

APPROVED

**City of Fort Lauderdale
Visioning Committee**

4:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 9, 2011

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

MEMBERS

		REGULAR MTGS		SPECIAL MTGS	
		Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Tim Smith, Chair	P	4	0	2	0
Stanley Eichelbaum, Vice Chair	P	3	1	0	2
Peg Buchan	P	4	0	2	0
Alan L. Gabriel	P	4	0	2	0
Desorae Giles-Smith	A	1	3	1	1
Gloria Katz	P	2	2	2	0
(by phone/off at 4:52 p.m.)					
Charles B. Ladd	P	3	1	2	0
Dan Lindblade	P	3	1	1	1
Gary T. Sieger	P	3	1	2	0
Wiley D. Thompson, III	P	3	1	2	0
Randall Vitale	P	4	0	2	0

Staff

Lee R. Feldman, City Manager
Sue Torriente, Asst. City Manager
Shannon Vezina, Staff Liaison
Chaz Adams, Public Information Office
Stephen Scott, Economic Development
Albert Carbon, Public Works
Frank Adderley, Police Chief
Greg Brewton, Planning and Zoning
Wayne Jessup, Planning and Zoning
Jenny Morejon, Planning and Zoning
Jimmy Koeth, Planning and Zoning
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.
Silvia Vargas, WRT
Chris Madsen, Mad4Marketing

Public:

Marilyn Mammano, Council of Civic Associations

Communication to City Commission

Motion by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Ms. Buchan, to ask the City Commission to provide feedback as to the role of this Committee moving forward in the visioning process with the consultant. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

I. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Tim Smith at 4:10 p.m.

1) Roll Call

(As of this date there were eleven appointed members to the Visioning Committee, which means six would constitute a quorum.) Following roll call by Ms. Vezina, it was determined a quorum was present.

2) Conference call participation

Chair Smith relayed a request from Ms. Katz to participate via conference call. **Motion** by Mr. Lindblade, seconded by Mr. Vitale, to allow Ms. Katz to participate via conference call. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

3) Approval of minutes from the June 14, 2011, meeting

Motion by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lindblade to approve the minutes of the June 14, 2011, meeting. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Vezina noted that she had made a few minor edits to the minutes, including adding the cumulative attendance record.

II. City Staff Introductions

1) Discussion by City Manager Lee R. Feldman

Chair Smith noted that the Visioning Committee has been working about 19 months, and has all the original members. He said they have consultants on staff and a name for the effort.

Chair Smith relayed that he spoke to the Council of Civic Associations and heard their misgivings about the visioning effort, mainly that it was for the downtown area. The Council asked him if they could have a seat at the table and Chair Smith told them they would have to go through the City Commission, which they did. The City Commission thought it was a good idea and the Council has chosen their representative, Marilyn Mammano, a professor at FAU and Vice-President of the Council of Civic Associations. Chair Smith believed the City Commission would take care of housekeeping at their next meeting to appoint her as a member of this Committee.

Ms. Buchan thought it was important for the entire Committee to discuss if they want to have a representative of a special interest group on the Committee. She feared that the Visioning Committee would become a special interest group rather than an umbrella

group for all interests. Chair Smith said it could be discussed later in the agenda under New Business.

Mr. Feldman commented that he is fully engaged after eight weeks on the job. He introduced Sue Torriente, who will be very involved with the visioning processes.

He continued that in the interviewing process for the position, he talked about the need for a community to have a vision, an overall direction of where the City wants to go, and strategic planning behind that visioning to help implement the vision. He added that the finished product should not be put on the shelf, and that is not the intent from the administrative level.

Mr. Feldman presented his organizational chart that is centered around five core services that the City has:

- Infrastructure
- Public places
- Neighborhood enhancement
- Business development
- Public safety

How those five core service areas work will be driven by the City's vision. Each core service area will be supported from four individuals in the Administration:

- Assistant City Manager Sue Torriente
 - Responsible for managing across the five core service areas with planning focus, capital improvement focus, operational focus
- Assistant City Manager Stanley Hawthorne
 - Responsible for supporting all departments providing services within core areas
- Performance Measurement and Process Improvement
 - Benchmarking and efficiency
- Neighborhood Support Office
 - Reaching out to and working with the community on each of the five core service areas

Mr. Feldman continued that the core services themselves will be driven by the vision, a strategic plan for each area (a three-five year outlook), and annual action plan to implement the strategic plan (definitive projects to accomplish within a timeframe). He emphasized that everything needs to be vision-oriented. He cautioned against spending time on the "agenda of the unimportant."

