

MASTER PLAN STEERING COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING

FEBRUARY 15, 2011

MINUTES

Chairperson Paul Novak called to order the regular meeting of the Master Plan Steering Committee (MPSC) on Monday, February 15, 2011, at 7:00 p.m., at Jarvis Hall, 4505 Ocean Drive, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea, Florida.

II. Pledge of Allegiance

III. Upon call of the roll, the following Committee members were present:

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

Upon call of the roll, the following Committee member was absent:

Ken Kugler

The following individuals were present:

Town Manager Connie Hoffman  
Assistant Town Manager Bud Bentley  
Director of Development Services Jeff Bowman

IV. Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting Minutes of December 20, 2010

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of December 20, 2010; the vote carried unanimously.

V. Public/Member Comments

Yann Brandt, resident of 4537 West Tradewinds, Lauderdale-By-The-Sea, noted his presence at the meeting was to ask the MPSC to address the seeming belief the Town had no Master Plan. As a member of the Planning & Zoning (P&Z) Board, he heard this view expressed as well as at the Town Commission Roundtable. He sought further explanation from the Committee as to whether there was a Master Plan and, if there was one, where could it be located. Both the P&Z Board and the Commission as a whole were puzzled and needed clarity; such as, was it possible for the Town to operate off the current Master Plan if there was one. He asked what items on the Master Plan was the Committee currently working on.

Chairperson Novak indicated the Committee would respond after the agenda items were reviewed, noting the Town did have a Master Plan

VI. New Business

None

VII. Old Business

**Item #1: A1A Enhancement Project**

- 1) FDOT A1A - Discussion regarding architectural features for the seating walls

Chairperson Novak recalled the Committee selected two designs from the options presented by staff, and the present goal was to select one of the two. The sail design had been acceptable, but the design needed adjustments, and staff included some new designs on the sail in the Committee's backup. He was unsure if the shell design was altered, directing everyone's attention to the designs illustrated on a board by staff.

Jeff Bowman, Director of Development Services understood from the previous meeting's discussions the aim of selecting a design was to create a theme throughout the Town, particularly along the A1A Enhancement Project, and carry it through to the El Mar Project for continuity.

There was a Committee discussion on all five designs, including the revised sail design. The discussions included: reviewing the original plans of all five designs; how the Committee's feedback on the designs were translated into the revisions to the shell and sail designs, the two preferred of the five; casting the original sail design in concrete rather than stainless steel and including a decorative element with tile; the fact that the

design element was a sea wall and was never intended as a bench, though it was likely people would sit on the wall.

Assistant Town Manager Bud Bentley reviewed the designs as presented in the Committee's previous public hearing, including the architectural elements.

Chairperson Novak wished to know of the cost differential between the designs.

Town Manager Connie Hoffman responded the feedback they received from the designers indicated with the changes staff made, including the reduction in the amount of actual land being covered by the subject project, it was likely the project would stay within its budget. The concrete shells she brought to the meeting was to give the Committee an idea of what the design could look like; they cost \$154 each and would be placed on the wall in El Prado Park for decoration.

Mr. Bentley continued his presentation, referring to the handout distributed to the Committee containing the 97 percent plan that showed two of the typicals illustrating how the wall fit into the intersection and the crosswalk. The square at the end of the wall was where the architectural feature would be located.

Member Panitas commented the sail design appeared to have too many sharp edges; they could be dangerous for children and might not be appropriate for display at a bus stop, for example. He felt the shell design, however, looked delicate as though it might break easily, wondering how strong it would be if it were made of concrete. They were both attractive designs.

Town Manager Hoffman believed the use of stainless steel would be rejected for maintenance and safety issues; she would request the design be cast in concrete.

Member Wetherington remarked on preferring the sail design, as the seashell design looked dated. The redesign of the sail still maintained the modern feel, and it was an attractive design feature that could be done in concrete.

Member Rogers concurred, questioning if the sail design might be done in Plexiglas or similar material.

Chairperson Novak pointed out it was premature to think about the cost and the medium the design would be in.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon agreed with the views expressed by Member Wetherington regarding the sail design, which he mentioned to his neighbors to gauge their opinions. The feedback he received supported the sail design over the shell. However, he thought the sail design too big, though the effect might be softened with trees in the background.

