

APPROVED

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Visioning Committee**

4:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 25, 2011

**City Hall, 100 North Andrews Avenue, 8th floor, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309**

MEMBERS		FEB 2010/DEC 2010		SPECIAL MTG	
		Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Tim Smith, Chair	P	6	0	4	0
Stanley Eichelbaum, Vice Chair	P	6	0	4	0
Peg Buchan	P	6	0	4	0
Alan L. Gabriel (arr. 4:37 pm)	P	6	0	4	0
Desorae Giles-Smith	A	5	1	1	3
Gloria Katz	P	5	1	3	1
Charles B. Ladd	A	5	1	3	1
Dan Lindblade (left at 6:07 pm)	P	5	1	4	0
Gary T. Sieger	P	6	0	3	1
Wiley D. Thompson, III (left at 4:30 pm)	P	5	1	3	1
Randall Vitale	A	6	0	2	2

Staff

Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison

Gerry Burrini, Public Information Office

Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communication to City Commission

Motion by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Vice-Chair Eichelbaum, that the Visioning Committee accepts the recommendation and findings of the Evaluation Committee, recommending Wallace Roberts & Todd's moderate and comprehensive plans. However, the Visioning Committee recommends and prefers the comprehensive plan, because the comprehensive plan, for minimal additional dollars, significantly increases outreach to the citizenry, which was the goal of the City Commission. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 4:12 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.

Since Mr. Thompson had to leave early to attend another meeting, he was given time to relay his experience speaking with City Commissioner Rogers. Mr. Thompson said Commissioner Rogers was fully supportive of the Committee's mission and wishes the Committee well. Mr. Thompson added that Commissioner Rogers was non-committal regarding funding.

- **Approval of Minutes of December 7, 2010 meeting**

Ms. Buchan wondered if it was appropriate to include the comments from the public in detail in the minutes. She suggested that the minutes reflect that the floor was open to public comments and that there was public comment.

Motion by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Lindblade, to approve the minutes of the December 7, 2010, meeting, moving the public comments to an addendum. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

A lengthy discussion followed including the following views:

- This is a public meeting and the public comments should be noted.
- The public comments should be put in a separate document (an addendum).
- If the public comments are discussed, then they could request that the discussion be included in the minutes. If the comments are merely heard however, then they did not need to be included in the minutes.
- Because the Committee set a time for public comments in the agenda, they should be included in the minutes in some manner.
- The public comments are always available in the audio recordings of the Committee meetings.
- Approving the public comments as part of the minutes is not appropriate.
- The public may speak on matters that are not on the agenda.
- Perhaps someone reading the minutes quickly would mistakenly assume that a comment from the public was something proposed by the Committee.

Old Business

- **RFP evaluation committee**

Chair Smith opened discussion of the presentation by the four short-listed proposers for the RFP, commenting that he was very impressed. He asked Ms. Vezina to share the findings of the Evaluation Committee.

Ms. Vezina reported that the Evaluation Committee heard from the four top-ranked proposers on January 14, 2011. After the presentations, they went through the scoring, and IBI received the most points in the basic category. Wallace Roberts & Todd received the most points in the moderate category and the comprehensive category. The highest-ranked plan overall was the moderate plan proposed by Wallace Roberts &

Todd. The Evaluation Committee decided to vote and recommend to the Commission the moderate and the comprehensive proposal from Wallace Roberts & Todd. Ms. Vezina stated that the Committee voted unanimously to not present a recommendation for a basic plan.

In response to a question by Mr. Sieger, Ms. Vezina said that video and audio recordings were made of the presentations. Copies of the video were provided to each of the Commissioners. She offered to make copies for anyone on the Committee.

Ms. Katz recommended discussing the decision of the Evaluation Committee and vote to either support it or not. She thought the selection was very good, although she was not happy with the way they had to make the decisions (the point breakdown).

Ms. Buchan agreed with Ms. Katz's comments. She said that Vice Chair Eichelbaum had mentioned that the cost involved putting together a bound proposal like the one the proposers submitted was around \$18-28K. She was impressed that the companies put together documents such as that. Ms. Buchan wondered if the City or the Visioning Committee could send some type of "thank you" to the companies who expended the travel, time and so forth, acknowledging the top four for their extra efforts. Chair Smith said they had been advised to be cautious when talking about the top ranked firms until the Commission makes their decision.