Mr. Feldman mentioned that the City will also be looking at integrating the City's sustainability effort with the visioning piece. He also brought up resiliency for the City as it relates to the vision.

He assured the Committee that Ms. Vezina and Mr. Adams would continue providing support for the visioning process, especially as it deals with public outreach. Additionally, the process will be integrated through all sections of the City's organization. He mentioned the importance of having Planning and Zoning and Economic Development participate in the process.

In conclusion, Mr. Feldman said that the visioning process has the full support of his office and that process will be driving the organization.

Mr. Ladd asked Mr. Feldman what he wants to accomplish career-wise in the next five years as City Manager. Mr. Feldman responded that he hopes to stay longer than five years, because he thinks there needs to be a longer perspective. Basically, he would want people to think that Fort Lauderdale is the "best of class" in whatever it does. He said he wants Fort Lauderdale to be recognized as a world-class community that other communities around the world would want to be like.

Chair Smith asked about the status of the Existing Conditions Report, and Ms. Vargas replied they are having communication with staff about that. She continued that staff is not preparing the report, she is. Staff is preparing the data book.

Mr. Gabriel was curious to know the needs of the City in terms of facilities, operational needs, and transportation in order to integrate those into a visioning plan. Mr. Feldman replied that the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) would be the place to go for that type of data. He added they will be keeping their five year and beyond "wish list," but for the following budget year, they will have a fully funded five-year CIP. The strategic planning process is where they take a look at the needs to implement the vision.

Chair Smith referred to the Mission Statement, which was printed at the bottom of the agenda. Mr. Vitale added that the Committee is process oriented, not outcome oriented. Mr. Feldman remarked that he understood the mission of the Committee, but wished to comment on the mission of a vision. The mission of a vision is to create a global framework under which the City operates. The Committee acts like a steering committee to get the City to the global framework.

Ms. Buchan expressed concern about the consultant's budget – she said it started out high and the City Commission took parts of the project out (mostly outreach) and put them into the Office of Public Information. She said there was no budget put into the Office of Public Information for those items (\$100,000), just the responsibility. Mr. Feldman said it would ultimately be up to him to ensure that what the Committee wants to do in terms of outreach is covered. Ms. Vargas noted they are still doing the website, but the PIO can handle the social networking more easily due to legal matters. She added many of those costs, such as printing, will be more cost efficient for a municipality that gets discounts.

Chair Smith asked if there was a line item in next year's budget for the balance of the visioning work, and Ms. Vezina said that the first Phase is taken care of, but Commission approval is needed to proceed with additional phases. Mr. Feldman assured Chair Smith they would be able to take care of moving forward on it.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum commented on the roles of the consultant, the Committee, and their connectivity. Ms. Vargas replied that it will be a citywide vision that will be "aspirational," but it will be grounded in some achievable reality. She added that WRT will provide the framework for identifying priorities and for making the projects happen within the framework.

Mr. Sieger wondered what would happen if the vision comes back from the City Commission completely different from what the Committee has presented. Mr. Feldman responded that initially there may be projects underway that may be in conflict with the ultimate vision. At that point, the City Commission will have to decide if they want to push forward on those projects. Farther down the road, the administration will have to be able to relate items/projects back to the vision, the annual plans and the strategic plan. If a project does not fall under the vision or strategic plan, it falls into the "unimportant" category.

Ms. Vargas expressed hope that WRT could have public forums with the administration staff and the City Commission before actually going into the neighborhoods.

Mr. Vitale was hopeful they would be embracing up-to-date technology not currently being used by the City to try to reach a large important segment of the community that is not being reached. Mr. Feldman remarked they are looking at social media venues, such as Facebook and Twitter.

[Ms. Katz left the meeting at 4:52 p.m.]

Mr. Feldman mentioned the records retention aspect of social media content. The City is also looking into Google Plus and QR codes.

