

MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING

JULY 20, 2010

MINUTES

Chairperson Paul Novak called to order the regular meeting of the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) on Tuesday, July 20, 2010, at 7:00 p.m., Jarvis Hall, 4505 Ocean Drive, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea, Florida. Upon call of the roll, the following Committee members were present:

Chairperson Paul Novak
Co-Chairman Edmund Malkoon
Sandra Booth
Robert Eckblad
Marjorie Evans
Ken Kugler
John Panitas
James Rogers
Helene Wetherington

The following individuals were present:

Vice Mayor Stewart Dodd
Interim Assistant Town Manager Bud Bentley
Jeff Bowman, Director of Development Services

III. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of June 15, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of June 15, 2010; the vote carried unanimously.

Chairman Novak commented the MPSC meetings should be run in a timely manner from 7:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. He thought speakers should limit their comments to no more than three minutes; if after speaking and allowing someone else to speak someone wished to add something further, they could at that time.

Member Booth concurred a meeting of no more than two hours was sufficient time for regular meetings to run. She checked with a number of other municipalities and how

they conducted similar meetings and discovered several of them mentioned enforcing the three-minute rule and how they did so. The individual to each person's right monitored the person beside them, letting them know if they were speaking for more than five minutes. She welcomed members of the Town Commission in attendance. The Master Plan, the January document of 2004, was a gift to the Town, and she knew the Commission expected the MPSC to revise the document. She thought part of the Committee's job was to embark upon that process, as it would be a huge undertaking, requiring the setting of timelines and deadlines. In the near future, she hoped to have the Dean of Architecture from the University of Miami speak to the Committee. She commended Chairman Novak for the work he did, as it took a strong person to keep everyone focused.

Chairman Novak concurred as to the revision process of the 2004 document; at the Commission's last Roundtable they alluded to the fact that the MPSC should begin to revise the 2004 Master Plan. He felt it unnecessary to redo the plan, rather the existing one should be revised to be more in tune with present day. An official order from the Commission for the MPSC to do a revision had yet to be issued.

IV. Public Comment

None

V. Old Business

a) El Mar Project

Chairman Novak recapped the consensus of the Committee on the subject item as contained in the minutes of June 15, 2010, distributed to the Committee members. Based on feedback he received, there was still concern as to the number of lanes on El Mar Drive. He referred Committee members to the backup information, noting the Town Commission voted in the past for four lanes on El Mar Drive.

Member Panitsas reviewed the information in the backup illustrating various options for usage of the space available.

Member Kugler believed at the last Committee meeting, he more or less spearheaded the idea of two lanes with good reason. He had time to consider the input of his fellow members and offered a compromise, suggesting there be two lanes, limit regular traffic to one lane on each side, have the second lane paved an alternative color, and making it into a multipurpose lane. Its uses could include: pedestrian, bicycle riding, and other activities the Committee previously discussed. He realized the back-out traffic was a problem, but the multipurpose nature of the lane would allow it to be used by traffic just not primarily; he said page SK-8 best showed what he was recommending.

Member Wetherington queried if the multipurpose lane could be used for event parking.

Member Kugler answered: absolutely; the multipurpose lane being used in the manner he suggested satisfied his concerns while achieving the desires of other members of the Committee. There were practical functions that needed to be taken into consideration.

Member Evans found the compromise acceptable.

Member Eckblad recalled in 2009 when the subject matter was first addressed, one of the options forwarded by Ocampo & Associates was stamped asphalt on the inside lanes on both sides of the road. As to the eight-foot sidewalks discussed, if each lane were ten feet wide, this would accommodate an eight-foot sidewalk.

Co-Chairman Malkoon referred to the historical information he sent out to the Committee prior to the present meeting, stating it contained a number of interesting facts. He was satisfied with the compromise suggested, after having discussions with various individuals and researching the issue further.

Chairman Novak was unsure making the inner lane a different color would be enough to keep vehicular traffic out of that lane.

