

**SR7/US 441 PARTNERSHIP MEETING
CITY OF LAUDERHILL MULTIPURPOSE ROOM
JUNE 13, 2001
2:00 P.M.-4:00 P.M.**

Report of Proceedings

INTRODUCTIONS

The meeting was opened by Janice M. Fleischer, South Florida Regional Planning Council, meeting facilitator. 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". In addition to the formal Designees or Alternates who had been named by jurisdictions which had signed the Partnership Agreement (Exhibit "B"), several jurisdictions were represented which had not yet formally signed the Agreement.

AGENDA REVIEW, DISCUSSION GUIDELINES AND CONSENSUS

The Facilitator then went over the Agenda for the meeting. (Exhibit "C" attached). She then explained her duties as a facilitator and reviewed the "Guidelines for Discussion" for the day. (Exhibits "D" and "E"). She explained that in order for the group to progress in its work, it is necessary to adopt rules concerning decision-making. The Facilitator expressed her preference for a consensus-based process, but explained that it is ultimately up to the group to choose which decision-making process they wish to use. For this meeting, decision-making would be by consensus and defined as a 2/3 vote. However, voting would only be used if complete consensus could not be reached in a reasonable amount of time.

Each jurisdiction (13 municipalities, the Seminole Tribe, Broward County) would be given one vote. If the jurisdiction had a Designee in attendance, that person was the only one who could vote for that jurisdiction. If an Alternate attended in place of the Designee, they were the voting member. For those jurisdictions that have not yet signed the Partnership Agreement, one vote would be allowed for this meeting only. Since several jurisdictions were present which had not yet become Partners and had more than one individual attending the meeting, the Facilitator told everyone from the same jurisdiction to sit together and decide who would be their official voting person for the meeting. At all future meetings, although input from others will be solicited in a variety of ways, the only individuals who will be allowed to deliberate and vote will be those formal Designees (or their Alternate if the Designee is not present) who have been named by signatory jurisdictions.

As questions were posed to the group for discussion and resolution, consensus would be tested at various times. The method for testing consensus was explained by the Facilitator. After posing a particular question, the Facilitator would allow discussion for a period of time. At some point, she would then call for a show of "fingers" so the group could see the level of consensus in the room. 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 fingers less than 3 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. (Exhibit "F" for Consensus Rules)

EXAMPLES OF ORGANIZATION STRUCTURES AROUND THE COUNTRY

The Facilitator then directed the participants to their packet of materials which contained two examples of organizational structures used by other multi-jurisdictional collaboratives. One was the "Route 1 Corridor Collaborative Study" from New Jersey (Exhibit "G") and the other was the "I-405 Corridor Program" from Washington State (Exhibit "H").

PROPOSED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

After a short explanation of each of these programs, the Facilitator then outlined a proposed structural organization for this group. This was done as a powerpoint presentation. Exhibit "I" contains a chart and explanation of the proposed structure.

As part of this presentation, the Facilitator explained that this group is now in Phase I: Organization. By contract, the Partnership has until September 30, 2001 to organize, develop a mission statement and set out overall objectives. Phases II and III will follow; it is understood that their timing and funding are yet to be determined.

Following the proposed organizational structure presentation, the Facilitator led the group through a series of decision-making questions.

DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS ON ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The first question asked was: "What would you like to be named?" The SFRPC staff had proposed the name: "SR 7 Livable Communities Collaborative". David Dahlstrom, SFRPC staff, explained that using the term "livable communities" may create funding advantages for the group. Discussion followed and participant comments were:

- "Livable" implies SR 7 is not livable today.
- Does the word "livable" add anything?
- In Hollywood, SR 7 is known as the US 441 Corridor and this should be included in the name.
- If we use "livable" it suggests a residential focus; there is a business/economic focus that needs to be reflected.
- Prefer "sustainable"
- How deep is the corridor?

A participant suggested the name "The SR 7/US 441 Collaborative". Discussion followed and a consensus ranking was taken. After much discussion, the Facilitator called for a vote since there were still one or two individuals showing 1 or 2 fingers. The vote for the name "The SR 7/US 441 Collaborative" passed 10 votes yes to 1 vote no. It was suggested that the phrase "Living and Working Together" could appear below the name of the Collaborative. This will be taken up at the next meeting.

The Facilitator announced that SFRPC staff would present a proposed logo for the group at the next meeting.

The group then agreed that the basic structure proposed by the SFRPC staff was fine. They further decided that the Steering Committee should be the decision-making body of the Collaborative.

The Facilitator asked, "Who are your voting members on the Steering Committee?" In response, the following comments were received:

- If we have 4 "at-large" members it would mean there would be 19 voting members which could be cumbersome
- If there are "at-large" members and they are from the jurisdictions, it would mean some jurisdictions would have more than one vote, this would be unfair
- Only those directly involved with the project should be voting members
- If votes are given to entities other than the jurisdictions would it be other government agencies, the state senator, etc.?
- There should be one vote per jurisdiction with all others on the Steering Committee being non-voting members.
- Active politicians or others who want to attend Steering Committee meetings could do so but would not have a vote unless they were the jurisdiction's Designee.
- Should voting members have to be elected officials?
- The FDOT representative indicated they would want to be an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Steering Committee.

After discussion, consensus was reached and the following **decisions** were made:

- The Steering Committee would be made up of Voting and Non-voting, Ex-Officio members.
- Both voting members and ex-officio members would deliberate but only the jurisdictions would have a vote.
- Each jurisdiction would have one vote.
- There will be no "at large" members.
- Ex-officio members will be determined at future meetings.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP

The Facilitator asked the group to "brainstorm" potential ex-officio members. No decisions were made and all suggestions were encouraged. The following entities were suggested:

- Florida Department of Transportation
- Florida Department of Community Affairs
- US Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Broward County Department of Planning and Environmental Protection
- Palm Beach and Miami-Dade County
- Broward Metropolitan Planning Organization
- South Florida Regional Planning Council
- South Florida Water Management District
- The Broward Alliance
- State Representatives?

FUTURE MEETINGS

The group went on to discuss the best days and times for future meetings. The Facilitator encouraged them to extend the length of their meetings to 4 hours in order to allow more in depth discussion and decision-making. It was decided that future meetings would be on Thursdays from 12:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. and lunch would be served. SFRPC staff would try to arrange a July meeting.

GETTING JURISDICTIONS INVOLVED

As a last item for the day, the Facilitator asked the group how they would suggest encouraging those jurisdictions that have not yet signed the Partnership Agreement to sign, become involved and participate. The following suggestions were made:

- Current partnership members should go out and speak with the other jurisdictions.
- Commissioner Hazelle Rogers, Lauderdale Lakes, agreed to go and speak to the other jurisdictions if she had other volunteers who would go with her.
- A list of current signatories should be send to the other jurisdictions so they can see that business is progressing in their absence.
- Enlighten them as to the newly developing structure.
- Let them know they have been given a vote at the table, and now it is in their best interest to sign the Partnership Agreement (thereby joining the Collaborative) and send an appointee.

The meeting was then adjourned for the day at approximately 3:45 pm.