Chair Smith noted that in the past they have asked for public comment at 5:00 p.m., but seeing no members of the community present, he proceeded to the next item on the agenda.

III. Project Branding

Ms. Vargas reported that the logo was put out to the public and suggestions were solicited. Ms. Vezina said that roughly 109 suggestions were received, and the top four were posted on the website for public voting. Public voting ended midnight the previous Wednesday, and according to that vote, the top title and tagline were: Fort Lauderdale - Our City, Our Vision. It was noted that there were approximately 300 votes.

Ms. Buchan submitted that this Committee decided not to put it out to the public but to go forward as professionally as possible. She remarked that the Committee spent a lot of time with a professional marketing person to come up with a logo. She reiterated that going to the public was not the will of the Committee.

Ms. Vargas responded to that by saying it was not how they had planned it either, but that is the way it worked out, and now they have the "winning" title and tagline.

Mr. Lindblade asked if this would go to the City Commission to approve what the public has voted on. Chair Smith understood that the City Commission did not approve the Committee's suggestion for the title so they devised the process for going to the public. Ms. Vezina said that staff sent a memo to the City Commission based on the feedback from this Committee from the June 14 meeting and the City Commission brought it up during Conference Reports (it was not on the Commission agenda). Mr. Feldman remarked that it was not a conference agenda item and would not be a conference agenda item on the upcoming agenda. He has already signed the memo advising the Commission of the results and unless staff hears back from them at a Commission meeting, the tag line and logo will be approved.

Ms. Buchan asked how many of the City Commissioners saw the branding and the logo before Chair Smith stood up at the Forum meeting and advised that this Committee did not select a brand, and of the ideas put on the table, none of the Committee liked them. Chair Smith said he did not know. Ms. Vezina said the memo went to the City Commission two or three days after the Committee meeting.

Ms. Buchan continued to say that Chair Smith's blog (after the Committee meeting) claimed that the Committee had not named the effort and suggested the readers call the Mayor with ideas. Chair Smith clarified it by saying that he was slated to attend the Forum the next day after the Committee meeting and instructed the Mayor that the Committee was "moving ahead." He said that he received an email from Ms. Vezina that evening saying that the Mayor does not want the branding unveiled. His main objection was that the City of Austin already had that logo. Chair Smith did not publicly unveil the logo following that. Then former Mayor Dressler started a contest the next morning and Chair Smith said his blog was about that contest.

Ms. Buchan objected to the fact that the City Commission had not even seen the Committee's advice when it was put out to the public that the Visioning Committee did not have a branding name, and that this Committee had ideas on the table but did not like any of them. She reiterated the Committee spent considerable time and effort and it was not put forth to the entire Commission. No one gave the Commission an overview of the process before the whole idea was killed. She was concerned that future ideas from the Committee may not be presented to the entire City Commission before the Mayor and Chair of this Committee appear in public and denigrate the Committee's decisions.

Chris Madsen joined the conversation, saying that she sat at the Forum and heard the joking about the taglines and slogans. She thought she was done a big injustice, both personally and professionally. She was not happy to have the statement made that the team could not come up with a creative solution.

Ms. Vargas said that Ms. Madsen feels passionately about not only her work, but being part of the City and this effort. Her team has worked under tight deadlines. Ms. Vargas relayed that she directed Ms. Madsen and her staff to try to salvage some of the work they had already done. She said that WRT thought the logo chosen by the Committee was a good one and she hoped it could be incorporated into the new product.

Ms. Madsen suggested taking the QR code and applying it to the new name and slogan.

Mr. Lindblade thought they should handle the issues that have been brought up before they try to think creatively. He thought they should straighten out how it happened and how to make sure it does not happen again. He said they cannot afford to be at odds with each other.

Mr. Thompson said the situation also came as a surprise to him. He thought an explanation would be helpful.

Mr. Vitale thought the Mayor had the prerogative to do what he did, but thought the Chair did not, as he is seen as representing the Committee. Chair Smith said there was very little he could do at the time, so he made up something lighthearted about some of the suggestions that were discarded. He apologized if he did it poorly. Chair Smith continued that he liked the logo and voted for it, and moved it ahead as far as he could. He acknowledged that the Mayor's decision hurt some feelings, but reminded the Committee that they are an advisory body to the City Commission.

