

**THE SR7/US 441 COLLABORATIVE  
STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

**South Florida Regional Planning Council**

July 19, 2001

12:00 p.m.-4:00 p.m.

**REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS**

**Introductions**

The meeting was opened by Janice M. Fleischer, South Florida Regional Planning Council Institute for Community Collaboration, meeting facilitator. Lunch was provided and participants were encouraged to get their lunch and eat while they worked. The first order of business was for all attendees to introduce themselves and tell which jurisdiction they represented. A list of all attendees is attached as Exhibit A. Eleven out of fifteen jurisdictions are now officially part of the Collaborative (See Exhibit B). Five jurisdictions were represented at this meeting.

**Objectives and Agenda Review**

The Facilitator then went over the Objectives and Agenda for the meeting. (See Exhibit C). As all the attendees had been present at the June 13, 2001 meeting, review of Discussion guidelines, Facilitator Roles and Consensus Rules was waived in the interest of time.

The Facilitator explained that the Consensus Rules used at the June meeting would still be in effect. When it was necessary to test the level of consensus, each voting person would hold up fingers to indicate the following:

- ✓ 5 fingers indicates wholehearted support
- ✓ 4 fingers indicates support
- ✓ 3 fingers indicates you are neutral but will support the result fully to the outside world
- ✓ 2 fingers indicated you still have questions that need to be answered
- ✓ 1 finger indicates you wish to block the decision.

As long as anyone put up 1 or 2 fingers, discussion would continue in the hope that at the next call for consensus, there would be no one with less than 3 fingers showing. If, however, it became evident that was not possible, a vote would be taken and if there was more than 2/3 of voting members in favor, the decision was made

**Organizational Structure Update and Grant Approval**

The Facilitator then directed the participants to their packet of materials that contained a copy of the organizational chart approved at the June 13 meeting with updated information reflecting the groups' previous decisions. (See Exhibit D). She pointed out the new name of the group "The State Road 7/US 441 Collaborative". It was suggested that "State Road" replace "SR" and this was adopted by unanimous agreement.

The Facilitator showed the participants five potential logos and asked for reactions and comments. (See Exhibit E for potential logos supplied). The participants decided they wanted a logo that would reflect both the residential and commercial aspects of the corridor. More options will be presented at the next meeting.

As a final item to this part of the meeting, the Facilitator directed the participants to the Memorandum regarding a TOP (Transportation Outreach Program) Grant (Exhibit F). The SFRPC would like to assist the Collaborative in funding Phases II and III of the Collaborative work by applying for this grant in the name of the Collaborative. The SFRPC would not make application without permission being granted by the Steering Committee. There was some discussion regarding the aspects of the grant which revealed the following:

1. Individual municipalities belonging to The Collaborative are not precluded from making application for the same grant funds in their own name.
2. Matching funds from Collaborative member municipalities would increase the “points” of the grant application, thereby increasing the likelihood of the grant being approved for funding.
3. Capital improvements could be used as “matching funds” and would be supportive of the grant.

All present approved the SFRPC making application for a TOP Grant in the name of the Collaborative.

#### **Internal/External Stakeholder Discussion**

Attention was then directed to consideration of the Steering Committee. It is this body which is the decision-making authority of the Collaborative. Decisions need to be made regarding who will serve on the Steering Committee and in what capacity (voting or non-voting).

The participants were directed again to their packets to a “Stakeholder Identification Worksheet” (See Exhibit G). The Facilitator explained that the Internal Stakeholders of the Collaborative are the fifteen jurisdictions, but at the last Steering Committee meeting 11 potential External stakeholders had been identified who might be asked to join the Steering Committee and assist in decision-making. Those 11 were:

Florida Department of Transportation  
Florida Department of Community Affairs  
United States Housing and Urban Development  
Palm Beach County  
Miami-Dade County  
Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization  
South Florida Regional Planning Council  
Broward County Department of Planning and Environmental Protection  
Broward Legislative Delegation  
South Florida Water Management District  
Broward Alliance

The participants were asked if they wanted to add any others to this group. Two more were added:

Broward League of Cities  
United States Congressional Delegation

The Facilitator then asked if any representatives of potential External Stakeholders were present to either answer questions or make a statement. James Ford, Florida Department of Transportation, indicated that the Department has decided that although it would like to be an External member of the Steering Committee, it would not want to be a voting member.

The Steering Committee members were then divided into two smaller groups. Each member was asked to complete his/her own individual "External Stakeholder Analysis Worksheet" (See Exhibit H) for each potential External Stakeholder. When he/she completed a worksheet for each potential stakeholder, all members of the small group were to compare their findings and prepare a master worksheet that indicated the number of votes received by each potential stakeholder. The composite results of the individual worksheets are contained in Exhibit I.

