

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Shore Protection Board was called to order on Thursday, February 23, 2012, at 8:30 a.m. in Town Council Chambers.

II. ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Chairman E. Llwyd Ecclestone, Vice Chair Bobbie Lindsay Buck, Mr. Kane Baker, Mr. Pat Cooper, Mr. Gerald Frank, Mr. Lewis Katz, and Mr. Lee David Goldstein.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Ecclestone led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda was made by Board Member Frank, seconded by Board Member Goldstein, and unanimously approved.

V. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 26, 2012, MEETING

Board Member Frank asked that lines 26-29 on page 2 of the minutes regarding the Sand Transfer Plant be omitted as he believed it was a misunderstanding of the question.

Motion to approve the minutes of the January 26, 2012, meeting with the removal of lines 26-29 on page 2 was made by Board Member Frank, seconded by Board Member Goldstein, and unanimously approved.

VI. RECOMMENDATION TO TOWN COUNCIL REGARDING THE SCOPE, COST, AND FUNDING OF THE TOWN'S COASTAL PROGRAM [Peter B. Elwell, Town Manager]

Larry Goldberg, 3360 South Ocean Boulevard, addressed the Board regarding the beach restoration program saying that some of the line items needed for shore protection were eliminated leaving a plan that had no protection, minimal protection, or dunes only, which doesn't provide shore protection.

Allen Wyett, 1145 North Lake Way, spoke about the errors made in the past and suggested the Task Force create an experimental area using Bahamian sand.

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

1 Town Manager Peter Elwell stated that the plan that was being presented was a
2 reasonable and viable approach based on history, work with the Shore Protection Board,
3 and input from the community including Ms. Erickson. He spoke about the successful
4 projects over the past twenty years. He reported that the beach was in better shape than
5 two decades ago, but it was an ongoing effort and the work would never be done.
6

7 Board Member Goldstein asked that the article in the Palm Beach Daily News on
8 February 20, 2012, by William Kelly be entered into the record.
9

10 *"Local governments' efforts to fight erosion on Florida's beaches are*
11 *hampered by a flawed regulatory system, Jeff Atwater, the state's chief*
12 *financial officer, said Monday.*
13

14 *"The system is designed for failure," Atwater told a Palm Beach Civic*
15 *Association audience at the Flagler Museum. "There are far too many*
16 *partners who have to be persuaded" to agree on sand grain size, offshore*
17 *dredge sites, impacts to nesting sea turtles and other environmental*
18 *consequences, he said.*
19

20 *Tougher mitigation standards can force local governments to spend*
21 *millions of dollars to compensate for lost marine habitat, Atwater said.*
22

23 *Local governments are required to undergo costly and lengthy reviews*
24 *before they can obtain state and federal environmental permits required to*
25 *fill beaches or install stand-trapping devices.*
26

27 *In 2008, environmental groups mounted a legal challenge that resulted in*
28 *the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's denial of a permit*
29 *the Town of Palm Beach sought to nourish Reach 8 and protect coastal*
30 *properties south of the Lake Worth Pier. The town is seeking state and*
31 *federal permission for a more modest fill at Reach 8.*
32

33 *Palm Beach County Commissioners have been trying to determine for years*
34 *how best to safeguard county beaches, especially Singer Island, from rapid*
35 *erosion. Sand has been dumped on Singer Island eight times during the past*
36 *11 years, but that is only a temporary solution.*
37

38 *Faced with concerns over environmental impacts, commissioners have*
39 *killed proposals to build rock breakwaters and a rock jetty to protect Singer*
40 *Island.*
41

42 *"I am now convinced that we should let one agency be accountable" for*
43 *regulating coastal projects, Atwater said. "When you have 15 agencies that*
44 *are accountable, you get nothing. That's where we're at."*
45

46 *If the beaches disappear, there will be no sea turtle nests to protect, he said.*
47

48 *"The end result should not be a sea wall from St. Augustine to Key West,"*
49 *Atwater said.*
50

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

The Town of Palm Beach has estimated its coastal plan will cost about \$6 million annually over the next 10 years. The county has said its program costs \$14 million a year. Both the town and county have historically relied on state and federal aid to help fund projects.

