

**APPROVED**  
**City of Fort Lauderdale**  
**Visioning Committee**  
**4:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 8, 2011**  
**City Hall, 100 North Andrews Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> floor,**  
**Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301**

MEMBERS		FEB 2011/DEC 2011			
		REGULAR MTGS		SPECIAL MTGS	
		Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Randall Vitale, Chair	P	7	0	2	0
Alan L. Gabriel, Vice Chair	A	6	1	2	0
Peg Buchan (left at 5:05)	P	7	0	2	0
Stanley Eichelbaum	P	6	1	0	2
Desorae Giles-Smith (by phone)	P	2	5	1	1
Gloria Katz	A	3	4	2	0
Charles B. Ladd	A	4	3	2	0
Dan Lindblade	A	4	3	1	1
Gary T. Sieger	P	5	2	2	0
Tim Smith	P	6	1	2	0
Wiley D. Thompson, III	A	3	4	2	0

**Staff**

Sue Torriente, Assistant City Manager  
 Adrienne Ehle, Department of Sustainable Development  
 D'Wayne Spence, City Attorney Office  
 Shannon Vezina, Public Information Office  
 Jimmy Koeth, Staff Liaison  
 Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**IT WAS NOTED THAT THERE WAS NO QUORUM PRESENT FOR THIS MEETING.**

**Communications to City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Randall Vitale at 4:10 p.m.

**a. 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. Hartmann, it was determined there was no quorum.

**b. Conference call participation**

This item was not addressed due to lack of quorum.

**c. Approval of October 11, 2011, meeting minutes**

This item was not addressed due to lack of quorum.

**II. Wallace Roberts & Todd**

**a. Additional Stakeholder interview additions update**

Mr. Fernsler mentioned that WRT is willing to conduct additional stakeholder interviews, but he said that they were only authorized to do the Mobilization Phase (which was supposed to last one month). That phase was to include one meeting with the Visioning Committee, but they have done four or five meetings. One task was to start collecting input from representative stakeholder groups and community opinion leaders to prepare an initial scan of the issues. They were budgeted for three days of interviews, and have done three and a half days so far.

He noted that he has a listing of all the suggestions from the Committee members, and said the lists go “well beyond” the intent of the initial interviews with community leaders. He acknowledged they need to have outreach with the “snowbirds” and other groups such as the Haitians, which is what the “meetings in a box” were supposed to do – go out into the neighborhoods instead of bringing them to another location for interviews.

Mr. Fernsler continued that he has presented a proposal to Administration on how they can continue doing additional interviews at this time without asking for more money. They proposed having two more full days of interviews, and coming to additional Visioning Committee meetings without compensation in return for a minor modification in the scope of work in Phase 2.

Mr. Eichelbaum inquired about the modification, and Mr. Fernsler replied that there are two tasks which would be modified:

- Media briefings will be eliminated to announce the dates and exercises for community forums.
- The first two in the proposed four week-long community forums in various areas will be combined.

The first forum was to review the Existing Conditions Report (which is not ready), and the second was actual “blue sky” visioning going out to different neighborhoods. The first hour and a half would be reviewing the facts, and the second would be citizen facilitation. From that, they could write a vision statement from a factual point of view including the key areas of concern and aspirations of the community. The next one would deal with concepts for strategic directions for the City in the broad categories. The final one in the series of Community forums would occur once they have a prioritized to-do list of strategies and actions and cost.

Assuming they get a direction to proceed along those lines, Mr. Fernsler said they need to come up with a manageable list of specific targets for interviews. He noted they could do “meetings in a box” with the groups provided, such as the Rotary club, Haitian groups and so forth.

Mr. Smith expressed disappointment that the consultant seemed more focused on compensation or on spending additional time, rather than assuring the Committee that they would move ahead. Mr. Fernsler responded that WRT does want to go out and finish the interviews, but noted they have a contract and are “way over budget.” He reiterated that they were open to the Committee doing the work (interviews).

Mr. Smith brought up that when he mapped the emergent trends, they all seemed to converge on a very small circle in the center of the City. He said that all of the interviewees that he suggested and the Committee agreed upon were not interviewed by the consultant. Mr. Fernsler responded that the Committee provided the Public Information Office with a list of stakeholders, and said that Ms. Vezina contacted every person on the list. Those who showed up were interviewed. Mr. Smith asserted that the project had missed a lot of people, and he thought they should make corrections as they go. Mr. Fernsler emphasized they have not been authorized to do community outreach.

Mr. Fernsler also pointed out that a lot of effort was extended in the Committee’s discussion of branding and the logo, but they thought it would be wise to involve the Committee in that discussion even though it was not mandatory. He reminded the Board that before the contract was executed, the scope of the effort was considerably limited after final negotiations.