Ms. Vezina did not foresee a problem with a letter going out, but suggested waiting until the recommendations were presented to the City Commission, so there was no perception of inappropriate behavior.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum called for clarification on what Committee members can and cannot do in terms of contact with the proposers in the interim. Chair Smith said he was advised not to have contact with the firms.

Mr. Lindblade was curious what the process would be moving forward. Chair Smith said the recommendation will be on the City Commission agenda for February 15, 2011. Ms. Vezina said that she had put together a Commission Agenda Report (CAR), which will appear on the regular meeting agenda on Tuesday, February 15, 2011.

[Mr. Thompson left the meeting at 4:30 p.m.]

Mr. Lindblade suggested that the item go first to a conference committee for briefing. Chair Smith said if they go in to the regular meeting prepared, it should be fine.

[Mr. Gabriel arrived at 4:37 p.m.]

Chair Smith recapped the meeting so far for Mr. Gabriel.

Chair Smith suggested strategizing how to help the City Commission pass the recommendation. He stated there are “budget hawks” in the public who are weary of spending and may not think this plan is worth spending on. He recommended asking supporters to attend the meeting.

Mr. Lindblade was not sure if this Committee should take an official stance, since he puts his full faith in the Evaluation Committee. He did not think the City Commission would have an issue over who was picked, but rather over the financing of the plan. He thought that is where this Committee should focus their strategizing. He noted it should be a taxpayer-footed bill.

Chair Smith said the City needs a true vision, not a “hodge podge.” He suggested explaining to the citizenry (at the Commission meeting) how this is not just another master plan, but a citywide effort. He suggested each person have a specific topic to speak about.

Ms. Buchan liked the concept, but did not think it should be the Committee making those comments. She thought they should be able to find five people in the community who are respected by the Commission, and they should make the points.

Mr. Lindblade commented that presenting the recommendation to the City Commission without getting buy-in from key stakeholders is risky. He said they should find out what the opposition is and why.

Chair Smith relayed a conversation he had with an opponent, and reported that he was able to answer the objections. He thought the Committee members would be able to handle the objections at the meeting, as they are the same objections the Committee members themselves struggled with at first. He reiterated they have to emphasize how unique this effort is. He suggested having each Committee member be prepared to explain a piece of the project in detail before the public speaks so that the bases are covered.

Mr. Lindblade hoped all four proposers were present at the City Commission meeting, so that they could answer questions if needed. Otherwise, the whole topic could be deferred or worse. Chair Smith commented they should at least invite the top contender and say it is in their best interest to be there.

There was a discussion about whether the topic should be addressed on the conference agenda or regular agenda.

Ms. Buchan pointed out that they do not have to sell the City Commission on the visioning process. She explained that their mission was to come up with a process, and they came up with the RFP, which was then approved by the City Commission. Now all that is left is for them to approve is the company that the Committee feels is most capable. She recommended having the issue on the regular agenda.

Ms. Buchan noted that the only point the approval can fail on is money. To that end, she did not think that having the Committee address the audience would be helpful.

Mr. Lindblade remarked it is not good to go into a vote without knowing the outcome. He wondered if the City Commissioners would remember that they have already approved the process, given that it has been a long time since it has been discussed.

Chair Smith said that he has spoken to Mr. Seiler and he supports the Committee. Ms. Katz spoke to Vice Mayor Rogers and he supports them also and is "ok" with the money. Mr. Sieger reported that he spoke to Commissioner Rodstrom and he thought she was on board with the visioning process. He said she was non-committal with the money, but if they show the value, he believes they can "sell" their product.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum expressed concern about marketing the funding, but not negating other projects, which need funding. Chair Smith noted that the money was not in the budget, but there is potential in the reserves. Vice Chair Eichelbaum continued that they should go with the approach that, "This is what you're going to get and this is what it will do."