But in today's tight budget climate, Town Manager Peter Elwell has said the town should no longer rely on state or federal aid when planning nourishments or other beach work.

Atwater said more local governments are competing for scarce beach aid dollars.

Atwater, R-North Palm Beach, is a former state representative and state senator who represented parts of Palm Beach and Broward counties.

He was Florida Senate president from 2008 to 2010, when he was elected chief financial officer."

Paul Brazil, Director of Public Works, reviewed the ten year plan by line number. He explained that the numbers were not sequential because the original numbering system was still in place. He further explained that unencumbered funds were money from the original budget that had not been spent or were not tied up in a purchase order. He reminded the Board that the majority of the plan was a planning document but the first column would be a recommendation to the Town Council for funding for the FY13 budget.

Line item #4, Groin Rehabilitation (Reaches 2-6) - Board Member Goldstein suggested a budget be established to rehabilitate the existing groins where needed. Chair Ecclestone proposed the unencumbered \$200,000 be utilized to get hard figures on the cost for permitting to be later conducted by Isiminger & Stubbs Engineering, Inc. He asked staff to come back at the next meeting with a proposal. Town Manager Elwell summarized the recommendation saying that a portion of the \$200,000 unexpended under line item 4 would be used to do a detailed plan prioritizing the order of the groins, create drawings, and move into a permit process. He advised that the Board would need to program into the Plan the cost for implementing the rehabilitation program. Chair Ecclestone said that he would like to put \$200,000 in the Plan for plans and permitting of the groins in the north end and \$500,000 a year for rehabilitation of the groins in a format to be agreed upon.

Motion was made by Board Member Goldstein and seconded by Board Member Baker to put the \$200,000 unencumbered funds from line 4 back into the Plan for a detailed plan prioritizing the order of the groins, to create drawings, and move into the permitting process. Additionally, \$500,000 a year would be added for rehabilitation of the groins.

Board Member Cooper spoke about the need to hold the sand longer, the cost of groins, and mitigation issues. He said it was a balancing act and he would like a full discussion about groins and how it would help arrest the movement of sand.

1
2 Vice Chair Lindsay Buck agreed. She stated that her understanding was that rehabbing
3 the old straight groins would result in no additional significant protection but would
4 primarily be a recreational benefit. She proposed getting a second opinion on
5 rehabilitating the groins and suggested using the \$200,000 to study the issue further. She
6 expressed concern with putting \$5 million in the Plan without a better understanding of
7 the benefits of the metal groins.
8

9 **The motion was amended to eliminate the \$500,000 a year for the rehabilitation**
10 **work but include the \$200,000 for the drawings, plans, a second opinion on**
11 **rehabilitating the groins, and to submit an application to the U.S. Army Corps of**
12 **Engineers (Corps).**
13

14 Town Manager Elwell stated that staff could provide the phases of the work including the
15 analytical work before the Board makes a commitment on the design and permitting.
16

17 Board Member Cooper asked about privately owned groins. Town Manager Elwell
18 answered that the Town could pursue a program to rehabilitate private groins but
19 easements would be required from the property owners.
20

21 **The motion as amended was approved unanimously.**
22

23 Lines 12-15, Sand Transfer Plant – Vice Chair Lindsay Buck commented that the budget
24 included no money for Reach 2, which was the only section of beach which had
25 historically lost volumetric levels of sand over time. She stated that the Town was
26 depending upon a positive settlement with the Federal government to fund Phase 2 of the
27 Sand Transfer Plant and requested that there be a notation that this item would be
28 revisited if a satisfactory outcome was not achieved with the Federal government.
29

30 **Motion was made by Board Member Goldstein and seconded by Vice Chair Lindsay**
31 **Buck that if the settlement with the Federal government was not positive, that**
32 **funding for phase 2 of the Sand Transfer Plant would be added to the budget.**
33

34 Town Manager Elwell agreed that it was essential to the success of the program that the
35 sand from the Inlet be bypassed successfully but cautioned about making a commitment
36 in the Plan to something that was not known. He suggested that if the Town does not
37 receive everything it was seeking in the litigation with the Federal government, that the
38 Board then revisit what should be done.
39

40 Chair Ecclestone stated that it was a bondable cost. Town Manager Elwell advised that
41 there may be elements that are not bondable.
42