Chairperson Novak observed the sail design would be about six feet tall, the average height of a man, and it was important for the design feature to be visible.

Member Evans wondered if it were possible to incorporate the Town's logo with one of the designs that consisted of the sun and a seagull, as Lauderdale-By-The-Sea was not really a "sailboat" town. She felt this design brought things into harmony as to what the design should depict about the Town. No member of the Committee seemed completely satisfied with either of the two designs they were considering, and the seashell design appeared cumbersome and dated.

Town Manager Hoffman questioned if the Committee was open to moving away from the two designs completely and going along with something more along the lines of the original concept sketches.

The Committee and staff continued to discuss the pros and cons of the various designs, including: having the Town logo etched into whichever design was selected; if having a prototype made would be helpful; there appearing to be a consensus to reject the seashell design; and, in selecting the sail design, how it could be further enhanced to the Committee members' satisfaction.

Member Evans suggested letting the designers know stainless steel was not acceptable and charging them with suggesting possible materials other than concrete, such as some form of plastic.

Town Manager Hoffman recommended the Committee make a number one and number two choice as to the preferred design, as time was running out for the subject project.

Member Booth stated she liked the shell, as she felt it to be more representative of Florida regardless of location. She too liked the sail but, possibly, it was the shape of the shell that made it appear dated, as the concept of a shell design was sound.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon vetoed both the shell and sail design, preferring the design illustrated in the "B" plan with the curved wall that could include some decorative muted tiles on the front of the curb to add color. He felt the beach theme of the sail and shell was too literal, as the design was something the Town would have for a long time.

Member Rogers questioned if it was possible to have more than one design, and alternate their placement.

Town Manager Hoffman indicated when staff asked that of the designers, they were told having one design would look better in the Town.

Mr. Bentley concurred, stating the designers told them impact would be lost without the consistency of the look throughout the Town, given the aim was to create identification of the area as being part of Lauderdale-By-The-Sea.

Member Rogers selected the sail design.

Member Panitas said he would pick the sail design if the shell and sail were his two options, though he preferred a more simple design.

Member Wetherington selected the sail.

Member Evans chose the sail.

Chairperson Novak acknowledged the consensus to go with the sail design for the present and to give the designers an opportunity to present alternatives of material, etc. within that design.

Town Manager Hoffman indicated she would include the directive to the designers that once the Town had gone through its branding exercise, to look into the possibility of incorporating the brand that was ultimately selected.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon asked if the Committee wished to see the name of the Town tastefully included in the design in some manner.

Member Wetherington thought later on, after the design was completed, if there was space available, a plaque with the Town's name could be attached. For now, the concrete could be left blank, as the sail design afforded adequate opportunities to include the Town's name at a later date.

\* \* \*

Chairperson Novak moved the discussion to allow the Committee to respond to Mr. Brandt's questions posed under the Public Comment section earlier in the meeting as to whether the Town had a Master Plan. Based on a recap of the last six months of MPSC meetings, the Committee had been jumping around in its discussions of various aspects of the Master Plan. He recalled the former administration was giving the Committee various directives and frequently changing their minds. With the coming in of the new administration, Town Manager Hoffman and the Committee were now reviewing the existing plan over the last four MPSC meetings, and he believed much had been accomplished. The changes made and the things that were eliminated led to the existing Master Plan the Committee was now working with.

Member Evans understood the plan had been for the Committee to meet with the Town Manager to revise the Master Plan and send the final document to the Commission.

Town Manager Hoffman indicated all the changes the Committee recommended to the Master Plan went to the Town Commission, and they were reviewed over the course of two Commission meetings. She thought the Commission agreed wholeheartedly with

those recommendations with two minor changes that sought only to tweak the existing language. One was related to the signage on the beach and the reef to happen sooner than later. She stated her subsequent discussion with the Commission was the Master Plan, having received the blessings of both the Committee and the Town Commission, had to be presented to the community for its feedback. The idea was to hold a series of community meetings in March to present the Plan and get public input as to support or suggestions, then return those results to the Commission for a final approval.

Chairperson Novak wondered if before the public hearings it were possible for the Committee to have the document that would be presented to the public to peruse.