The number of votes cast for each potential stakeholder in one of three categories was the basis upon which a decision was made whether a stakeholder would be invited to join the Steering Committee and if that invitation was for a voting or non-voting position. The three categories indicated each potential stakeholder's importance to the Steering Committee and the work of the Collaborative. They were:

Extremely Important = Voting Rights on Steering Committee

Very Important = Ex-Officio on Steering Committee

Important = Encourage Collaborative membership and potential TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) representation but no membership on Steering Committee

The results of the voting were:

<b>External Stakeholder Name</b>	<b>EI</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>Voting (Y/N)</b>
Florida Department of Transportation	0	5	0	N
Florida Department of Community Affairs	0	5	0	N
United States HUD	0	1	4	N/A
Palm Beach County	0	0	2	N/A
Miami-Dade County	0	0	3	N/A
Broward MPO	0	5	0	N
South Florida Regional Planning Council	0	4	1	N
Broward Dept. of Planning and Environmental Protection	0	0	5	N/A
Broward Legislative Delegation	0	0	5	N/A
South Florida Water Management District	0	3	2	N
Broward Alliance	0	1	4	N/A
Broward League of Cities	0	0	5	N/A
U.S. Delegation	0	0	5	N/A

\*Initial vote for Broward MPO was 2 votes EI, 3 votes VI. After some discussion to reach consensus, it was decided that the MPO was a Very Important member of the Collaborative, but because their member municipalities are already represented on the Steering Committee they did not need an additional (and potentially duplicative municipality) representation on the Steering Committee.

As can be seen from the above Table, no entity was granted voting rights. All entities that will be sent an invitation will be non-voting.

The entities which will receive an invitation to appoint a representative to serve on the Steering Committee will be:

Florida Department of Transportation  
 Florida Department of Community Affairs  
 South Florida Regional Planning Council  
 South Florida Water Management District  
 Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization

**Core Values**

To prepare the group to begin their drafting of a Mission Statement, the Facilitator first had them brainstorm a list of values. A Value was defined as: "A principle, standard, or quality considered worthwhile or desirable." The values elicited from the group were:

NAME OF VALUE	VOTES RECEIVED*
Working together	Combined
Positive perception	1
Homogenized look	Combined
Economic vitality	5
Transportation	2
Aesthetic improvements	4 (Combined as described below)
Sustainable	0
Communities	0
Diversification	1
Redevelopment	4
Reduce number of car lanes	Combined
Traffic calming	1 (Combined as described below)
Landscaping	Combined
Pedestrian safety	3
Regional perspective	2
Resource coordination	5

\*See below

The Facilitator then asked the group whether any of the above items could/should be combined. The following values were combined:

Working together/Resource coordination  
 Aesthetic improvements/Landscaping/Homogenized look  
 Traffic calming/Reduce number of car lanes

The Facilitator then gave each person 5 votes. Each member of the Steering Committee was to vote no more than 5 times and could not place more than one vote on any item. The 5 items receiving the most votes would be designated as the groups' Core Values. The votes received are indicated above after combining. The Core Values designated were:

Economic Vitality  
Aesthetic Improvements  
Resource Coordination  
Redevelopment  
Pedestrian Safety

### **Mission Statement**

The members were once again broken into two small groups. Each group was given a “Mission Statement Worksheet” containing the following questions:

1. Who are we? What is our purpose? Why have we come together?
2. In general, what are the basic social and political needs or problems we exist to fill or address?
3. In general, what do we want to do to recognize or anticipate and respond to these needs or problems?
4. How should we interact with and involve our key stakeholders?
5. What are our core values?
6. What makes us distinct or unique?
7. Examine the answers to the prior questions and draft a mission statement.

Each group worked through the above questions and drafted a mission statement. The two statements drafted were:

The State Road 7/US 441 Collaborative is committed to resource coordination to improve pedestrian safety and promote economic vitality through aesthetic improvements and redevelopment.

We are a unique collaborative organization pooling our resources to promote economic vitality, aesthetic improvements, safety and redevelopment.

At this point in the day, the group took a break.

While the members were taking their break, the two statements were typed up and projected on a screen for the group to compare.

After returning from their break, the members redrafted the two statements into one new statement. The Mission Statement for The State Road 7/US 441 Collaborative will be:

**The State Road 7/US 441 Collaborative is a unique organization dedicated to coordinating its resources to promote economic vitality through aesthetic improvements, redevelopment and safety.**

### **Decision Making Process, Next meeting, and Survey Form**

The Facilitator asked the group how they liked the consensus process so far. There was unanimous agreement that it was working well and the method should be continued in the future.

It was decided that there would not be an August meeting; the next meeting will be in September.

Prior to adjourning, the members were asked to fill in their Evaluation Forms (Results contained in Exhibit J) and take the “Survey on Collaborative Objectives” with them to complete and send back to the Facilitator (See Exhibit K) for use at the next meeting.

The meeting was then adjourned.