43 **The motion was amended to state that the Shore Protection Board would revisit the**
44 **scope and cost of the Town's efforts to improve the effectiveness of sand bypassing**
45 **at Lake Worth Inlet to the degree that may necessary if the Federal government**

1 **does not provide all the funding and assistance that the Town is seeking through the**
2 **on-going litigation.**

3
4 In response to a question from Chair Ecclestone, Mr. Brazil reported that the Town was
5 approved for the permitting effort that would lead to a set of plans and would come back
6 to the Shore Protection Board and Town Council for approval of the funds. Town
7 Manager Elwell added that if any significant changes occur in the permitting process, the
8 design and parameters of the plan would be brought back to the Board before the project
9 was sent out to bid. A discussion followed.

10
11 **The motion as amended was unanimously approved.**

12
13 Line 18, Maint Dredge Sand Permitting Placement Extension – Mr. Brazil explained that
14 the permit was to extend the placement area that the Corps used when placing sand on the
15 dry beach. He further explained that the issue was if the placement could be extended
16 further south or to other areas of the Town. He said that the Town was trying to modify
17 the Corps' permit for disposal. Town Manager Elwell advised that staff would come back
18 to the Board with the scope of the work and engagement of a consultant to spend the
19 funds. In response to a question from Board Member Cooper, Town Manager Elwell
20 stated that the Town would have to pay some incremental cost for the next major
21 dredging effort.

22
23 Line 19, Biological Monitoring (0.8 acre reef) – Mr. Brazil reported that Rob Weber,
24 Coastal Coordinator, spoke with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and
25 they agreed to do a trial with coral transplant, and it was successful. He said it was much
26 less expensive than the traditional work that had been done and may set a precedent for
27 the future. The Board commended Mr. Weber.

28
29 Lines 24, 25 & 26, Reach 2 Dune Restoration Permitting Effort – Mr. Brazil advised that
30 these items were dropped from the Plan due to money issues. He said it was originally for
31 a dune project in Reach 2, possibly with a truck haul. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck stated
32 that where the beach is narrow, which is most of Reach 2, the dune would be washed
33 away. She further stated that later, when a more effective bypassing plan is put together,
34 the Board could take another look at a project and as the beach builds up in front of the
35 seawalls, it would be logical to build dunes.

36
37 Line 29, Reach 3/4 (Mid-Town) Beach Renourishment Permitting – Mr. Brazil stated that
38 a small restoration project had been planned for Mid-Town in 2015. He explained the
39 reason for the small project was that the schedule had been to build Mid-Town and Reach
40 7 in the same year which would have been a large spike in the anticipated budget. He
41 further explained that because Mid-Town has been done repetitively, the proposal was to
42 do a smaller project at Mid-Town (\$3.3 million) to change the cycle. He reported that
43 there is a groin field at Mid-Town now with a hot spot at the very south end which needs
44 a small groin to stabilize the area because it erodes back to the seawall. He stated that the
45 groin would be built as part of the smaller project. There was discussion on the project.

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

1 There was discussion regarding feeder beaches.

2
3 Board Member Katz asked if the work the State's FDOT did to reinforce A1A in Reach 6
4 impacted the flow of sand especially north of Reach 7. Mr. Weber answered that the issue
5 was being reviewed by Mike Walther in the advance design for Reach 7 including the
6 influence of the monster groin in Reach 5, the influence of the revetment along Reach 6,
7 and the other structures in Reach 6. He stated that the revetment as well other coastal
8 structures and nearshore rock influence the area.

