units out of 6,000. There is an 11-month supply, and 6 months is the norm. The rental market is doing better than the "for sale" market. He does not see high-rise construction in the near future. Mr. Ladd continued that he has been thinking a lot about the assumption that the population will continue to increase based on the past. After subdivisions are built, those units get recycled into lower-income inhabitants. He does not think density is a given.

There was a discussion about population increase and density, with Mr. Ladd proposing that they cannot count on it, and Mr. Ropes saying that people will not come just because "we build it" – they will come because it is a beautiful place to work and play. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum contributed that there is a whiplash going on in big cities now due to the recession, and the expected reurbanization is not happening.

Chair Smith inquired about the WAVE and if it is stalled. Mr. Ropes reported that they had to hire a consultant, which slowed them down a bit, but it is moving along.

Chair Smith noted the downtown has come a long way since the '80s. He said the Committee would like the DDA to stay in contact.

Ms. Katz commented that through the RFP they can ensure that every advisory board with a connection would be required to participate.

Liaison Report (heard out of order)

- **Follow up from May 11 Meeting**

Mr. Adams reported that he was filling in for Ms. Vezina. There was a thank you letter sent to Harris Steinberg, who spoke at the last meeting.

Chair Smith will speak about the Communication to the City Commission.

The draft of the RFP from Procurement was emailed to the Committee members the past Friday and he has extra copies. He also has extra copies of the draft RFP that Ms. Buchan had written.

Chairman's Report

- **General Announcements**

Chair Smith announced that he had received a copy of the County's VISION 2010, which was prepared in 2000. Mr. Ladd said he would like to read and report on it.

He also announced that he is currently reading a book called "The Structure of Belonging," which was purchased by Ms. Vezina for the Committee. When he is finished, he will pass it on.

- **Trolley Tour**

Chair Smith reported that the Transportation Management Association has offered the use of a trolley for the Committee's tour on June 8th. He notified the City Commissioners about the tour, and three of the five have already reported back affirmatively. Vice-Mayor Rogers was very enthusiastic and sent a list of things he would like the Committee to see in District 4. They will meet at City Hall at 4:00 p.m. and guests are invited, as the trolley holds 40 people. The logistics are still up in the air about the route. At the halfway point, they can have dinner at the Parrot Lounge, and they should allow 45 minutes to an hour per district.

Chair Smith asked for a volunteer to lead the project, to determine the route and consult the Commissioners to identify sites they would like the Committee to visit. Mr. Adams said they could help coordinate communicating with the City Commissioners about setting up stops for the tour.

Chair Smith wondered who else they should invite. Ideas and concerns included:

- Media
- Neighborhood presidents
- Let City Commissioners invite their own people
- Senior City staff would also be good
- Let the City Manager decide who might be appropriate
- Invite Wayne Jessup, Deputy Director of the Planning & Zoning Department
- Concern that it is the wrong time for the press, as it may hinder conversation
- Fear they will overlook somebody

It was decided that the Commissioners should be invited to stay the entire tour. Chair Smith noted that Commissioner DuBose is only available from 4:00-5:00 p.m., He suggested that perhaps this could be somewhat of an abbreviated tour and perhaps at a later date they can have additional tours.

Mr. Lindblade suggested something to consider in the future would be to look at the City from the water, as it is a totally different perspective.

Chair Smith reminded the Committee that the next meeting will be the trolley tour only, meeting just before 4:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Old Business

- **RFP**

Chair Smith led the Committee in a round of applause for the work that Ms. Buchan did on putting together the combined RFP, noting it was a well-done document.

Chair Smith announced they would be viewing a video segment of the City Commission meeting when they discussed the RFP. He commented that the RFP is now back in the hands of the Committee since the City Attorney and Procurement have reviewed it.

[The Committee watched a video of the City Commission's discussion on the RFP.]

Chair Smith commented that final copy of the RFP that came back from the City was almost identical to what was submitted except for some technical items at the end of the document.

Ms. Buchan directed the Committee's attention to #6-1, under "Expectations." The document refers to "core drivers stated above," but there are no core drivers stated above on the same page.

Ms. Katz thought that the Committee was going to discuss the document, as she thinks it is not specific enough in their scope and expectations. Some things she wants to discuss are:

- Deliverables
- Scope
- Expectations

Regarding deliverables, Ms. Katz wondered if the Committee decided it wanted a policy vision, a physical vision, or a combination of the two. Chair Smith said they had talked about both, but did not make any specific decision. Ms. Katz recommended it be a combination of the two. Chair Smith listed the project deliverables:

1. The existing conditions report
2. Strategies demonstrating broad-based community involvement
3. Stakeholder data, organized by subject
4. Final product (statement) including capital projects and policy suggestions

There was a short discussion of where to put Ms. Katz' suggestion, with the end result being in the Final product. Ms. Buchan and the Committee suggested the following wording: "Community vision statements describing the City of Fort Lauderdale in the year 2035. Such specific action plan shall include: 1) setting direction, 2) providing guidance for vision implementation, 3) physical improvements of significance, and 4) government policy changes as necessary to complete the Vision."

