

**APPROVED**  
**City of Fort Lauderdale**  
**Visioning Committee**  
**4:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 7, 2010**  
**Fort Lauderdale Executive Airport, 6000 NW 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue**  
**Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309**

MEMBERS		FEB 2010/DEC 2010		SPECIAL MTG	
		Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Tim Smith, Chair	P	6	0	3	0
Stanley Eichelbaum, Vice Chair	P	6	0	3	0
Peg Buchan	P	6	0	3	0
Alan L. Gabriel	P	6	0	3	0
Desorae Giles-Smith	A	5	1	1	2
Gloria Katz	P	5	1	2	1
Charles B. Ladd	A	5	1	3	0
Dan Lindblade	P	5	1	3	0
Gary T. Sieger	P	6	0	2	1
Wiley D. Thompson, III (arr. 4:24)	P	5	1	2	1
Randall Vitale	A	6	0	2	1

**Staff**

Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison  
Gerry Burrini, Public Information Office  
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communication to City Commission**

The Visioning Committee would like to encourage the City Commission to attend the final oral presentations by the visioning consultant RFP proposers on January 14, 2011.

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 4:07 p.m. by Chair Smith.

- **Roll Call**

(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.

- **Approval of Minutes from October 19 meeting**

**Motion** by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Sieger, to approve the minutes of the October 19, 2010, meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

- **Approval of Minutes from November 1 meeting**

**Motion** by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Sieger, to approve the minutes of the November 1, 2010, meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**New Business**

- **Legacy Project for the Subtropical Conference – J. Murley**

Ms. Katz introduced Mr. Murley. FAU and the University of Queensland in Australia will be putting on a conference called “Subtropical Cities” in March in downtown Fort Lauderdale. Mr. Murley is head of one of the committees involved with the conference and will explain what some of plans are for the conference.

Mr. Murley detailed his experience at FAU, noting that he has been there for 10 years, and is now at the College of Design and Social Inquiry. He is at the downtown complex, which is shared with Broward College. Mr. Murley commented he is Assistant Dean in charge of External Affairs. He said that the college wants to be available to the Committee in any way that it can.

One of the professors of Architecture, Tony **Abate**, has been the leader on the international conference and has traveled to Australia to study the similarities of cities in a tropical environment. It is a class by geographic determination. It is similar to a sister city exchange, except that it focuses more on architecture, urban planning and other professional issues.

Mr. Murley referred to a handout about the conference. He explained why they assigned the term “legacy project” to the conference, noting that it defines a project such as the one a group of architect volunteers conducted in the City of Miami for the Miami River. A large group of volunteer experts spent a week working with the Miami River Commission and left behind their ideas of what might make an enhanced river in downtown Miami.

Mr. Murley commented that the upcoming conference is much smaller than the one held in Miami, but they wanted to find a specific time at the conference where the experts can engage with the community. This would occur on March 12, and might include interviews or walk-arounds. From that activity, a “leave behind” project for the Visioning Committee and consultants would emerge.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Murley what came out of the Miami effort. Mr. Murley answered that it was a document including text and drawings. Chair Smith wondered if Fort Lauderdale’s challenges were similar to those of the Miami River, and Mr. Murley said, “Yes and no.” He said the vision for the City of Fort Lauderdale would be broader than the Miami River project.

The University and the planning committee for the Conference wish to start a dialogue to try to fashion something that would be helpful.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum said he was encouraged by the idea of a symposium of what global best practices are in areas such as architecture, crime, education and others. He hoped they could integrate the symposium with the Visioning Committee's consultant and make this a kick-off event. The session could be an idea charette versus a project charette.

Chair Smith confirmed that the time available for such an exercise would be just the one day, and Chair Marley said perhaps some of the experts could stay over if they wished.

Mr. Sieger commented they would be "crazy" to turn something like this down, and would look forward to seeing the results integrated into the City's comprehensive plan.

Ms. Buchan announced that the St. Patrick's Day parade is March 12, and they discussed that potential conflict. Mr. Murley said he would bring this to the attention of the organizing committee.

Chair Smith asked Ms. Buchan about the timeline for the actual visioning process, which they hope to start in February. She said that they will end up with a basic six-month program, the first 30 days will be the existing inventory (statistical benchmarking), and that could dovetail into the seminar. That inventory should be done by mid-March.

[Mr. Thompson joined the meeting.]

Mr. Murley commented that perhaps they could get students from the college to participate.

Ms. Katz remarked that if they have an interest, they should keep the communication lines open with Mr. Murley and Mr. Abate. When the RFP is accepted, then a few more details could be spelled out.

