



# TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Office of the Town Clerk

## REPORT OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING

Wednesday, September 10, 1997  
1:30 P.M.

At  
South Fire-Rescue Station  
2185 South Ocean Boulevard

### I. CALL TO ORDER

The Meeting of the Shore Protection Board was called to order at 1:30 p.m. on September 10, 1997 in the South Fire-Rescue Station Meeting Room.

### II. ROLL CALL

On roll call, the following were in attendance: Chairman Garrison D. Lickle, Vice Chairman George M. Moffett, II, Board Members Wayne F. Dimm, Charles C. Isiminger, and Joel Martino. Board Member Eileen C. Curran arrived at 2:25 P.M. Absent from the meeting were Board Members Edward Hennessy, Jr., Gerald H. Levy, and Richard Raffo. Also in attendance were Town of South Palm Beach Mayor Margot Roberts, Town of South Palm Beach Commissioner Ernest Muro, Manalapan Town Manager Charles Helm, Lantana Director of Marine Safety/Sports Complex Dan Reidy, City of Lake Worth Projects Engineer Ray Smith, Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management Engineering Assistant III Bob Clinger, Applied Technology & Management Vice President Dave Decker, Applied Technology & Management Vice President Karyn Erickson, and Applied Technology & Management Senior Engineer Mike Barnett. Staff from the Town of Palm Beach in attendance for all or part of the meeting were: Town Manager Robert Doney, Assistant Town Manager Peter Elwell, Director of Public Works Al Dusey, and Susan Eichhorn from the Office of the Town Clerk.

## **II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda was approved as printed, through motion of Vice Chairman Moffett, seconded by Board Member Joel Martino.

## **IV. CONSIDERATION OF SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING REPORT FOR MEETING HELD ON JULY 29, 1997**

The Shore Protection Board Meeting Report for the meeting held on July 29, 1997 was approved through motion of Vice Chairman Moffett, seconded by Board Member Dimm.

## **V. STATUS REPORT ON TOWN'S SELECTION OF A COASTAL ENGINEERING CONSULTANT TO PERFORM "PEER REVIEW" ON THE COMPREHENSIVE COASTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (CCMP) UPDATE**

Chairman Lickle referred to the Applied Technology & Management (ATM) Report submitted, indicating that it could be divided into two sections for discussion: 1) Engineering and 2) The Executive Summary. He noted that the Peer Review report would ultimately offer more substantive comment. The final presentation to the Town Council would then include the ATM Report, the Financing Package, the Educational/Public Relations Package, and the Referendum Package.

Mr. William Guttman suggested that a more reader-friendly version of the proposal be created, which could be understood by laypersons.

In response to the query of Board Member Isiminger, ATM Vice President Dave Decker explained that the maps included in the ATM Report represented a compilation of the eight management recommendations being made. The drawings included more specific details. ATM Vice President Karyn Erickson noted that additional text would be added to the report to encourage State and Federal funding. Mike Barnett commented that, at the recommendation of Bob Clinger, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers had been added as the responsible entities in appropriate reaches.

Discussion then took place on the Executive Summary portion of the report:

Ms. Erickson explained that Reach 4, 7, and 8 involved public access and public funding. Reach 2 would qualify for a maximum of 50% public funding. She advised that the figures in the report were valid enough for the appropriate applications for the funding process.

Palm Beach Town Manager Robert Doney suggested that an index could be included in the final report in order to show the reaches by page, as well as numbering the pages consecutively throughout the whole report in order to improve readability and referencing.

Chairman Lickle suggested that a page should be included indicating the frontage that each municipality would be responsible for, along with the pro-rata portion of costs.

Dave Decker of ATM replied that pro-rata shares based upon lineal foot of shoreline would be assigned to each municipality.

Karyn Erickson of ATM explained that when financing was in place, and permits had been applied for, the projects could shift--project #4 could come before project #3-- because of technical and funding issues.

In response to the request of Chairman Lickle for an explanation of the federal project mentioned on page 11 of the report, Mike Barnett of ATM responded that there were three federal initiatives identified for the island of Palm Beach--the North Palm Beach Project, the Mid-Town Project, and the South Palm Beach Project.

Chairman Lickle suggested that a background paragraph be included in explanation of the federal initiatives, as well as the time frame for these projects.

Bob Clinger of Palm Beach County suggested that a paragraph be included that would explain the progression of authorization for federal funding for projects, as well as the process by which cost reimbursements could be considered for a particular project area.

Discussion of storm protection benefits, design levels/costs of storm protection programs, categories of storms, and effects of storm surges took place, with Chairman Lickle noting the need for simplification of technical terms in laypersons' language.