Chair Smith mentioned that a member of NOVA was present at the meeting, Jack Pinkowski, Associate Professor of Public Administration, and NOVA has agreed to help with the project.

Mr. Lindblade remarked that he heard the City Commission directing the Committee to go through the Universities first. He urged that the Committee stay with their original direction to hire the best facilitator they can, albeit that person may come from the University. He strongly advocated having an objective RFP process. Mr. Lindblade continued that he would like to see the Visioning process be unfettered.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum said that the word "best" is the key word, and agreed with Mr. Lindblade. It is not a matter of getting University support, it is a matter of getting someone who has the capabilities and can meet the criteria to create the best end product. Chair Smith said the City has a comprehensive database and would send the RFP to 1,000 companies.

There was a discussion on who is going to get the RFP, whether or not the vendors in the City database are the best and most appropriate vendors for this type of project and who is going to decide who gets the bid. Some Committee members expressed concern that they would not be represented in the selection of the bidder.

Chair Smith reported that all of the City Commissioners he spoke with are ready to spend money, but if there is the prospect of pro bono or local resources, they would like the Committee to use them. He noted that the Committee can request that the RFP be sent to for-profit organizations as well as the Universities, and the Committee can submit a list of vendors they would like to receive the RFP.

Ms. Buchan stated for the record that she does not want to hear from NOVA at this point. She is a fan of NOVA, but NOVA has nothing to do with why the Committee is here and what they are charged with. An RFP should elicit excitement. If all the Committee wants is a facilitator, then they should tear up the RFP. She would like to hear from NOVA after they have released the RFP.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum agreed with Ms. Buchan, but is open to hearing ideas from Mr. Pinkowski about the RFP process.

Chair Smith moved the agenda to Public Input, as it was already past time for that.

- **Public Input**

Mr. Pinkowski from NOVA wished to comment that the kind of project that they have outlined in the RFP is in the \$650,000 - \$800,000 range with major consultants. Vision Broward involved 1,000 community groups in 2005-2006. NOVA substantially subsidized the Broward County Office of Economic Development Initiative to produce that consensus. He noted he was the principle person in charge of organizing, formulating, facilitating and writing that report. There was a group of 8 Executive Committee members, 50 Steering Committee Members and the product represented a "soft vision" policy.

He continued that no one locally is capable of doing everything stated in the RFP, other than possibly EDSA, who might farm out part of it. Although NOVA is not in a position to subsidize another project like this, NOVA will allow Mr. Pinkowski to work as project manager for a reasonable fee. He would be hired at whatever amount the Committee determines is reasonable to pay and would lead community groups, community input, visioning organizing and even working with architects and planners to do everything on the RFP. NOVA can put in a bid "on the cheap" but the ancillary firms will not be cheap.

Mr. Lindblade asked Mr. Pinkowski if he were managing the project, what the cost would be. Mr. Pinkowski replied that it depends on the ability to get grant funding. For example, the McArthur Foundation gave FAU roughly \$250,000-\$300,000 a few years

ago to produce a graphic document. If he (through NOVA) were the Project Manager, they would certainly try to keep the total expense under \$500,000.

In response to a question by Chair Smith, Mr. Pinkowski said they would reply to the RFP if they received one; however, they would have to be non-responsive on some items that they cannot control. Ms. Buchan noted that the RFP states that a bid has to be on the entire project.

Mr. Ladd clarified that the “physical improvements” mentioned in the RFP are not referencing drawings per se, but ideas they would like to see. He continued that he hopes to get ideas back from the community that they can rally around.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum expressed his frustration with what he sees as the Committee lowering their aspirations and going back and forth over the same things.

Chair Smith emphasized that they are not talking about ditching the RFP and going with pro bono or local resources, they are talking about whether they would embrace pro bono or local resources if they were offered.

Chris Beck spoke about going to HUD in Washington D.C., and being awarded \$.5B over a five-year period to do advertising for HUD. There was a large RFP involved, and he regarded it as a fine document. On the business side, the business needs to have a result, and the result is monetized, which is different than academic or government exercises. He maintained that the Committee has to set the framework for the community, as it “is rocket science.” He also cautioned against setting up meetings and waiting for people to come, as only a select group will show up.

Chair Smith closed the Public Input and announced a return to the discussion of the RFP.

- **RFP (continued)**

Chair Smith conducted a straw poll and determined that all Committee members were in agreement that when they were finished working on it, they would ask the City Commission to send out the RFP as broadly and quickly as possible.

Ms. Katz directed the Committee’s attention to page 15, under “Scope of Work.” She said that items 1, 2, 3 and 4 seemed general to her, and she wondered if they should make more specific suggestions. Chair Smith answered that it is the job of the experts to figure that out and tell the Committee, not the other way around. Mr. Gabriel pointed out that Item one appears to include those items.

There was a discussion about the exact content of the verbiage in that section of the RFP, with a highlight on best practices.