Mr. Sieger expressed his surprise if the City Commission did not see the logo, but Mr. Vitale said it was presented haphazardly and the Mayor told the City Commission that he had heard from several people on the Visioning Committee that they did not like it. He wanted the Commission to go to the new process, and they all agreed.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum stated it is important to be open and honest and value people's integrity. He thought the Committee needed to make a commitment to a quality product.

Motion by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that predicated upon the concept that as the Committee moves from the planning phase into the implementation phase of a City-wide visioning process, that it would benefit from leadership who possess a strong working knowledge of social media and web technologies, a non-political platform from which to articulate and champion advisory board decisions and recommendations and who can outreach to the broadest community base without

special interest constraints, therefore she nominated Randall Vitale for Visioning Committee Chair and Allen Gabriel for Committee Vice Chair. (This motion was voted on after the motion by Mr. Gabriel.)

Mr. Ladd felt that motion was a side issue. He thought the biggest thing that needs to be addressed is the first part of their mission: coming up with a process and putting it in place. Second, is producing the vision for the next century. He said that based on the actions so far, this Committee needs input from the City Commission on what role the Committee should play in producing the vision plan. He wondered if their work was done.

Vice Chair Eichelbaum agreed with Mr. Ladd, but has seen the need for an input board to provide navigation.

Mr. Sieger did not think their job was done – the plan has not been produced. He wondered why Ms. Buchan wished to have a new chair instead of having the present chair commit to promote the Committee's ideas.

Ms. Buchan said her number one reason was that she did not think the Chair could articulate and champion the vision of this Committee. She did not agree with his approach in discussing matters with the City Commission. She thought there would be many opportunities going forward for the City Commission to disagree with decisions of the Committee, and she felt having a Chair who cannot defend their decisions would not benefit the Committee. Going forward, she does not want to be put in that position again. Mr. Sieger brought up a problem with a Committee member putting out a blog that has information inconsistent with what the Committee has stated.

Chair Smith said that this Committee is about the future of the City and it should not be focusing on him or the Mayor. He deeply believes in the effort of the Committee, but he wants the Committee to go forward and not focus on him. He tendered his resignation as Chair, but said he would continue to serve on the Committee and be a good team player.

Mr. Ladd thought there should be additional suggestions/nominations from the floor. Ms. Buchan explained her reasoning for nominating Mr. Vitale.

Mr. Gabriel did not think Mr. Smith did anything inappropriate under the circumstances. He thought a change of leadership was immaterial.

Chair Eichelbaum asked for advice and Ms. Vezina said it is not normal procedure for a committee to have a vote for a chair outside of the term end (18 months).

Mr. Sieger asked Mr. Smith to rescind his resignation, as his issue was with the blog, not with him personally.

Mr. Ladd said he would seek input from the City Commission as to what they are looking for from this Committee from now to the end of the process, and then have a meeting to address what that leadership should be based on that mission.

Ms. Vargas remarked that typically they work with a steering committee that represents the interests of the community, as it is impractical to work with all of the citizens. She thought the rules for Fort Lauderdale were different from other cities she has worked with, and cited the need to take decisions to the City Commission before moving forward.

Chair Eichelbaum remarked that the consultant needs input from the Committee. He continued there are two issues on the table: one is the mandate and one is the allocation of time.

Motion by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Ladd, to defer the vote on change of Chair and Vice Chair to the next meeting. In a roll call vote, the motion failed (2-7) as follows: Ms. Buchan, no; Chair Eichelbaum, no; Mr. Gabriel, yes; Mr. Ladd, yes; Mr. Lindblade, no; Mr. Sieger, no; Mr. Smith, no; Mr. Thompson, no; Mr. Vitale, no.

Mr. Gabriel explained that they should take the opportunity to do a Communication to the City Commission to ask for a clarification of just the question of where they should go from here and if the City Commission wishes the Committee to have an active role participating in this activity of the vision.

Mr. Thompson explained that he seconded the original motion in order to have new leadership with a different skill set for the new phase, and that it had nothing to do with Mr. Smith, personally or professionally.