Member Panitsas indicated certain markers could be used, some temporary, others permanent, such as double solid yellow lines.

Member Wetherington supported the compromise, noting there were some options of doing gradual curbing that was slightly elevated that would not inhibit the ability to drive into the lane if needed. A lot could be done visually with regard to the type of pavement used; if the road looked less like a street, it would not be used as such. She thought the matter should be given to the designers to allow them to come up with options.

Chairman Novak found the only other issue he had was with the back-out parking, particularly during increased tourist seasons; he was unsure of the extent to which this might pose a problem.

Member Kugler reiterated this was the goal of having a multipurpose lane, for use as needed when needed.

Member Rogers agreed with the compromise, but thought the traffic lane should be closer to the median as opposed to closer to the sidewalk.

Chairman Novak anticipated many traffic accidents if this were done, as bikers and pedestrians could be struck by vehicles backing out.

Member Evans felt the multipurpose lane being closer to the sidewalk could have been better were it not for the back-out parking. One existing problem for people trying to back out was trying to determine if there were any pedestrians or bikers in the vicinity. Thus, keeping the multipurpose lane closer to the median was safer.

Member Panitsas stated it was possible the approach to improvements on El Mar Drive was wrong, in that they were based on two issues: back-out parking and event parking. The back-out parking always existed and was something residents lived with, but the thinking for event parking should be shifted, possibly creating other parking. It appeared the suggested compromise was the best solution at present without resorting to more radical ones, such as building a parking garage.

Chairman Novak opened the discussion to the public.

Diane Boutin, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, commended the Committee for accepting a compromise, as it was truly the best approach to problem solving. If the sidewalks were widened, due to their current deplorable state, most pedestrians would hopefully stop walking in the street. She commented if the Committee was working toward suggesting underground utilities for the future, those along El Mar drive would have to use some of the center median area. The cost of maintaining and paving or stamping different colors for both lanes could be difficult in light of the need for tighter economies. Many hotels had back-out parking and, if the sidewalks were widened, rather than being immediately behind the bumper, an added three or four feet would be inserted between back-out parking and the edge of the sidewalk and pedestrians. Ms. Boutin thought the Committee was on the right track.

Frank, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, foresaw a problem with delivery trucks parking in the multipurpose portion of the road and possibly blocking the roadway. He preferred seeing the joggers next to the median where the shrubbery was located.

Vice Mayor Stuart Dodd remarked his job as a Commissioner was to implement the consensus of the Committee's deliberations. His personal opinion on public restrooms was irrelevant, as he hoped to see it off the Oriana, but that was not the consensus. He applauded the Committee for thinking outside the box, and the solution the members were coming via Member Kugler's suggestion was a terrific one.

Member Kugler found the input of the Commissioners useful and did not see their comments as an effort to exert undue influence, as Committee members were fully able to think for themselves.

Chairman Novak concurred, stating all members of the Town Commission were welcome.

Co-Chairman Malkoon responded the attendance of members of the Commission was related to statements he made, noting he never said Commissioners were not welcome

at the MPSC meeting. He read into the record a quote of what he actually said, which indicated attendance by members of the Commission was welcome, though he was concerned their presence might interfere with the independent process by which the Committee should operate under. The real problem arose when he felt direction was being given to the Committee by one Commissioner outside the presence of other Commissioners, who could not give their input at the time. He pointed out the reason some members were on the Committee was due to their being appointed by a member of the Commission, and that could influence a member's position on a particular matter. The important point was for everyone on the Committee to have a say in all decisions.

Member Kugler acknowledged how Committee members were appointed; he did not believe disagreeing with the views of the Commissioner appointing one to the Committee was likely to result in removal from the Committee. Each member of the Committee was appointed due to a belief in their ability to accomplish the task(s) given.