Mr. Gabriel expressed interest in some type of design ideas that would help people walk from one place to another without getting sunburned or wet.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum ventured that they should not get too caught up in the mandates of the conference, but expand their thinking to include all ideas for the City.

**Motion** by Ms. Katz, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, to embrace the concept and work through the details. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Murley commented that the visioning exercise could be a great way to strengthen the ties between the local campus and the City of Fort Lauderdale. He continued that

he hopes they have 200-300 people attending. They will continue working on the details and keep the Committee posted.

- **Leadership of District I (not addressed)**

### **\*\*Public Comment**

Chair Smith informed the members of the public that they would take a break at 5:00 p.m. to hear their comments.

### **Old Business**

- **Visioning Consultant RFP**

Chair Smith reported that all members of the Evaluation Committee came to their meeting with score sheets filled out. He described the score sheet process as “daunting.”

He asked Ms. Buchan to report on the four finalists. She believed they will end up with something “pretty exciting.” She reported that the cost range for the basic portion was from \$100,000 (IBI) to \$388,664 (Renaissance). ACP Visioning was \$343,131. Wallace, Robert and Todd was just over \$200,000. She said the Evaluation Committee felt they could hire any one of those for the basic portion and get a quality product.

There were a number of entries who did not make the list, as their idea of basic did not meet the Committee’s expectations. In some cases, the responders gave their pricing by hours, some by project, and some said they would come to the Committee and “figure it out.” She said it was difficult, as they could never compare apples to apples.

She commented that she thought the selection of teams was interesting, and there may be some shifting after the winning firm is chosen. The firms that made the top four had a local presence.

Some of the proposers were heavily populated by urban planners or people with government backgrounds. While the Committee did not want to disregard them, they did not have a local presence and that negatively affected their outcome. Chair Smith said a lot of the firms had done prior visioning work.

Ms. Vezina cautioned the Committee not to go into too much detail at this point. She reiterated they did select four and those are invited back on January 14. She said that there should not be any discussion which may appear to be other people not on the Evaluation Committee providing input. She thought the meeting went very well, and they were all on the same page regarding the responses they received.

Chair Smith said that even though the firms were rated, now that they are on the short list, they all “come in from scratch.”

Chair Smith announced the four firms in order of their ranking, noting that the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> firms tied for 2<sup>nd</sup> place:

- Wallace, Roberts and Todd (Philadelphia, PA)
- IBI Group (Pompano Beach, FL)
- Renaissance (Orlando, FL)
- ACP (Columbus, Ohio)

All the firms are highly experienced, with about 20 people on their teams.

Mr. Lindblade asked about the funding, and Chair Smith said he had added that subject to the bottom of the agenda, but he will address it now.

Chair Smith said the firms were told that there was no funding now, but that it was expected. He proposed a structured plan to get enough funding. He said the cheapest cost is \$100,000 and the most expensive is \$1M. He said they need a strategy to lobby the City Commissioners. One way is to couch the cost in terms of dollars per person; e.g., \$1 per person would be \$180,000.

Mr. Lindblade expressed concern that they would not be able to get the necessary funding.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum suggested inviting the City Commissioners to attend the presentations by the firms so that they can see its value. Chair Smith thought that was a good idea inasmuch as the City Commission will actually be the ones to hire them.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum contended that if the Commissioners do not hear the presentations, they will be deciding strictly on the cost. Ms. Buchan disagreed, stating she thinks they will vote on the Committee’s recommendation. She said the Committee should be prepared with a backup recommendation.

Mr. Sieger remarked that the Commissioners should attend the presentations, so they see more than dollar signs.

Chair Smith suggested each person go to the Commissioner who invited him to be on the Visioning Committee and remind him or her of the City’s plan for the future.

Ms. Katz mentioned that the whole visioning exercise came from a group of community activists, and they need to impress upon the Commissioners that it is not just a “pie in the sky” kind of thing.

She also wondered if there was a way to find matching funding or donations from businesses. Mr. Sieger thought that idea was premature, that offering matching funds

to someone might entice them to spend less. He suggested getting the dollar amount from the Commission first before getting creative.

Chair Smith shared his opinion of where the various Commissioners stand as far as funding goes. He felt they would all agree on something in the end.

Ms. Buchan declared that she does not think fundraising belongs in this Committee. She thought all they had to do was come up with a plan to take back to the Commission. She thinks that once their recommendation goes to the Commission, their work as a Committee could be over.

Mr. Lindblade read aloud the Committee purpose, and it did not mention fundraising. Ms. Buchan added that if the Commission agrees with their recommendation for a consultant who identifies how the visioning is going to be done, then the Commission agrees with the process.