Mr. Sieger commented that when he thought of “initial stakeholders,” he thought of people like major industries and educators, etc., and not individual residents. He said there is not much a person can do if they are invited but do not show up. Mr. Sieger also remarked that the visioning process meetings would be the time to go into the neighborhoods such as the Galt Ocean Mile. He said the Committee needs to look at it as a business contract, and what has been accomplished to date.

Mr. Smith clarified that the stakeholder groups on the list suggested by him were not his suggestions, but were the names the Committee had voted on. Mr. Sieger recapped that the number suggested at the outset for interviews was about 30-40, and the

Committee provided significantly more than that. He concluded that he is happy with what the consultant has done, and said the Committee needs to monitor after the City Commission approves more funding.

Mr. Eichelbaum said he finds the process to be frustrating. He requested further clarification on the Committee's role in the process from the consultant and the City. He said that should include documents that the Committee must read before each meeting, and notice of what will be voted on. Secondly, Mr. Eichelbaum wanted to know from the consultant who would be involved at each stage of the process, and how "wide" the consultant's team is.

As a result of speaking to people around the City, Mr. Eichelbaum said he has heard the single biggest issue was, "Our kids don't want to live here after they graduate." He thought the college/youth group was missed the first time around.

Mr. Fernsler clarified that they remain enthusiastic about the project, but share the Committee's frustration. He stated that they have not yet been authorized to do the visioning process, and that would enable them to mount their team. He said Mad 4 Marketing had two tasks: develop the theme and the logo, and provide a public outreach plan. PlaceMatters was charged with creating the website, and they have done that. Mr. Fernsler reiterated they are willing to do outreach and interview key opinion leaders who were, for some reason, omitted the first time.

Ms. Torriente reported that she met with the City Manager and came up with a plan for the next few months. The City Commission accepted the Communication from this Committee and they agreed to extend the dates of the Visioning Committee. Staff will be working on the resolution regarding that, and that should go before the City Commission in December. She hoped there would be an opportunity to redefine the Committee's role at that time. Ms. Torriente continued that she will be meeting with the consultant the next day to talk about Phase I, and tweak the scope to do the additional interviews. They also want to discuss the scope, the cost, phasing, timing, and expectations for Phases 2, 3, and 4 in order to "find the right amount of money" and then go to the City Commission with that item in December. She added that the Committee Chair has been invited to the meeting on the next day.

Ms. Buchan asked about the role of Mad 4 Marketing, and Mr. Fernsler said they will be helping to orchestrate all the community forums.

Mr. Smith returned to the discussion of the interviews and wanted to know who was on the list for the additional interviews. He reiterated that the following were not interviewed: representatives from the Haitian community, the Minority Empowerment group, the faith community, former elected officials and City Managers, K-12 community, State officials living in the City, County Commissioners who represent the City, South Andrews community, Hispanic/Latin Chamber of Commerce, and the Greater Realty Association.

Mr. Sieger asked for the list of who staff contacted, and Ms. Vezina said she can provide a list of all people called and what their responses were. Mr. Koeth said the list was emailed out. Chair Vitale pointed out that Mr. Fernsler and Ms. Vargas did not set up the meetings. He said any future meetings will be set up by staff and WRT will simply "show up" at the designated time and place to conduct them.

Mr. Smith claimed that what happened is that staff called certain people, who then passed the word along to others in their community who were excited about the project and those people came to City Hall for interviews and filled up the slots. He cited eight people from the Marine industry and 14 from the downtown community who were interviewed. He emphasized he is not blaming anyone for this, but said that the end result was that they did not get the leadership citywide. He said he cannot be in favor of the project unless it is citywide.

Mr. Fernsler reiterated they are open to having Committee members do the interviews. However, he did not think the most effective means to reaching out to certain communities is to pick one person to come to City Hall for half an hour. He felt the "meetings in a box" would be a better approach for that purpose.

Ms. Buchan suggested that the consultant tell the Committee what to do next, rather than the other way around. Mr. Fernsler then said they propose to come up with a succinct list of opinion leaders and representatives of key organizations that were missed. He clarified that he was referring to formal representatives of groups, not a whole community per se. He said that process would culminate in a report called the "Preliminary Stakeholder Identification." He suggested a list of 30 individuals/small groups would cover the additional stakeholder interviews.

Ms. Giles-Smith mentioned that only one or two people from her list were contacted, and her list was separate from the list that Ms. Vezina used. She stated they should try to be representative of the entire City of Fort Lauderdale, not just downtown. She asserted that there are opinion leaders in every community and they should be part of the process.

Mr. Fernsler commented that the next step should be to determine a way to come up with the final list of additional stakeholders. Ms. Vezina thought specific people need to be identified, not a group. Mr. Fernsler also cautioned against picking a person within a neighborhood group at random since that person may not speak for the group. Ms. Torriente suggested a specific person be recommended, then called and informed that he/she is on the list, and be asked to be ready to respond to Ms. Vezina's call.