Diane Kugler, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, supported the idea of having two lanes, with a low speed limit enforced, as well as inserting some traffic calming, such as speed bumps. She mentioned in Tallahassee they used a specific material to delineate between road lanes, and she could get the information and forward it to the Committee. On the matter of which lane to make the traffic lane and which to make the multipurpose lane, it was safer for a person backing out to see another oncoming car than a biker or pedestrian.

Member Eckblad indicated the multipurpose lane was better situated near the median, as placing in the lane next to the sidewalk meant special event parking would block vehicles backing out.

Chairman Novak saw where having two lanes with one as multipurpose would work; at the very least, it could be tried without going to a great deal of expense. As a Committee, a vote was required to change the language to indicate El Mar Drive would be two lanes, one being an activity lane and the other a travel lane. The Committee's recommendation(s) should be forwarded to the Town Commission for review and further direction. He said the decision on sidewalk width was best left to Ocampo to make.

Member Kugler thought further delineation was needed, in that both would be classified as traffic lanes, though one would be designated as multipurpose rather than an activity lane. The multipurpose lane would be the interior lane abutting the center median.

Chairman Novak received a consensus from the Committee to have staff write a recommendation to be forwarded to the Town Commission on the El Mar Drive Project. He went on to note, as required by the Sunshine Law, Committee members should not email information back and forth, rather; it should be included in the backup information for everyone's access.

Member Kugler remarked members should include in any correspondence sent a not instructing the receiver not to reply to the email; this reduced the chance of committing a violation.

VI. New Business

a) Beach Public Restrooms

Chairman Novak opined there were few locations at which public restrooms could be installed. El Prado Park would be one such location, and nearby the pier was another.

Director of Development Services Jeff Bowman gave a PowerPoint presentation on beach public restrooms.

Member Evans wondered if staff consulted with the local police as to the safest place to for a public restroom; this was an issue the City of Pompano Beach was experiencing.

Mr. Bowman responded the Sheriff's Office wished the Town to incorporate certain security elements into the construct, such as: landscaping, lighting, etc.

Member Kugler wished to know if the prefabricated units were up to code with respect to hurricanes and other weather conditions.

Mr. Bowman answered: yes.

Chairman Novak questioned if the cost for the prefabricated units was \$150,000 per unit or \$75,000 each for two units.

Mr. Bowman replied the cost was for one unit based on staff's recommendation for one location. The subject item was placed on the MPSC meeting agenda due to the Commission's request for the Committee to make a recommendation as to a location.

Chairman Novak inquired if a recommendation was expected of the MPSC at present.

Mr. Bowman said that was entirely up to the Committee; they could delay their recommendation to their next meeting if desired.

Member Kugler reiterated the Commission's direction to the MPSC at the last Roundtable: 1) make a recommendation as to location; 2) the choice of location did not have to be limited to those presented by staff; 3) whether to proceed as a town to prioritize installing the restrooms at the present point in time. Further Committee discussion was required.

Co-Chairman Malkoon thought the Committee was to give its preference as to where it thought the restrooms should be located rather than trying to move forward.

Member Kugler stated this was not his understanding from the Roundtable discussion.

Chairman Novak believed it best for the Committee to work as a group on selecting a location; as to when the restrooms would be installed was for another discussion.

Co-Chairman Malkoon mentioned doing some research and commented his focus was on the El Prado Park and the pier alleyway as the two strongest contenders for locations. He went around and took pictures of the locations and had some concerns with the two sites. Both were near residential areas and there was also an issue with the turtle lighting being so close on the sand near the shore; it could turn into a safety issue, as the restrooms would have to be closed early to shut the lights off. He indicated El Prado was away from the core area where Town events took place, and with both sites being east of El Mar, they had to follow the coastal construction line requirements. He remarked the pier alleyway was not very visible, and access could not go through the parking lot, as it was private property and people were not allowed to walk under the pier at either high or low tide, making access an issue. Another potential issue with the pier alleyway was the area was also a utility easement and could not be built upon. Mr. Malkoon suggested the El Mar parking lot, though in a different location to the southwest corner of the lot, as in staff's suggested location, three to five parking spots would be lost, whereas in his suggestion only one or two would be lost. The preferred access would be the alleyway. As to Commissioner Sasser's expressed concerns of the restroom fitting into the overall Master Plan, he directed attention to pages 70 to 73 of the Master Plan document, it detailed changes to the alleyway, making it more pedestrian friendly and attractive. It was better for the restrooms not to be located closer to El Mar.