Chair Smith predicted that the City Commission would not like the idea of having symposia with subject matter experts. He also commented that “poor people” who are working two jobs are not going to come out to a big meeting at the Performing Arts Center to hear an expert. Ms. Buchan offered that having subject matter experts come in is very exciting, but it belongs in the second phase. The first phase is to seek the under-represented individual. Ms. Katz said that she has run charrettes in under-represented neighborhoods and it opens their eyes to things they had never before considered.

Ms. Buchan asserted that the City has not gone out to the people and asked them what they think. Ms. Katz suggested somewhere in the process that the under-represented “allow” the Committee to bring someone in, or they themselves bring in an expert. Chair Smith said they have to go to the people, as the people are not going to come to them. He said that if they go out and give a presentation outlining the City’s assets and then show them what other cities have done, it might stimulate thinking. Vice-Chair Eichelbaum expressed his support for having symposiums on different subjects using different experts, as not everyone is interested in everything.

Chair Smith returned to the topic of including best practices within the presentations. Mr. Ladd commented that he likes the idea of reproducible presentations.

Ms. Buchan brought up #6-1 on page 15, which is about the visioning process addressing core drivers. The Committee decided on the following wording: “The visioning process, which will address the core drivers and highlight state of the art practices used around the world and result in specific visions and action plans.”

Ms. Katz raised the issue of benchmarks and core drivers. She suggested listing the core drivers in #6-1 in alphabetical order, so they do not imply prioritizing. They are:

- Community identity, image and attitude
- Economic development
- Education
- Government infrastructure/transportation including funding methods
- Marine interests
- Public safety
- Quality of life neighborhoods/parks
- Tourism interest and industries

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum held that they should include a requirement for benchmarks or comparative assessments between Fort Lauderdale and other cities. It was noted that this would be expensive to carry out. Ms. Buchan commented that the RFP does ask for an existing conditions report on page 16, #9. After discussion, the following wording

was decided upon: "An existing conditions report, including benchmarking information against comparable markets/cities."

Ms. Katz wondered how the Committee would know in the future if they have achieved their goals. Ms. Buchan referred to the top of page 16, under "Scope of Work," noting that the document does ask for a recommended process for the Commission to revisit the Vision Action Plan on a scheduled basis.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum thought the consultant should explain how everything is going to be paid for. Other members of the Committee thought it was up to the City to figure out how to pay for it. After discussion, the Committee decided by consensus to ask for a "funding strategy" rather than cost-benefit analysis.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum pointed out there was some information missing on page four of the RFP, and Ms. Buchan noted it was probably boilerplate language. She and Mr. Adams will see that it is put back in.

Mr. Eichelbaum expressed concern about eligibility. He commented that the Committee ought to be specific in their criteria, and a lot of groups are not performing "out there." He proposed including expertise in the areas of meeting facilitation, urban research, economic analysis, environmental, and cultural areas. Chair Smith remarked that the more difficult the RFP is, the less response there will be. After discussion, the Committee decided to include verbiage in the eligibility section to the effect that the firm would assemble a team of principles able to address the core drivers.

Vice-Chair Eichelbaum brought up another point about the consultant group being required to monitor what other efforts the City has underway. Ms. Buchan commented that that requirement is not in the finished RFP and they had talked about a collaborative effort with existing organizations having input into existing strategies. After discussion, the Committee decided to add "study groups" to the end of the sentence in #1. She noted she changed the word "participants" in #2 to "stakeholders."

Mr. Lindblade was curious why the evaluation process on page 17 was left blank. Mr. Adams replied that Procurement was probably looking for input from the Committee. Ms. Buchan commented that in the original RFP draft, that information was on page six, and she purposely did not include percentages. After discussion, Chair Smith suggested the following weighted percentages: 30% on cost, 20% on approach, 20% on qualifications, and 10% on the other three. The Committee agreed by consensus.

There was discussion on what to do now. Chair Smith asked Mr. Adams if Ms. Buchan sends the final corrected copy to him, would he be able to send it back to all Committee members as an information item. If any say "no," then it will be brought back for discussion. If everyone agrees, then it moves forward. Mr. Adams commented it still

has to go through Legal. Mr. Lindblade recommended not rushing it through, but bringing it back when they have a full meeting.

Ms. Buchan mentioned that she did not see the timetable in the new draft, and it needs to be in there. It was suggested that they draw up a list of items and plug in the numbers later.

There was a discussion about the role of the Committee in the selection process. Mr. Adams can send details of the selection process to the Committee members via email. There was consensus amongst Committee members that they wanted representation on the Selection Committee.

Chair Smith reiterated the Committee's upcoming activities:

- Ms. Buchan and Mr. Adams will work with the changes made so far
- Trolley tour on June 8th
- Meet on the second Tuesday in July and take up the corrected RFP

New Business (none)

- **Potential Partnerships**

Other Matters of Interest

Mr. Gabriel proposed a tagline for the Committee: "We can do more...together." Chair Smith liked it and suggested they think about it.

- **Communications to City Commission (none)**
- **Confirm Date of Next Meeting (heard earlier)**

Adjournment

Hearing no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:09 p.m.