9
10 Karyn Erickson of Erickson Consulting Engineers expressed concern with the cost
11 figures in the Plan. She suggested the Board adopt the budget for FY2013 but wait on the
12 FY14 budget to hear the true costs from the consultants in March and April. She said that
13 a 20% contingency should be included on the bottom line for future projects. She spoke
14 about Aragonite sand and the choice of sand affecting the costs. She explained that the
15 heavier sand and steeper shape of the beach due to the coarseness of the sand would
16 greatly impact sand volumes, which would also affect the mitigation. She advised that
17 rather than put any on the Inlet dredging sand on Reach 4 or Reach 3, it should all be
18 designated for Reaches 2 and 8 which have the most sensitive hardbottom. She suggested
19 that the Town use an engineer with experience on how Aragonite shapes, moves and
20 performs and take that analysis to the permitting agencies. She said she believed that
21 more cores were needed from the offshore sand source and that rather than going with the
22 minimum spacing required by DEP, take specific cores on the outer edge of the borrow
23 site to locate the best quality of sand within the site. She stated that no sand nourishment
24 or structures were funded in the Plan for Reach 8 and recommended that the March 22
25 Shore Protection Board meeting focus on what should be done rather than only a dune
26 restoration project. She spoke about the need for structures. She suggested the Board hold
27 off on approval of the Plan until the costs were received for future years but if the Board
28 chose to not postpone approval of the Plan, she recommended money be added for
29 structures for Reach 7 and Reach 8.

30
31 Town Manager Elwell responded to Ms. Erickson's comments saying that the Town
32 Council President had asked that the Board to send a Plan to the Town Council by March.
33 He stated that the Plan would recommend what should be done in the first year with
34 everything else more or less conceptual. He agreed that there were significant issues that
35 the Board would be addressing in March and April and said that everything would be
36 subject to adaptive management.

37
38 Chair Ecclestone responded that the Board had delayed the Plan for several months and
39 he believed a Plan should be submitted to the Town Council as they requested.

40
41 Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked if more cores should be taken. Dr. Michael Jenkins of
42 Applied Technology Management (ATM) replied that the current data collected exceeded
43 state standards. He noted that Coastal Technology Corporation (Coastal Tech) was
44 working on a detailed bar area design and he would defer to them regarding if more data
45 is needed. Town Manager Elwell stated that it was anticipated that the funds left from the

1 sand search (\$146,000) would be used for further examination of Aragonite, if that was
2 the decision of the Board.

3
4 Vice Chair Lindsay Buck agreed with the Ms. Erickson's point regarding the placement
5 of the dredged sand in Reach 2 and Reach 8 before Mid-Town.

6
7 Board Member Goldstein recommended the Board do a sample template in Reach 8 using
8 Aragonite sand. He asked Ms. Erickson the cost. Ms. Erickson answered that a
9 worthwhile test would be between 100,000-150,000 cubic yards.

10
11 Richard Hunegs, 3360 South Ocean Boulevard, spoke on behalf of Save Our Shores and
12 Northern Alliance of Palm Beach saying that a test area would be appropriate and
13 necessary. He asked that the Board to look again at the amount of sand and size of
14 particles. He said there is some possibility of success in Reach 7 but none in Reach 8.
15

VII. SAND TRANSFER PLANT PHASE II WORKSHOP

TIME CERTAIN 10:30 AM

- A. Introduction by Town Staff
- B. Presentation by Applied Technology & Management, Inc.
- C. Communications from Shore Protection Board Members
- D. Communications from Citizens
- E. Scheduling of Future Neighborhood Meetings

16
17 Chair Ecclestone opened the public workshop on the Sand Transfer Plant, Phase II.

18
19 Dr. Michael Jenkins of Applied Technology and Management, Inc. gave a Powerpoint
20 presentation reviewing the issues with the Inlet and the lack of sand in Reach 2. He stated
21 that the proposal was for a second discharge between R-78 and R-80 with a nearshore
22 location on the sandbar. He reviewed alternatives: status quo, build a second discharge, or
23 mechanically move the sand from Reach 1 to Reach 2. He showed pictures of the current
24 discharge pipe and what the proposed discharge would look like off of the beach.
25

26 Sanford Kuvin, 149 East Inlet Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed second
27 discharge regarding the origin of the proposed second pipe, the nodal point, the Town's
28 response to the DEP and the Corps for additional information, the authenticity of the \$4
29 million cost for the project, and if any of the monies would be reimbursed by the Federal
30 government. He stated that the project was inefficient, not cost effective, had no coastal
31 engineering support, as yet, and there were severe potential hazards. Dr. Jenkins
32 responded that the Town was preparing the response to the regulatory agencies but was
33 waiting until after the public workshop to submit it.
34

35 Connie Gasque, 159 Root Trail, expressed concern with the impact on the hardbottom in
36 Reach 2. She stated that it was an expensive experiment.