Town Manager Hoffman affirmed it was possible, noting she would email the revised Master Plan the Commission approved to all MPSC members the following day. She reminded the Committee there were some detailed issues that were not addressed in the Master Plan, such as: design guidelines, the intent being to go through the Urban Design Seminar Series; and the controversial aspects of specific road designs. However, in terms of laying out the broad plan, that was complete and the citizenry needed to concur. As to the next step for the Committee, she thought this was a decision the Committee needed to discuss with the Town Commission, as the MPSC functioned as an advisory committee to the Commission.

Chairperson Novak reiterated the Committee should get the broad version of the Master Plan was printed and then work on the finer details. A new Committee member would be joining them in March 1, 2011.

Town Manager Hoffman reminded the Committee there would be a third speaker, architect Gianni Feoli, who visited the Town and helped her understand the concept of "Miami Modern Design" of which the Town had a lot of. He was tentatively scheduled to speak on March 15, 2011, for an hour prior to the commencement of the MPSC meeting. He would discuss the prevalence of Miami modern design in Lauderdale-By-The-Sea and what it was precisely to facilitate a better understanding of the concept. She thanked Member Wetherington for bringing him to the Town's attention, noting Mr. Feoli was a colleague of hers.

Chairperson Novak estimated Committee discussion on the finer details in the broad version Master Plan could begin at the April MPSC meeting.

Member Evans wondered about the sidewalks the Town was informed it could remove and, if the Committee wished to recommend their removal to the Commission, should this be part of the detailed discussions of the Master Plan.

Town Manager Hoffman affirmed this would be appropriate.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon questioned if the Committee's preference would be to breakdown the Town into areas and discuss the components of each area identified.

Town Manager Hoffman pointed out this had already been done, with the three areas already identified. Simultaneously, the Town hired consultants Redevelopment Management Associates that specialized in economic redevelopment, and they were examining the Master Plan as it was currently, including the Committee's revisions and Commission's tweaks. She indicated the consultants would advise the Town from an economic standpoint on how realistic the Master Plan was, what were the barriers, opportunities, and if any of the Town's present practices could inhibit implementing the Plan. They would delineate what the Town's priorities should be from an economic development standpoint, and they would draft a five-year finance plan for the Town to implement. She said the consultant's work should be concluded by mid March, and they would make a presentation to the Town Commission to which the MPSC and the P&Z Board members would be invited along with the general population. Ms. Hoffman felt this would give everyone a considerable amount of information to digest and determine which projects the Town should start on first. She thought the MPSC's April or May meeting would be the appropriate time to begin discussions with regard to the more detailed aspects of the Master Plan.

Chairperson Novak recalled the Town had an upcoming meeting with the hoteliers that might affect the Master Plan.

Town Manager Hoffman stated the meeting was being held by the abovementioned consultants to get the hoteliers feedback on issues related to the Town's Master Plan and its economic and redevelopment. They would also be holding a meeting with the Town's retailers, and those meetings were scheduled for the coming Monday.

Chairperson Novak commented, despite Mr. Brandt and the P&Z Board's questioning whether the Town had a Master Plan or not, there was a Master Plan in place, though it was in the process of being finalized.

Town Manager Hoffman was unclear if Mr. Brandt's comments reflected the P&Z Board's opinion rather than just his own.

Mr. Brandt indicated his comments pertained to views expressed by individual members of both the P&Z Board and the Town Commission in reference to the Master Plan as the reason decisions seemed difficult to make. If the Master Plan was in place, this meant there were established guidelines by which to move forward and make decisions.

Member Eckblad inquired if the copy of Ordinance 2007-17, the earlier Master Plan approved by the Commission, that was in the backup was a document the Committee should be concerned about. If the Town Commission sought to adopt a new Master Plan, they should rescind the old ordinance; he was wondering why the document was included in the Committee's backup materials.

Chairperson Novak was unsure why the document was included in the backup.

\* \* \*

Member Eckblad asked if when the Committee devised a finalized El Mar plan, would Ocampo supply final drawings for the Committee and the public to view.

Town Manager Hoffman was unclear where the Town was going with Ocampo presently, as their design was very different from what the Committee recommended. Another issue pertaining to El Mar Drive was the Committee recommended the utilities be placed underground, and staff was gathering information the cost to do this. This information would be given to the Commission for a decision on how next to proceed, as this was an issue that could delay the El Mar project.