Member Eckblad thought El Prado Park was the logical place for at least one of the restrooms, as this was where all the beachgoers went. The other parking lot was Town-owned, and he leaned toward placing the restrooms to the front of the parking lot near El Mar for security reasons. Storefronts were not a good idea, and the pier alleyway was too out of the way and hidden.

Member Kugler remarked, with respect to placing restrooms anywhere on the east side of El Mar, whether at Oriana or El Prado Park, this was not a good idea. He believed everyone agreed El Mar was the "jewel" of the Town and, as to Oriana, he concurred with Co-Chairman Malkoon's view with respect to the alleyway. There were multimillion dollar condominiums at Oriana, and it seemed unwise to place public restrooms next to them. He expressed several concerns with El Prado Park, one being it was not centrally located, and the majority of the traffic on the beach seemed centered about the pier. The restrooms should not be placed on the pier but centrally located where the majority of the pedestrian traffic was; that was clearly in the downtown area. He agreed the restrooms were best installed in the parking lot next to Ham N' Eggs. Other

objections to El Prado Park included: only locals tended to use El Prado; El Prado would not alleviate the use of restaurant bathrooms, a goals enumerated to justify the installation of public restrooms; El Prado had one of the few, if not only, unobstructed views of the ocean; and green space should not be lost to restrooms.

Member Rogers concurred with the choice of locating the restrooms in the parking lot next to Ham N' Eggs.

Member Panitsas commented El Prado Park was a natural location, as many went there to swim, and there was room on each side, though he was unsure of the setback requirements. No one mentioned Washingtonia Portal and Pine Avenue as options, where there was plenty of room; they were situated some distance from El Prado, and space at the other locations was limited and had other challenges to overcome.

Member Wetherington asked if staff evaluate Washingtonia Portal or Pine Avenue as possible locations. She favored the idea of not having the restrooms located immediately on the beach blocking the view and disturbing the aesthetics of the beachfront. There appeared to be many other choices, and she favored the El Mar location, as the alleyway could be enhanced; the area was considerably unattractive and poorly lit at present. She felt the pier location was too invasive on the beachfront; the storefront was cost problematic and controversial with the neighbors; the El Prado Park option could remain on the table; the only obvious downfall with all beach locations was the restrooms being placed directly in front of the beach.

Member Evans supported the parking lot location.

Member Booth mentioned doing research on possibly locating the restrooms at the Bougainvilla Drive parking lot. The Committee was supposed to be the five to ten year thinkers; the main duty was to discuss and build things that would perpetuate years after Committee members no longer served. She thought the Committee was missing the point by not considering locations along the west end of Commercial Blvd.; when large restaurant chains consider locating there, it would be wonderful to have restrooms as part of the Bougainvilla parking lot. Her research revealed there was a requirement for three-quarter inch waterlines and four-inch water pipe. The location was very accessible for, was well lit and had two walls to the north and south of the site. She remarked, as business continued to grow, the west side must be considered.

Chairman Novak felt the public restrooms should be placed where the greatest concentration of bathers were, around the pier and El Prado. Thus, there should be one restroom at El Prado, and he was unsure if the parking lot next to Ham N' Eggs was the best location, as it could generate traffic and safety problems. He thought the alley between Oriana and the parking lot the pier used was a better location, as the closest to the beach they were located, the more usage there would be, and placing them over in the parking lot meant erecting signage to direct patrons.

Member Kugler was unsure if the issue of public restrooms was a priority for the Committee at present but would defer to the decision of the Town Commission. He suggested taking a preliminary vote or consensus to gauge the Committee's position.