37
38 Peter Pettie, 801 S. Olive, West Palm Beach, spoke about mitigation issues, the history

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

of mitigation in Reaches 5, 7 and 8, and the change in the stated amount of hardbottom in Reach 2.

David Leavitt, 1420 Via Manana, spoke in opposition to the discharge pipe saying that there was now a huge sand bar in the water.

Larry Goldberg, 3360 South Ocean Boulevard, asked the yardage that would be available to transfer, how much shore protection would residents get from the sand placed and would it be real protection, would the sand bypass the hardbottom, and if there would be mitigation. He also why the hardbottom on Reach 2 could be covered but not the hardbottom on Reach 8.

Bill Bryan, 1350 North Ocean Boulevard, expressed concern with the look of the current discharge pipe and stated that it would be more palatable with pipe in water. He asked about moving the sand that was dredged by barge to a location further south. Town Manager Elwell spoke about the efforts of the Town and Corps to get the permitted disposal area in Reach 1 moved further down into Reach 2. He stated that the engineers had informed the Town that creating the second discharge and moving the disposal area further south would be better for the shoreline and would provide a sand resource for the benefit of the entire Town. He stated that the Town could look further at the idea of moving the sand by barge. Mr. Brazil noted that the sand would have to be offloaded and shaped using heavy equipment. He said he didn't know if it would be as cost effective. Dr. Jenkins added that there were some technical constraints with barges regarding scheduling when to have a barge there to fill and issues with the nearshore hardbottom.

Michael Small, 156 E. Inlet Drive, said he would oppose anything that would diminish the recreational traffic on the beach. He asked about the possibility of increasing the resource area. Mr. Brazil responded that the Town would like to create a bigger sand trap on the north side of the Inlet partnering with the Corps because it would minimize the number of times they had to dredge.

Chair Ecclestone thanked everyone for their thoughts and suggestions. Town Manager Elwell advised that staff would meet with north end residents who are most affected by the second pipe and get additional input about alternatives that are being explored.

Mr. Goldberg suggested a workshop on the Reach 7 and Reach 8 permitting process with diagrams would be very helpful.

VI. RECOMMENDATION TO TOWN COUNCIL REGARDING THE SCOPE, COST, AND FUNDING OF THE TOWN'S COASTAL PROGRAM [Peter B. Elwell, Town Manager]

Mr. Brazil continued his review of the Coastal Program.

Board Member Katz asked that an asterisk be placed in the Plan for Reach 7 to remind the Board that as the project gets closer to reality with better information on the design and cost, the Board would reevaluate it. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck commented that there

1 was nothing in the budget for phase 2. She stated that all the numbers were estimates and
2 the Town Council understood that the numbers would go up or down based on the actual
3 project. Board Member Katz explained that Coastal Tech would present a project design
4 to the Board in March. He said that the addition of one or two structures could make a
5 difference of \$3 million. He asked that the Plan either include the best estimate for the
6 work or an asterisk to put the Town Council on notice that there may be a change. Town
7 Manager Elwell stated that the Board would be addressing significant substantive
8 questions in the near term (next couple of months) that might significantly change the
9 cost. He said he believed that the point was well taken that the degree of uncertainty that
10 could run into several million dollars in a particular reach was enough to be worth a
11 footnote.

12
13 **Motion was made by Board Member Goldstein and seconded by Board Member**
14 **Katz to put asterisks on the Plan on Reach 7 and Reach 8 to note that there may be**
15 **a change. The motion was unanimously approved.**
16

17 Mr. Goldstein stated that he was hoping to get groins in front of Sloan's Curve and
18 Phipps Park in Reach 7 which would be extra money.
19

20 Line 53, Reach 8, South of the Lake Worth Pier, Critical Beach Erosion Designation –
21 Mr. Brazil reported that staff would continue to pursue a critically eroded beach
22 designation for the area but had been unsuccessful in the past. He explained that the DEP
23 would send someone out physically to survey the area and if they deem the buildings in
24 the area to be threatened, it could be deemed critically eroded. He reported that the
25 sections of the beach north and south are critically eroded. In response to a question from
26 Chair Ecclestone, he stated that the EIS would lay the groundwork for the project
27 alternatives that were viable and would mostly help with shared reimbursement by the
28 state and need issues.
29