Member Booth observed if the cost to put the wires underground was very high, the Town would have to leave them aboveground.

Town Manager Hoffman pointed out this was a policy decision the Town Commission had to make and on a grand scale, as it affected all the other projects the Town hoped to do and their cost. At present, the Town had a considerable amount of money available for the various projects, so it was a matter of prioritization. Though she did not have the final audit figures, the amount was over \$10 million distributed in various cash, reserve and capital fund accounts.

Member Booth thought the Committee's job was to make recommendations; the Commission would then take a look at the big picture and decide how to proceed.

Member Eckblad recalled when Ocampo first did the presentation, they provided four options, and a combination of those four options to some extent portrayed what the Committee recommended. It seemed unnecessary to begin the process again, if the design was complete.

Chairperson Novak acknowledged the agenda discussion had moved onto item #2.

**Item #2: El Mar Drive Project**

- 1) Further review and discussion of the El Mar Drive Project

Mr. Bowman remarked the reason this item was on the MPSC agenda was due to the Committee's discussion at its last meeting; it was not clear which option the Committee selected. Thus, the current discussion was for clarification.

Chairperson Novak clarified the discussion was in reference to the lanes on El Mar Drive going north and south, whether there would be a multipurpose lane, and if it would be located on the east or west side. There was some debate as to whether the multipurpose lane should be made available for not only pedestrian and bicycle traffic, but vehicle traffic as well; there were supporters for both views.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon stated he reviewed the video of the previous meeting and, from what he recalled of the discussion, Member Kugler proposed a “compromise” that there should be two lanes on both sides of the road. One lane would be used primarily by cyclists and pedestrians but not vehicular traffic; there were still issues with allowing back-out traffic.

Member Eckblad was puzzled as to how one would keep vehicles out of the multipurpose lane.

Mr. Bowman pointed out option A shown in the backup was selected by the Committee.

Member Panitas noted having the vehicular traffic lane near the median made no sense, as most of the traffic was local traveling to motels, and they had to cross the other lane; it made no sense. He believed the only reason for having two lanes was to allow one for the use of pedestrian and bicycle traffic; and when there was a large event in the Town, the multi lane could be used for parking. This would satisfy those requesting a lane to walk or run in, as well as those who wished the median to remain as is. He attended the meeting at which the Commission was involved in the discussion, and it was determined if there was a multipurpose lane in which all traffic was allowed, having bikes was not permissible, as they could hit someone. He presented the Committee with a revised rendering of El Mar Drive, which he reviewed.

Member Booth expressed concern over having a bike lane, as vehicles backing out onto the road was a problem.

Member Panitas indicated every street had a bike lane and there were limited places to put it.

Member Booth acknowledged the subject of discussion was a hot topic, but she felt the situation could be alleviated if people were allowed to walk down the center. If there were two multipurpose lanes, placing one large stretch down the center for the joggers and put the bikers on the side, somewhat like a park, and less space would be lost.

Chairperson Novak questioned, given the size of the multipurpose lane, why the sidewalks were so wide.

Member Eckblad thought the reason people wanted two traffic lanes in each direction was in the event one became blocked; for instance, by a garbage truck in one of the lanes. Thus, if there was a blockage in one lane, it was still possible to use the multipurpose lane to go around the obstacle; however, it would not function as a through-traffic lane.

There was Committee discussion on the logistics of the size and utilization of the lanes for the most functionality.

Town Manager Hoffman stated the Town's traffic engineer indicated the Committee's original proposal for a multipurpose lane was feasible given the proposed width. There was no Department of Transportation (DOT) requirement that the multipurpose lane had to be located on the outside lane. On the issue of preventing cars from using the multipurpose lane, the Committee had recommended marking the lane in a different color to indicate its usage, raising the lane slightly, making it textured, etc.

Member Wetherington thanked Member Panitas for taking the time to do another rendering, as it represented her understanding of what the enhancements of the bike lane would be and was something she could definitely support.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon suggested voting to approve the final rendering going forward to the Town Commission for approval.

Chairperson Novak concurred.

Member Wetherington made a motion to accept Member Panitas' latest rendering presented to the Committee in the present meeting, moving it forward to the Town Commission for approval, seconded by Member Eckblad; the vote carried unanimously.