Member Wetherington recommended each member of the Committee list their top two choice locations, give those to staff, and they could do a tally and additional analysis on costs, pros/cons, etc.

Chairman Novak thought a show of hands would be adequate at present.

Member Kugler agreed to a show of hands to indicate top choices.

Interim Assistant Town Manager Bud Bentley commented it appeared Committee members would be voting on different matters regarding the same issue; that is, El Prado served a different population than downtown. He suggested the Committee rank which should be the Town's priority: a downtown or an El Prado location. In staff's thinking, it was never a decision for either/or regarding the locations, rather it was as to which restroom would be built first. Staff saw a need at both locations, as the populations they served was different.

Member Kugler pointed out, if it was a question of prioritizing a downtown versus an El Prado location, there were public restrooms situated at behind Jarvis Hall already in close proximity to the beach. Therefore, a downtown location should be the priority.

Member Eckblad questioned if the parking lot at El Prado had been ruled out as a location, as there was adequate space.

Member Kugler felt the same issue arose with placing public restrooms close to multimillion condominiums.

Chairman Novak believed if the restrooms were located in the El Prado Park, they could be camouflaged so no one would know they were restrooms. In the parking lot, he agreed residents of the condominiums would not enjoy looking down at bathrooms.

Member Kugler repeated his objection to loss of green space to accommodate public restrooms at the El Prado Park location.

Chairman Novak recommended members indicate their choice of location in the downtown area and proceed from that point, with the Town starting with one restroom and see what transpired. For the future, as to the Washingtonia Portal and Pine Avenue locations, they could be considered as the Town grew; many patrons utilized the beaches in those areas, and the same could be said for considering locations to the west. Each member could give their top two locations.

Member Panitsas indicated, as the downtown improvements were still under consideration, and the restrooms were primarily for beachgoers, the Committee should not focus on the downtown area. As downtown developed, a location for restrooms could be found, and he suggested focus remain on locations that catered mainly to beachgoers.

Member Kugler mentioned the restrooms were for beachgoers as well as patrons of special events held in the Town, helping restaurants by reducing the increased demand on their restrooms.

Committee members gave their first choice location: Member Booth - Bougainvilla parking lot; Co-Chairman Malkoon - El Mar Parking lot in the corner he mentioned earlier; Member Eckblad - El Prado Park; Member Kugler - El Mar parking lot; Member Rogers - El Mar parking lot; Member Panitsas - El Prado Park; Member Wetherington - El Mar parking lot; Member Evans - El Mar parking lot; and Chairman Novak - alley to the east side.

Member Rogers reminded members the restrooms would be modular and could be moved to other locations, they would not be permanent structures.

Chairman Novak acknowledged a consensus of five supporters for the El Mar parking lot location, and this would be the Committee's recommendation to the Town Commission. He opened the discussion to the public.

Diana Kugler, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, commented it was important to remember, as a community, the goal was to alleviate some of the strain and stress of over use of restaurant bathrooms. It was not just beachgoers that were being thought of, as the pedestrian traffic included: shoppers, diners and special event goers. She thought if beachgoers were the focus, it seemed wiser to place restrooms both north and south of the pier, or centrally located where most of the traffic was. Locations to the west should also be considered, as they too were proximally located.

Frank, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, supported the Bougainvilla parking lot location, as it was underused and would not interfere with anyone.

Diane Boutin, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, mentioned the issue of installing public restrooms was discussed at various times for some 15 years, so it was important for the Committee to think long range. There were many reasons to push for public bathrooms, and citizens advocated for them over the years; it was the responsibility of a Town oriented towards tourism and the development of its commercial sector to provide such amenities. She thought it important to determine who the focus population was in the general public over the next two or three years, as the Town lost four or five of its large hotels and heading residential along El Mar Drive. This should be considered in contrast to the commercial district in the downtown area. She supported the Bougainvilla parking lot site.