Chair Smith returned to his earlier thought, asking each Committee member to visit with their appointer, making sure they are up to date with what the Committee is doing. He reiterated the value of reducing the cost to a dollar per resident. Vice Chair Eichelbaum cautioned against having a Commissioner hear two of the Committee members. It was noted that the Committee members cannot go two at a time, due to the Sunshine Law.

Mr. Gabriel remarked that he sees Commissioner Roberts on a regular basis, so he can talk to him. Ms. Katz and Mr. Gabriel did not see anything wrong with both of them speaking to Commissioner Roberts (individually).

Mr. Sieger will talk to Commissioner Rodstrom. Ms. Buchan wished to not speak to Commissioner Rogers, as she sees already him in regards to the Centennial Committee. Neither of Commissioner DuBose's appointees was present, but they thought that Ms. Giles-Smith should be the first choice, as she is his neighbor. Chair Smith asked Ms. Vezina to ask Ms. Giles-Smith first and Mr. Vitale second. Chair Smith and Vice Chair Eichelbaum will both see the Mayor.

There was a short discussion on what the content of their discussions with the Commissioners should include. Chair Smith urged the Committee members to meet with the Commissioners very soon, as the proposals are scheduled for January 14, 2011, in the 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference room, tentatively at 10:00 a.m.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum wondered if there was a way to inform the submitters that the funders (that is, the Commissioners) would be in the room for their presentations. Ms. Vezina said she could ask Procurement to advise them.

At this point, Chair Smith asked for Public Comment.

**\*\*Public Comment (moved from earlier in the agenda)**

## **Public Comment**

Mr. Chris Beck was impressed by the progress made by both the Visioning and the Evaluation Committees. He reminded the Committee of the papers he sent out on March 9, April 13 and April 20 of this year.

He thought some of those issues still come up. His chief concern is that the community has great ideas, but he has noticed that the “right” people are not being included in talks. He said they need to talk to people outside about the tourist industry. He suggested talking to experts in the U.S. economy, infrastructure, and global marketing.

Mr. Beck said they first have to look at Fort Lauderdale as a product, and he did not think the grassroots approach would have the answer to that. He also recommended looking at Fort Lauderdale as a brand.

He outlined a simple planning cycle:

- Where the City should be
- What might be done
- What can be done
- What the City wants to do
- What should be done to make it happen

Each of the target groups should be asked each of those questions.

Mr. Beck expressed concern that the visioning process is more politically driven than product driven. He reiterated that the experts have to lead the process. He encouraged the Committee to think of the future and those who have not even been born.

Ms. Katz informed Mr. Beck of the opportunity brought up by Mr. Murley regarding the experts coming to the Subtropical Cities Conference and how the Committee agreed to engage with them. Mr. Beck commented that input would be great.

Chair Smith informed Mr. Beck that one of the requirements of the RFP was that the companies are to share with the Committee the best practices of the nine core drivers.

Hearing no more comments, Chair Smith closed the public session.

## **Other Matters of Interest**

- **Date and location of next meeting**

Chair Smith wondered how many Committee members who were not on the Evaluation Committee were going to attend the oral presentations by the RFP proposers. He asked Ms. Vezina to explain to the Committee members how important the meeting will be, and encourage them to attend.

Ms. Vezina commented it was her understanding that this Committee wanted to review the recommendation from the Evaluation Committee before it went to the Commission. Ms. Buchan said they did specify that.

Ms. Buchan asked if the January 14 date for the presentations was cast in stone, and remarked that may be a bad day, as it leads up to a three-day weekend. Ms. Vezina commented it was not finalized. Ms. Vezina said she would contact Procurement and then inform the Committee of any changes.

After discussion, the Committee decided by consensus to hold their next meeting on January 25, 2011, at 4:00 p.m. At that meeting, the Evaluation Committee will meet with them and share their selection. Chair Smith added that they will ask the City Commission to agenda the item as soon as possible at the next Commission meeting. Ms. Vezina stated that it would probably be on the Commission agenda for February 15, due to agenda deadlines.

In response to a question by Chair Smith, Ms. Vezina remarked that the Committee had not officially been to District 2.

- **Communications to City Commission**

Ms. Vezina informed the Committee they have an option to officially invite the Commissioners to the presentations via a Communication to the Commission.

**Motion** by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lindblade, to send a Communication to the City Commission to officially encourage them to attend the final oral presentations by the visioning consultant RFP proposers on January 14, 2011. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

**Adjourn**

**Motion** by Ms. Katz, seconded by Mr. Sieger, to adjourn the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

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