Mr. Gabriel cautioned that the Committee should not expect that the materials have been read and studied and that a vote will be in their favor. He wondered if the proposing firm should be speaking or be available as they will have the answers.

Chair Smith echoed Mr. Gabriel's comments that the City Commission has so much on their plate that they will probably just have a slight knowledge of the material.

Mr. Sieger suggested talking to each Commissioner and exploring their opinions on the cost. Chair Smith thought nearly all the Commissioners have already expressed their opinions. Chair Smith thought that DuBose would need to be convinced that his constituents would be part of the process.

****Public Comment**

Chair Smith opened the floor for public comment at 5:08 p.m.

Art Seitz began his remarks by citing the resources available on the web. He mentioned that the new City Manager will be instrumental in implementing the visioning plan. He praised the "2020 Vision" for Key Biscayne. He also mentioned local resources: Edward B. Stone Associates, City of Hollywood Beach, Deerfield Beach, Doug Coleman, University of Florida, FAU, and the Art Institute.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Seitz what he would like to see the consultant do to help the City come up with a vision. Mr. Seitz responded that the City's biggest asset is the barrier island, and suggested working to enhance the Birch State Park. He said they should

get a consultant to lay out a north/south east/west grid to lay out the assets and attractions.

Mr. Sieger asked Mr. Seitz if he thought the process the Committee has done so far is worthwhile and Mr. Seitz responded affirmatively, noting that having the consultant will bring in new ideas.

Mr. Lester Zalewski, from Central Beach Alliance, declared that the main purpose of the vision is land allocation. Land is a finite resource and has to be used for whatever it is, no matter where it is. The consultant should bear in mind that land is the crucial element, whether they are considering on, below, or above the land.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Zalewski how much opportunity he had to help plan the future of the City in his 12 years here. Mr. Zalewski said he got involved with the Central Beach Alliance specifically for the purpose of helping his neighborhood with the theoretical master plan.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Zalewski if there was a need to pull all the components (beach, downtown and so forth) together and Mr. Zalewski replied affirmatively, noting that a master plan should apply to all portions of the city in the present and future acquisitions.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum doubted that the Visioning Committee's work was only about land allocation. Mr. Zalewski responded that he hoped that the consultant, as well as the Committee, would keep in mind that land is finite and cannot be replaced.

C.J. Beck stated that he had no argument with separating out the public comment from the body of the minutes, but did have an issue with limiting the amount of time available for public input since the whole project is about public input.

He cautioned the Committee that if they do not invest a significant proportion of the budget and consultancy effort behind a high caliber, globally aware "thought leadership" the City will end up with another report gathering dust.

He said leaders and boosters build a City that will attract people. The "thought leaders" (decision-makers) must buy in to the visioning process.

Chair Smith asked Mr. Beck if he thought there was hope for Fort Lauderdale to be a great city and Mr. Beck replied they have a great basis for growth, but have to have a coherent strategy for that. He said most of the money/effort has to be spent with the global thinkers, and less with "the man on the street."

Chair Smith closed the Public Comment at 5:32 p.m. and returned to the discussion of the RFP Evaluation Committee.

- **RFP evaluation committee (continued)**

Mr. Gabriel brought up the issue of inviting the other RFP applicants to the City Commission meeting. He was leery of someone trying to push a proposer other than the one selected by the Evaluation Committee, and suggested asking Wallace Roberts & Todd to the meeting, briefing them on what to expect in terms of questions.

If the Committee sunsets before their work is done, Ms. Vezina said they could prepare a resolution to extend the term of the Committee.

Ms. Katz thought a representative from the Civic Homeowners Council (who originated the visioning idea) should be invited to the City Commission meeting for support. Any other major respected groups ought to speak up also. This will help the City Commissioners feel more comfortable spending the money for the project. Mr. Lindblade said the Chamber would be represented.

Ms. Buchan did not think the City would negotiate the contract "from the dais." She added that corporations do not spend money to be good citizens, they spend money to save money. She suggested pointing out to the City Commissioners that the big corporations as well as the "man on the street" have already bought into the plan.