30 Line 58, Reach 8, South of the Lake Worth Pier, Structures Study (Environmental Impact
31 Statement (EIS)) – Mr. Brazil stated that the Town Council approved a budget of \$.5
32 million to join Palm Beach County for a combined EIS project. He reported that the
33 Town had received a letter confirming that the County was pulling out of the project. He
34 said he would report back in March about the ramifications and alternatives for the Town
35 to move forward or stop work. He stated that the decision of the Board could drastically
36 change the budget for Reach 8. In response to a question from Chair Ecclestone, Town
37 Manager Elwell reminded the Board members that they had requested staff get numbers
38 for the additional EIS work the Town needed as part of the beach nourishment
39 permitting, either as a sand related EIS or as a structures related EIS. Chair Ecclestone
40 stated he would like to look at both options. Town Manager Elwell reported that because
41 the County had stopped the project, the Town would need to pick it up. Board Member
42 Cooper noted that there should be unencumbered money in the line item. Town Manager
43 Elwell responded that the money was currently encumbered but a lot had been unspent.
44 He said that at the next meeting, he would inform the Board of the amount that was not
45 spent.
46

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

1 Mr. Brazil completed his review of the Plan stating that the raw totals for the ten-year
2 Plan was \$67,266,750 of which \$12,200,000 was bondable which left the ten year total
3 not bonded at \$55,066,750. He reported that the bondable payback annual cost (debt
4 service) was \$813,333 over 30 years and the average annual cost of the program without
5 the bondables was \$5.5 million. He further reported that the average annual cost
6 including the bonding was \$6,320,008.

7
8 **Motion was made by Board Member Goldstein and seconded by Board Member**
9 **Katz to approve the FY2013 Proposed Coastal Management Program as presented**
10 **with the noted amendments.**

11
12 Mr. Hunegs commented on the Plan. He asked why the Town did not get with the other
13 beach communities and work together as a strong force. He addressed issues regarding
14 dune restoration and permanent structures. Mr. Brazil responded that the Town had
15 joined with Palm Beach County and all the communities south of the Town to look at a
16 global project which included structures. He stated that County had pulled out of the
17 project. There was discussion regarding the littoral movement of sand from Singer Island.

18
19 Mr. Hunegs asked about protecting the north end beach with the Sand Transfer Plant
20 extension. Town Manager Elwell explained that there would be two outfalls and when it
21 was appropriate, sand would be pumped out of the second outfall to move sand more
22 quickly into the littoral drift. He added that at times the first outfall would be used to
23 stabilize the beach from eroding.

24
25 Ms. Erickson asked for the CAD drawings and sand based design for Reach 8.

26
27 Board Member Cooper asked about a project in Reach 6 to feed Reach 7. Town Manager
28 Elwell replied that it would be desirable but he cautioned about doing it in isolation and
29 putting more effort and money into a new project. He stated that there would be some
30 consideration of the concept in the design work related to Reach 7 and how is it impacted
31 by Reaches 5 and 6.

32
33 Town Manager Elwell clarified that the Board would be recommending to the Town
34 Council the approval of the FY13 column as a budgeted plan to be funded and pursued,
35 and for FY14 and beyond, the Board would recommend the Ten-Year Coastal Protection
36 Plan for consideration by the Town Council subject to further review and modifications.

37
38 **The motion to approve the FY2013 Proposed Coastal Management Program as**
39 **amended was unanimously approved.**
40

41
42 **IX. REVIEW OF BAHAMIAN SAND AS A POTENTIAL SOURCE FOR FUTURE TOWN**
43 **BEACH NOURISHMENT PROJECTS [Robert Weber, Coastal Coordinator]**
44

45 Chair Ecclestone noted that the Bahamian sand memorandum was included in the back
46 up material for the meeting. There were no questions regarding the memorandum.

X. SHORELINE CONDITION ASSESSMENT [Robert Weber, Coastal Coordinator]

Mr. Weber gave a Powerpoint presentation on the shoreline condition. He reported that the beach at Phipps Ocean Park was in an eroded state and was a hot spot. He said that coastal engineering alternatives to address the hot spot would be presented to the Shore Protection Board in March. He stated that it was not indicative of the Town-wide situation. He reported that the southerly portion of Reach 4 had narrowed and he would monitor it. He said that he was encouraged that the revetment in Reach 2 was buried by sand.