The other motion, by Ms. Buchan, was voted on at this point: **Motion** by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that predicated upon the concept that as the Committee moves from the planning phase into the implementation phase of a City-wide visioning process, that the Committee would benefit from leadership who possessed a strong working knowledge of social media and web technologies, a non-political platform from which to articulate and champion advisory board decisions and recommendations and who can outreach to the broadest community base without special interest constraints, therefore she nominated Randall Vitale for Visioning Committee Chair and Allen Gabriel for Committee Vice Chair. In a roll call vote, the motion passed (8-1) as follows: Ms. Buchan, yes; Chair Eichelbaum, yes; Mr. Gabriel, yes; Mr. Ladd, yes; Mr. Lindblade, yes; Mr. Sieger, no; Mr. Smith, yes; Mr. Thompson, yes; Mr. Vitale, yes.

Motion by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Mr. Thompson, that the Committee request that the City Commission provide specifics as to role of this Committee between the commencement of work by the consultant and finalization of the Visioning Plan. This motion was deferred to go into a formal Communication to the City Commission later in the meeting.

Chair Vitale returned the discussion to the Project Branding.

Ms. Madsen showed several versions of a new brand layout. The logos incorporated a QR code. (When a person points their smartphone at the code, it takes the phone user to a website.) Ms. Vargas asked for a recommendation to take a layout to the City Commission, so that they can move forward with the website and branding. They now think the open houses will be in mid-September, as they need to prepare all the branding materials and think about the outreach that is needed.

Ms. Vargas said the logo shown on the left would be called #1, and the one on the right, called #2. In a straw vote, four people liked #1, and one liked #2. Ms. Vargas explained that the only part put out to the public was the title. There was then a voice vote, with the majority voting for #1.

It was noted that the design submitted earlier to the City Commission had the same logo, but a different title and tagline.

IV. UPDATE ON PHASE I

1) Stakeholder Interviews

Ms. Vargas remarked they are still working on the summary report, so the information at this meeting is preliminary. She said the most important thing has been the interviews, which Ms. Vezina arranged. Ms. Vargas said the interviews took place in July and early August, involving 22 group and individual interviews, and 61 people. She mentioned the comments from the interviews will not be attached to names or issues.

The interviews covered approximately 19 different areas, from community development to hospitality. Ms. Vargas said that although they had pre-selected questions, the interviews were informal, and they did not necessarily follow the pre-designed format. The interviewees were asked to look back over the last 20-30 years and note changes they have seen, and then imagine what they might like to see happen in the next few decades. The interviewees were also asked what impediments they might see to achieving those goals and what threats they perceive on the horizon. They were asked how the City could distinguish itself and become a leader in the region, and other any issues they might want to cover.

Ms. Vargas said that the most commonly mentioned topics were:

- Transportation and Mobility (came up most often)
- Community Identity Issues
- Governance/City Processes - Customer Care
- Development Permitting/Codes
- Workforce – Employment/Business Environment
- Downtown Synergies

- Intergovernmental Coordination/Cooperation
- Climate Change - Adaptation

She continued that in terms of transportation and mobility, the key issue is the integration of land use and transit. Transit is needed to support a compact land use that will allow greater efficiency and, at the same time, more compact land use is needed in order to support the desired transit. The WAVE was mentioned by all, with recognition that the project is very small. The concept of commuter rail and the FEC railroad track was extremely important – everybody referred to it as a “game changer.” Port expansion was also brought up as a key opportunity.

As far as key challenges/threats in terms of transportation and mobility, the present lack of connectivity throughout the City and lack of effective links between the neighborhoods, downtown and the beach was mentioned. The commuter rail brings up conflicts between passenger/freight train needs, train/vehicular traffic (crossings), and train/boat traffic (New River crossing). Lastly, a fear of urban density was expressed.

As far as community identity goes, identified key assets/opportunities include the changing demographics and the community reaching the end of the suburban cycle, as there are no more greenfields. The City could become a magnet for the creative class, leveraging the urban environment. There was some nostalgia about Fort Lauderdale being the “Spring Break” capital, and there was also a desire for including that in the rebranding.

Ms. Buchan suggested that the Committee members study Ms. Vargas’ information on their own time in order to save meeting time. This was agreed, and Ms. Vargas said she will provide a PDF file to Ms. Vezina to distribute to the Committee.