Mr. Fernsler said they will do as many half-hours with individuals/small groups interviews as they can in two days or "whatever it turns out to be."

Mr. Smith suggested starting off with the ten from Ms. Giles-Smith's scaled down list and then fill the list up to 30.

Ms. Giles-Smith wondered if some people could just fill out a survey instead of coming in for an interview. Mr. Fernsler said it could be done, but it would not be a "scientific survey." Ms. Giles-Smith was concerned that people would be left out because they would not have time to go to an interview. Ms. Buchan suggested people who want to be opinion leaders have to make the time for an interview. Mr. Fernsler then proposed contacting all the individuals on Ms. Giles-Smith's list and see what kind of response there is. If they cannot make interviews, they will devise another plan. Mr. Smith suggested a timeframe for the interviews that was outside of the traditional 9-5 time slot. Furthermore, he suggested if they still cannot make the interview, to get their feedback in writing.

[Ms. Buchan left the meeting at 5:05 p.m.]

Mr. Fernsler said that if they cannot make it to a meeting, he could conduct the interview over the telephone. He also asked that staff send an email to Committee members specifically requesting phone numbers for the stakeholders.

Mr. Smith detailed how he went through the minutes and compiled a list of who had been suggested, who had been contacted and not contacted.

Mr. Fernsler asked Ms. Vezina to send a copy of her most recent list (who she contacted and who she could not contact) to the Committee. He also said it is more effective to have a small group talking about a similar topic than it is to do one-by-one interviews.

A discussion ensued involving the various lists and what names were on them. Mr. Eichelbaum suggested that Mr. Smith group his list and submit that list with the others mentioned. Chair Vitale recapped that whoever submitted names should make an effort to go through their list and submit names as a group, if a group makes sense, and send the list back to Ms. Vezina. The Committee members agreed to do that.

### **b. Communications and Public Engagement Strategy**

Mr. Fernsler referred to a draft version of a preliminary Engagement and Outreach Plan received from Mad 4 Marketing. He said it identifies basic principles and types of events.

He highlighted the principles:

- All events are open to all
- Not every type of outreach technique is appropriate for all groups
- Same exercise will be modeled on the website as well as "meetings in a box" and social media

- Engage community, not only talking to consultant but talking to each other
- Transparency (individual quotes will not be used if provocative), but information will be publicly available
- Once get started between consultant and staff and Committee, ensure everyone has the same set of key messages
- What is visioning about? – promote sense of community identity and pride, enhancing quality of life, retaining and attracting new businesses and employers, economic growth, and needs of tourism industry.

He directed the Committee's attention to a matrix of specific elements of engagement, noting he will need to work on that before the next meeting to get specific deliverables and dates.

Mr. Eichelbaum asked about the media plan. Mr. Fernsler responded that the plan must be in advance of the media briefing, adding that Mad 4 Marketing will be in charge of that.

### **c. Draft Preliminary Issue Identification Report**

Regarding the draft Preliminary Issues Report, he referred to a preliminary report presented earlier by Ms. Vargas. He thought all the broad themes were covered. There will be a final report issued after the next round of stakeholder interviews.

### **III. \*Public Comment (approx. 5:00 p.m.)**

There were no public comments.

Chair Vitale reviewed that Committee members should do their groupings, provide the contact information, and give the contact a heads up. Everyone agreed with that.

### **IV. Set Agenda for next meeting**

Mr. Eichelbaum suggested that the consultant drive the agenda and provide the necessary documents to be reviewed.

Mr. Smith brought up Mr. Vitale's editorial and wondered if it had run in the paper. It was noted that it did not. Since it was geared toward open house participation, Mr. Vitale said the concept of it was transferable to attending any activity relating to the Visioning effort.

### **V. Communication to the City Commission**

None.

### **VI. For the Good of the Committee**

Mr. Koeth assured the Committee that the Dressler letter (addressed at the October meeting) will be part of the record and posted together with the minutes on the city's website once the Committee approves the October minutes.

Mr. Sieger asked if there was any information on hits to the website, and Mr. Fernsler said he would find out.

Mr. Eichelbaum brought up distribution of the media plan, and Mr. Fernsler said they will be meeting very soon to detail the media plan. He said everything involving public engagement in Phase 1 has been done except the media briefing.

Mr. Eichelbaum also requested that Committee members receive a summary of the meeting to be held the next day. Chair Vitale said he would be happy to make that suggestion, but is not in a position to direct staff. Mr. Fernsler remarked that he will raise that issue in the meeting and find out what information can be messaged directly to the Committee.

## **VII. Announcements**

None.

## **VIII. Adjournment (7:00 p.m.)**

Hearing no further business, Chair Vitale adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

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