Town Manager Hoffman sought clarification on how wide the median would be.

Member Panitas replied the existing median was 20 feet; in the rendering, the median would be reduced to 14 feet to accommodate the bike lanes.

Mr. Brandt commented it seemed history was being repeated, as the four lane/two lane, multipurpose versus non-multipurpose debates were ongoing, just the people discussing them changed. The idea of the two lanes to four lanes and the multipurpose lane faltered due to a lack of public support.

Member Booth pointed out the process ended with the Commission; if they rejected the concept, and it kept getting sent back, the Committee would continue to make the recommendations they thought best. Thus, this matter should stay with the Commission for a final decision and not be sent back to the Committee.

Vice Mayor Stuart Dodd asked the Committee to reconsider its decision to send Member Panitas most recent rendering to the Commission very carefully. The Commission's decision not to put the concrete walkway to nowhere down the center of El Mar Drive was based on the dais having no desire to lose the green space. He remarked the Committee was now putting forward a recommendation that advocated reducing the green space from 20 feet to 14 feet. As a member of the Town Commission, he had no wish to spoil the situation, but it would be very difficult for the Commission to support the Committee's recommendation if it removed six feet of one of the Town's biggest assets. He was unsure why there was a lack of support for the

multipurpose lane and the bike lane, as the 20-feet of green space could still be retained. These were his personal opinions, and he would give the Committee's recommendations the proper consideration when they were brought before the dais for a vote; he thanked the Committee for their time, work and recommendations.

Member Booth thought the Commission was at liberty to veto any recommendations made by the Committee, as it was the right of the general community to reject them.

Member Panitas stated it would not be the "end of the world" if the Commission rejected the Committee's recommendations, as there were other options. The idea of removing six feet out of the median was not likely to be noticed very much, as 14 feet was still a significant width. He mentioned another possibility was to dedicate three of the ten feet for the multipurpose lane to a bike lane. The best solution was to send the rendering taking the six feet from the existing 20-foot median and, if the Commission rejected the recommendation, they could include bikes as part of the uses in the multipurpose lane.

Chairperson Novak restated his concerns with backing out onto El Mar Drive and the safety issues that presented, particularly if bikes were introduced in the mix.

Member Booth concurred, noting a similar situation existing along A1A, and this concerned her greatly. The bikes could be diverted along A1A where there were two existing bike lanes.

Member Panitas felt it necessary to include bikes, as there were many people biking in the mornings, and many riders preferred the scenery of El Mar Drive to A1A.

### **Item #3: Discussion on items to be placed on future agendas**

Chairperson Novak commented items the Committee wished placed on future agendas should be discussed at meetings to facilitate staff's ability to prepare the MPSC agenda.

Member Booth understood the next step for the MPSC was to discuss the details within the Master Plan.

Town Manager Hoffman said such a discussion at the March meeting was premature.

Member Wetherington recalled two meetings prior a Committee member mentioned the possibility of considering a Lauderdale-By-The-Sea green market. She contacted the people in Las Olas and Coral Ridge, and they indicated a willingness to come to the Town and meet with staff to discuss the layout, as well as make a small presentation to the Committee.

Chairperson Novak believed it was he that brought up the idea of the green market, stating he thought it could be held on El Prado; when it was held in the past, it was a relatively successful event before it got somewhat political between the merchants.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon wished to discuss the procedure for placing items on the Committee agenda. For instance, there should be a deadline by which a matter for discussion should be submitted to staff to allow time for them to put it together and include any backup materials. He felt a policy should be devised, requiring a deadline by which items could be submitted to staff, including backup materials; for example, a week prior to the next meeting.

Chairperson Novak concurred.

Member Booth expressed some confusion as to what the MPSC should be doing. For instance, if staff created an agenda for the March meeting, what would the items be.

Co-Chairperson Malkoon thought a lot of what the Committee would be doing was being discussed, as evidenced by the Town's hiring economic and redevelopment consultants whose findings would be presented to the Town Commission, staff, the Committee, etc.

Chairperson Novak agreed, stating after listening to the presenter on March 1, perhaps the Committee could begin some discussion at its next meeting.

Member Booth hoped everyone would attend the March 1 meeting.