Louis (sp), Lauderdale-By-The-Sea resident, stated putting bathrooms by the pier or by (Inaudible) Park brought to mind the issue of turtle lighting, and it was a matter of safety. The police felt putting the bathrooms in the alley would create safety issues. He pointed out having public restrooms in the Ham N' Eggs parking lot would help the Chamber of Commerce events. People parking in the Bougainvilla parking lot usually accessed the beach through that alley; and for the morning walkers along El Mar Drive, they could utilize those facilities as well.

Chairman Novak received no further input from the public.

Member Wetherington believed the alleyway near the Ham N' Eggs parking lot usually flooded and wondered if this would interfere with the use of the facilities.

Chairman Novak did not think flooding was a problem in that area, as he walked through there numerous times.

Member Kugler inquired if the public's opinion caused any member of the Committee to rethink their location choice.

Member Wetherington commented there seemed to be public support for using the Bougainvilla parking lot, and taking that location out of the list of sites for consideration gave the appearance of the Committee ignoring the public's input.

Member Kugler said his first choice was still the El Mar parking lot, and if a backup choice could be forwarded, the Bougainvilla parking lot was next.

Member Evans concurred, as long as the restrooms were placed in a parking lot and not the other spaces suggested.

Co-Chairman Malkoon agreed with the first and second choice for locations.

Chairman Novak gained a consensus from the Committee on two choices for locating the public restrooms, the first being the El Mar parking lot, and the second, the Bougainvilla parking lot. He asked if staff considered using the proposed facilities and having the public pay to use them in order to raise funds to maintain them.

Mr. Bentley responded there was some discussion at the Commission meeting months prior, where staff was asked to explore the European model, a standalone unit that self-cleaned after use. These were examined and found to be very expensive.

Chairman Novak believed their cost was in the range of \$3,000.

Mr. Bentley noted those he priced cost much more. Staff did not develop a policy recommendation on charging, and he opined it was not worth the revenue stream to try to control that.

Chairman Novak clarified he was thinking more of keeping the doors to the stalls locked to prevent the units being vandalized.

Mr. Bentley concurred, stating this was one of the reasons the location of the restrooms was critical, and it was important to have as many eyes as possible on the front of the facilities. Lighting was critical, and security cameras would be important in the various locations discussed.

Chairman Novak wondered if buying self-cleaning units reduced maintenance costs.

Mr. Bentley stated he was most familiar with the European models that required a fee to enter them.

Co-Chairman Malkoon mentioned researching the self-cleaning European models the previous year and came across a website on them. He affirmed them to be very expensive, and some cities that installed them removed them, as they were costly to operate, and some had to disabled the cleaning option due to excessive use.

Mr. Bentley informed the Committee the Town's recommended budget would go to the Commission the coming Friday and would be placed on the Commission agenda for their meeting next Tuesday. The Five-Year Capital Project Plan would be discussed at the next Commission workshop the next Wednesday. He asked for the matter to be placed on the next MPSC agenda that he might make a presentation concerning the Town's Five-Year Capital Plan.

Chairman Novak indicated the item would be placed on the next MPSC next.

Member Wetherington requested an update on the A1A Project.

Chairman Novak recalled in the previous minutes he noted the Committee would meet either at the present or next meeting. This meant meeting with A1A project representatives at the next MPSC meeting. Each time they attended a meeting, it cost about \$1,000, so it was important to keep such attendance to a minimum.

Member Wetherington suggested if cost was an issue, in lieu of them attending a Committee, could a member of Town staff or the Committee meet with the A1A representative and review their recommendations and update the Committee. The Committee gave very specific recommendations after being presented a basic design; the Committee concurred this was satisfactory with the inclusion of a few inclusions.

Chairman Novak thought this a plausible suggestion but recommended first contacting them to find out their feeling on a meeting with an individual Town representative.

Member Evans commented the A1A representatives could also forward a progress report to the Committee and that could be discussed at a future MPSC meeting.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.