XI. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS - 3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE

Suzanne Wean, 2275 South Ocean Boulevard, addressed the Board stating that she lived at The Reef and could not access the beach. She asked what could be done. Mr. Brazil advised Ms. Wean to contact Mark Tatum, the local DEP representative. He explained that a field permit would be needed to reconstruct the stairs to the beach and a building permit from the Town of Palm Beach Planning, Zoning, and Building Department. He said there is no short-term solution for reconstructing the beach. He spoke about the issues at the beach.

XII. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEMBERS

Regarding the second discharge for the Sand Transfer Plant, Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked if the 250 cubic yards per hour coming out of the pipe would be on dry beach or in the water. Dr. Jenkins answered that the volume would be the same on dry beach or water. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked if the mitigation would be more stringent for placing the pipe in the water than on the dry beach. Dr. Jenkins answered he would have to consult with the DEP. Town Manager Elwell added that there was a concern that there might be more impacts and, therefore, more mitigation if the outfall is in the water than if on dry land and that impact would be assessed. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked for the smallest possible profile for the pipe. Dr. Jenkins responded that he would look into it but it would have to be an elevated pipe. Town Manager Elwell stated that staff had explored screening close to the pipe but it was not possible. He further stated there could be some screening in the dune area but the actual location could not be camouflaged.

Chair Ecclestone asked about the effectiveness of getting the sand further south whether on the beach or offshore. Town Manager Elwell stated that there were three variables working against each other: cost, effectiveness and environmental impacts.

Vice Chair Lindsay Buck asked if only one-third of the approximate 150,000 cubic yards that are bypassed each year would be moved down to Reach 2. She commented that it would take twenty years to get the same amount of sand on Reach 2 that was truck hauled to Reach 7. Mr. Brazil explained that it would be the same result if the sand was physically moved or if there was a second discharge. He said that it was a balancing act

**MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012**

of recession versus positive gains and of effectiveness and mitigation impact. Vice Chair Lindsay Buck said she believed that the community wanted a more fair and equitable sharing of the sand that is bypassed so that Reach 2, which is severely eroded, gets wider. She said it would be helpful if staff could quantify some of this information to clarify to residents how much would be coming across and if half of it was moved, what would it mean: would the beach be 10' wider or 20' wider and for how long. Mr. Brazil responded that the information was very technical, and he would try to distill it and bring the specific information back to the Board. Town Manager Elwell cautioned that the next report could be more technical but staff could not say that the beach would be 10' wider or 20' wider.

Board Member Frank suggested that some of the sand dredged from the Inlet could be placed on Reach 1 which could compensate for the sand that would be discharged from the second outlet of the Sand Transfer Plant. He also suggested that rocks or limestone could be built around or close to the discharge pipe to help it look more natural.

Board Member Kane stated that the main reason to keep beaches in good shape was to maintain the infrastructure of the Town. He commended the Board and staff for trying to use different methods and systems to cure the problems with the sand. He said there was no reason the Town could not work with sand in the system, in the littoral drift, to fix the problems.

Board Member Katz said he was impressed with the relationship between Town staff and Ms. Erickson which resulted in the Coastal Protection Plan.

XIII. 2012 SPB MEETINGS [Peter B. Elwell, Town Manager]

A. Topics for Future Meetings

- a. Recommendation to Town Council Regarding Reach 8: Short Term and Long Term Coastal Management Efforts
- b. Phipps Ocean Park/Reach 7 Advanced Design Results
- c. Recommendation to Town Council Regarding Reach 7 Permitting
- d. Florida Statutes Consultants Competitive Negotiations Act (CCNA) Pre-Qualifications Selection Process For Coastal Engineering Consultants
- e. FY 2013 Coastal Program Budget
- f. Offshore Dredging Technologies Overview

B. Schedule

- a. March 22, 2012
- b. April 26, 2012

Town Manager Elwell stated that the next meetings would be held on March 22 and April 26. He further stated that a proposal relating to the groin analysis and prioritization would be added to the list of future topics.

MINUTES OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING
HELD ON THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2012

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

APPROVED:



E. Llwyd Ecclestone
Chairman