Chairperson Novak inquired as to the time staff needed in terms of receiving agenda requests and backup material prior to the next Committee meeting.

Town Manager Hoffman responded if Committee members could get the information to staff a week, preferably ten days prior of the date of the next meeting, that would suffice. She explained individual members of the Committee sent staff emails requesting certain items be placed on the agenda, after which staff would meet with the Committee Chair to discuss what items to include on the agenda. She understood Chairperson Novak was requesting that, from henceforth, no items should be placed on the Committee's agenda unless the group, as a whole, agreed the item(s) should be put on the agenda or that the item was something that naturally flowed from what the Committee did already. For instance, Member Booth mentioned wanting the topic of a green market for the town placed on the agenda, which she assumed would be planned for the next year. They explored the possibility of holding a green market at the staff level and realized there was no way to organize and put on such an event and do it well in the present year, as the end of the green market season was April. She reminded the Committee one of the comments made in the recommendations in the Master Plan updates was the Town should program El Prado Park more.

Member Wetherington understood the purpose of the Committee, upon its being reactivated, was to develop a Master Plan that would be presented to the community. The Plan would be improved, redesigned and enhanced for the community to reach

concurrency as to the Master Plan for the Town; this was the Committee's mission, and it appeared this mission was incomplete.

Town Manager Hoffman pointed out she did not have that portion of the Charter that set forth the guidelines of the MPSC and its responsibilities.

Member Wetherington commented holding a green market in the Town was an absolutely wonderful idea, but she was unsure if such an event was in the scope of the Committee to recommend. If the Commission tasked the Committee to continue to work, prioritize and help implement the Master Plan, the decision on a green market was not her understanding of the purpose of the MPSC.

Town Manager Hoffman suggested getting clarification from the Town Commission on what they saw the role of the MPSC.

Member Wetherington felt one of the roles of the Committee might be to engage the community and get buy in and community support for the Committee's recommendations once approved by the Commission.

Town Manager Hoffman queried, since there would be a series of community meetings to get public input on the Master Plan, would individual Committee members be willing to participate in such meetings as facilitators. As a facilitator, members would have to leave their opinions at the door and facilitate citizen discussions of the various issues or ideas the Committee put on the table. She invited any Committee members who felt they might be good facilitators to contact her, as she would greatly appreciate their participation in the community feedback sessions.

Member Evans thought Ms. Hoffman was already a good facilitator.

Member Wetherington expressed her willingness to follow the Commission's directive and accomplish what they hoped the MPSC would achieve. It seemed, perhaps, the tasking for the Committee would be to support the recommendations they made as a group. She believed it might be in the best interest of the community for the Committee to explain how they arrived at their decisions, as this could help garner support for the Committee's recommendations.

Town Manager Hoffman noted a facilitator could always explain the idea behind a concept but should avoid getting into an argument with anyone. There was no way of knowing how large the meetings would be, but some could be held at the present location, while others could be held elsewhere; the number of meeting places were limited in the Town.

Member Evans said she would be willing to go into the condominiums and get feedback on the Master Plan.

Town Manager Hoffman thought it was better to get such feedback in a controlled setting, as there needed to be an established format that should be followed to ensure the public input was given freely, recorded and accurately reflected. This did not mean a meeting could not be conducted in a meeting room at a condominium, as people from the particular local area could be invited to attend.

Chairperson Novak wished to know, in light of Ms. Hoffman's statement that a green market was unlikely for the present year, what items would be discussed at the March 15 meeting.

Member Evans thought it best to come up with a plan on how to get the Master Plan circulated in the public. She asked if the Commission would vote on the revised Master Plan at the next Commission meeting, due to it being unlikely they'll support the Committee's recommended change to the median on El Mar Drive.

Town Manager Hoffman was unsure on which Commission meeting agenda the matter would be voted on.

Member Rogers remarked by the next meeting, the Committee would have heard from two more speakers. It seemed the Committee might be in a position to begin looking at details in the Master Plan.

Member Wetherington concurred.

Chairperson Novak suggested, for the next Committee agenda, the Committee could discuss some of the information supplied by the guest speakers, focusing on how the Master Plan would be affected.

Member Evans requested the issue of bathrooms be included on the next agenda. She believed once the Committee received a copy of the final draft of the Master Plan, there would most likely be things for discussion.

## VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.