Ms. Vargas said that the items in red (in her handout) are ongoing or waiting on something to complete. She reiterated that her presentation is not the report, it is the beginnings of the report. The members can expect a more detailed memorandum at a later time. She continued that as they continue gathering information, they may get different opinions.

Mr. Eichelbaum asked for a timeline along with what inputs WRT wants from the Committee and what the review schedule should be. That could go back to the City Commission to help facilitate the process of the study.

Ms. Vargas commented that the interviewees were generous with their time and information and were happy to help. She said it was interesting to see the patterns of thought come up. She shared that the most difficult subject to bring to the public was the climate change and sea level rise/sustainability. She said that impacts public and private investments along the waterfront.

She said everybody interviewed was proud to be part of the City, despite complaints they might have. Many people acknowledged that the City had changed, but not necessarily for the better in terms of both the environment and the government. There was a sense the City took itself too seriously. There is a perception among residents that the City caters to the business community, and the businesses think the City puts obstacles in front of them "at every turn."

There was a discussion about the use of the core drivers in the questioning process. Mr. Sieger wondered why they created them if they were not used, and Chair Vitale said that they did not want to filter peoples' comments or steer their thoughts. Ms. Vezina said she would go over the core drivers with WRT before they do any outreach. Ms. Buchan clarified that when they picked the core drivers, they also picked 61 people who were opinion makers in those areas, so the drivers were addressed.

Chair Vitale asked Ms. Vargas if she could lay out a revised timeline from the original Phase I. Mr. Eichelbaum added it would be helpful to define what the role of the Committee will be at each meeting. Ms. Vargas said that in a typical process, the Committee and staff would review deliverables and provide feedback; the consultant would make revisions based on the feedback.

Mr. Ladd wondered how WRT would distill their information into something concrete. Ms. Vargas said they have to go back out into the community to verify the core drivers, and to conduct the Existing Conditions evaluation to compare the Vision with where the City is.

In response to a comment about the validity of the global warming theory, Ms. Vargas acknowledged there are differences of opinion about global warming, but if people have ideas on it, those cannot be ignored.

Ms. Vargas asked the Committee to email Ms. Vezina with ideas, especially for the open houses.

Ms. Buchan asked Mr. Feldman if Committee members are able to contact the consultant and have a conversation. Mr. Feldman said he does not have an issue with it, but it is incumbent upon the consultants to ensure they are not communicating any specific information between one member of the Committee and another. Additionally, Committee members need to be aware that no one member has the independent authority to direct the consultant to do any work which would parlay into compensation or to move into a direction other than what the Committee collectively has decided.

Ms. Vargas said she is open to direct communication, but suggested that Ms. Vezina be copied on such communication.

2) Next Steps: Open Houses, Website, Data Collection, etc.

Ms. Vargas said some items are pending regarding the website, such as color palette. Over the next few days, the consultants and Ms. Vezina will be brainstorming about the open houses and activities, taking a tour of the initiatives. She estimated that the open houses would occur around mid-September.

V. ****Public Comment**

None.

VI. **Other Matters of Interest**

1) **Communication to the City Commission**

Motion by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Ms. Buchan, to ask the City Commission to provide guidance on the role and activities this Committee is expected to take as to the visioning process from this point forward. Motion later restated.

Mr. Eichelbaum and Mr. Lindblade thought that was an open-ended question and they might receive a vague answer. In answer to a question by Mr. Ladd, Mr. Feldman said the matter could be taken up in a conference agenda.

Mr. Ladd said if the Committee wants details, they should ask for specific clarifications in the role the City Commission wants them to play in this process with specific questions and answers that could be provided by the City Manager, who has been in this meeting.

Chair Vitale thought the motion was clear that the City Manager had discretion to talk to the consultant if he so chooses in advance of that meeting. Mr. Feldman offered the following: confirm what the Committee believes the next role is, rather than ask what it is. He added that his understanding of what that role is, after defining the process, is to act as a steering committee to oversee that process being implemented and to provide feedback to the City Commission as the process continues. A steering committee oversees a process, it does not create a vision.