Mr. Gabriel noted they may not have enough time to speak to the community groups before the City Commission meeting. Ms. Katz said the business community and the homeowners are two important groups to reach. Chair Smith offered to contact Doug Sterner, President of the Council of the Neighborhoods, and explain the project to him.

There was discussion on what to recommend to the City Commission as far as hiring the proposed firm was concerned. It was discussed whether they should recommend the moderate plan or the more extensive plan.

Motion by Mr. Lindblade, seconded by Mr. Sieger, that they recommend the WRT firm at the comprehensive level as well as for the moderate plan. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lindblade thought for the additional 90,000 people they could reach, it was worth the extra money (\$403K, as opposed to \$319K).

Mr. Gabriel clarified that the reasoning behind this was that they could reach out to more citizens, dollar for dollar. Ms. Buchan said by increasing outreach, the ability to meet the Committee's mission is increased.

Motion by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Ms. Katz, that the Committee would accept an alternative if the City Commission wanted to pick a different, cheaper version, then look to the moderate plan. Motion withdrawn by Mr. Gabriel.

Ms. Buchan pointed out that the Evaluation Committee already put forth their recommendation, to go moderate or comprehensive. The Visioning Committee is recommending comprehensive.

Mr. Sieger wondered if they should make a motion to recommend the Evaluation Committee's consultant as the name, and then go back and make a second motion to recommend the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Gabriel suggested accepting the Evaluation Committee's findings, as a way of letting the City Commission know that they believe that is the best firm.

Chair Smith stated that if they recommend the more comprehensive plan, it gives the City Commission room to "come down." He added that they need to make sure they indicate approval of the moderate plan as well.

- **Communications to City Commission (taken out of order)**

Motion by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Vice-Chair Eichelbaum, that the Visioning Committee accepts the recommendation and findings of the Evaluation Committee, recommending Wallace Roberts & Todd's moderate and comprehensive plans. However, the Visioning Committee recommends and prefers the comprehensive plan, because the comprehensive plan, for minimal additional dollars, significantly increases outreach to the citizenry, which was the goal of the City Commission. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Smith suggested setting aside (by consensus) the earlier motion by Mr. Lindblade. Mr. Lindblade agreed, and there was no objection from the Committee.

Ms. Vezina asked if this was to be a Communication, and Chair Smith answered it was.

[Mr. Lindblade left the meeting at 6:07 p.m.]

Chair Smith reiterated the importance of reaching out to pivotal people before the City Commission meets.

Ms. Buchan explained her handout and mentioned that the President of Bank Atlantic offered to speak at one of the Committee's meetings regarding lessons learned during a recent volunteer effort.

Ms. Katz brought up the Legacy Committee, commenting it was proceeding with representatives from different local organizations that have information about planning and environmental issues. They may put together a book to give to the City about things the City should look at in the future. Ms. Katz hoped that the consultant would be able to use that as a resource. She said the Legacy Committee meets Friday, March

11, 2011, from 9 a.m. to noon at FAU. Chair Smith asked Ms. Vezina to send a reminder out regarding that meeting.

Mr. Sieger was curious about the relationships between the consultant, the Visioning Committee and the City Commission. Chair Smith said that early on, the Committee would be “invaluable” to the consultant. Ms. Buchan noted that in the RFP, the consultant is to be giving regular reports to the Committee.

Chair Smith expanded on the subject, reminding the members that the Visioning Committee does not sunset until December, 2011. He added that at the City Commission meeting, someone should bring up that the Visioning Committee feels that they want to stay in the middle of the effort and assist the consultant and be a sounding board/steering committee.

Mr. Sieger wanted to be sure that the Committee would still have input from the public going forward.

Chair Smith contributed that the Committee is to guide the City Commission in their policy and decision-making regarding the plan, and the Committee is here to organize and produce a plan.

Other Matters of Interest

- **Communications to City Commission (addressed earlier)**
- **Confirm date of next meeting**

The regular meeting date would be February 8, 2011, and there was a short discussion on the need to meet before the next City Commission meeting on February 15.

Chair Smith suggested meeting the second Tuesday in March, which would be March 8, 2011.

Adjourn

Hearing no further business, Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

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