At this point, Mr. Ladd restated his motion: **Motion** by Mr. Ladd, seconded by Ms. Buchan, to ask the City Commission to provide feedback as to the role of this Committee moving forward in the visioning process with the consultant. In a voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Vitale brought up (from earlier in the meeting) the matter of the addition of a member to the Committee.

Ms. Buchan was strongly opposed to the idea of a member on the Committee who represents a special interest. She thought the City Commission initially chose people they thought could represent all of the citizens. Mr. Smith disagreed, saying that the

Committee's mission is to find the under-represented people who think the business people run the City. Their representation is important to get their buy-in to the project.

Chair Vitale was concerned that the City Commission could decide to add another member to represent another interest, such as the marine interest.

Marilyn Mammano, from the Council of Civic Organizations, introduced herself. She noted she has been a member of many advisory boards. She explained that when the City Commission was reviewing the proposal from the Committee to hire a consultant to do the visioning process, she lobbied her City Commissioner to vote for the "full shot." She felt the Committee was lucky to get the City Commission's support because she felt nobody cares about the effort. She said there needs to be buy-in from the residents/neighborhoods, and the neighborhoods feel they have not been a part of it. The Council felt it was important to ask for a seat at the table. She gave two examples of where this has worked – the Centennial Committee and the City Manager Search Committee. By having a member of the Council on the Committees, they established two-way communication. She said it would be easier for this Committee to do their job if the neighborhoods were represented at the table, than if they were just perceived as stakeholders.

Mr. Sieger commented that the vision is not about whatever any Committee member's vision is, the Committee's function is to steer the consultant so that they get to the areas and the neighborhoods and get the input they need. He said he also would be concerned if the marine industry, for example, had a seat at the table. He said the one thing the Committee did not want to do was have special interests guide where the Committee is going.

Ms. Vargas noted that typically they recommend that every constituency and interest be represented on the steering committee. But, once at the table, a person does not push their agenda – they just take the information back to their constituency.

Ms. Buchan emphasized that they will reach out to all of the special interest groups, but they do not all have to be at the table.

Motion by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to not expand this Committee with special interests, that we would retain this Committee as it exists today as a steering group. Motion later restated.

Mr. Eichelbaum stated that for consistency's sake, per the earlier motion about restructuring the skill set of this Committee, that they should defer the matter to the City Manager.

Motion by Mr. Eichelbaum, seconded by Mr. Lindblade, to defer Ms. Buchan's motion to the expertise of the City Manager to talk about the guidance that is necessary and how it should be framed going to the City Commission. In a vote by show of hands, the

motion failed (3-6) as follows: Mr. Lindblade, Mr. Eichelbaum and Mr. Thompson in favor; Vice Chair Gabriel, Ms. Buchan, Mr. Sieger, Mr. Smith, Mr. Ladd and Chair Vitale opposed.

Mr. Lindblade brought up the possibility of swapping out the team to get into the next phase. He wanted clarification on that from the City Commission.

Ms. Buchan said her motion had been reframed beyond recognition. She said she was suggesting that this Committee is working as it is and she thought it would be detrimental if the City Commission starting appointing special interest members to this Committee. Her recommendation was that the Committee should remain as it is (with the two appointees of each of the Commissioners and one at large) and not start adding special interest Committee members.

Ms. Mammano urged the Committee not to use the term "special interest" as it has an adverse affect on many members of the community. After discussion, Ms. Buchan agreed to use the term "constituency."

Ms. Buchan restated her motion as follows: **Motion** by Ms. Buchan, seconded by Mr. Thompson, to recommend to the City Commission that the advisory board as it is currently structured should remain in place with no additional constituencies added to the advisory board. In a vote by show of hands, the motion passed (5-4) as follows: Ms. Buchan, Vice Chair Gabriel, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Eichelbaum, Chair Vitale in favor; Mr. Smith, Mr. Ladd, Mr. Sieger, and Mr. Lindblade opposed.

Mr. Smith reported that before the meeting began, Mr. Bill Smart brought in a submittal for a creative idea for a vision and he wanted to recognize that it was brought in and submitted appropriately.

2) Date of next meeting

Chair Vitale said the next regularly scheduled meeting is Tuesday, September 13, 2001.

VII. Adjourn

Motion by Vice Chair Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Lindblade, to adjourn the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

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