Karyn Erickson of ATM addressed the benefits analysis portion of the report, clarifying that recreational benefits would not accrue to the person using a beach, but to the property itself. She explained that appraised values of waterfront property in the State of Florida versus non-waterfront property did not follow the same appreciation rate, and that was how the recreational benefit was derived--through the enhanced property value. Since a financing program would need to be legally

defensible, certain terms would need to be applied, such as "recreational benefit," however further explanation could accompany the use of such terms in order for greater understanding by the layperson. The property enhancement benefit was calculated as a recreation benefit, and then spread on an ad valorem basis to all property owners on the island.

Board Member Joel Martino maintained that the aesthetic value of beach property had not been mentioned. He recommended that beach renourishment should not be based on storm protection value exclusively, but that the aesthetic value should be considered as well.

Discussion took place of the differences within beachfront communities regarding cost/benefit ratios and the financing structure of beach renourishment projects. Karyn Erickson of ATM further explained the economic benefit analysis.

In response to the query of Board Member Dimm concerning the categorization of storms, Dave Decker of ATM explained that there were statistical projections of what would constitute a 100-year storm, for example--the level of the surge, size of the waves, and windspeed were calculated for designation/categorization of storms. Those studies would be relied upon as a baseline for the information presented in the ATM report.

Assistant Town Manager Peter Elwell advised that the duration of storm events must be considered as well. He suggested that the report, as well as information shared with the public, address probabilities of impact.

Mr. Decker advised that technicians had a very complicated perspective of a storm event, and that the descriptions would need to be simplified in order for the public to gain understanding. The cost/benefit ratio, was correlated with the intensity of the storm, as well as the time necessary to renourish the beaches. Evaluation of the storm event was related to the cubic yardage of sand per front foot of shoreline expected to be eroded from the beach face as a result of the storm. Mr. Decker suggested that the technical aspects of the project could be included in the engineering portion of the report, while the Executive Summary portion could be softened for reader understanding.

Ms. Erickson stated that she would prefer to leave the current project document intact, with an additional edited document created for the project in laypersons terms for public dissemination. She added that newsletters, brochures and question/answer sessions were valuable informative tools for communities to use in gaining public support.

Board Member Moffett moved that Chairman Lickle be appointed by the Shore Protection Board to work with ATM to refine the Executive Summary. The motion was seconded by Board Member Curran.

Assistant Town Manager Elwell cautioned the members of the Shore Protection Board that the Sunshine Law regulations must be followed. After discussion, it was decided that comments of the Shore Board Members on the ATM Report would continue at this time.

Dave Decker of ATM clarified that re-writing the Executive Summary to make it more understandable by the general public was the goal, however, he advised against having ATM as the author, since it would be overly simplified. He suggested that the document be developed and reviewed, with Town staff or the Shore Board presenting it to the Town Council as the laymen interpretation of the report.

Assistant Town Manager Elwell suggested that the Shore Protection Board could produce a summary report, designating a member to draft it, and allow the ATM report to stand on its own (both technical portion and Executive Summary portion).

Chairman Lickle proposed that he would draft his interpretation of the Executive Summary of the ATM report, and present it to ATM for review before going any further.

Board member Joel Martino proceeded with his comments on the Executive Summary:

He suggested that the Executive Summary contain some form of explanation as to who it was meant for in the title/heading.

Town Manager Doney noted that there would be a transmittal letter, which would address the issue.

Mr. Martino then referred to the last sentence of the Executive Summary: "The primary benefit, however, will be to provide island properties (estimated assessed value of over four (4) billion dollars) with improved storm protection at an annualized cost of approximately 4.16 million dollars (assuming a 30-year project life)." He maintained that by saying "primary" benefit, the other benefits were relegated as being secondary; he suggested that the wording be changed to: "One of the significant benefits..."

Karyn Erickson of ATM pointed out that there were actually three large benefits to the community: storm protection, enhanced property values, and environmental resource creation. It was agreed that the three main benefits would be substituted in the last sentence of the Executive Summary.

In response to the query of Mayor Roberts of the Town of South Palm Beach, Ms. Erickson noted that the amount of 4 billion dollars mentioned in the last sentence of the Executive Summary was not correct--the figure was actually 6.06 billion, and would be corrected.

Mr. Martino also suggested that the term "storm protection" be explained in detail, as well as the benefits that all residents (including those not living on the ocean) would accrue.

Mr. Martino then referred to the first paragraph of the Executive Summary, suggesting the elimination of the wording "coastal communities" in the last sentence (Implementation of the Plan will help the *coastal communities* on the island restore and sustain a healthy shoreline which is more stable, provides storm protection, supports recreational use and enhances property values).

Ms. Erickson proposed the wording: "...will sustain a healthy shoreline which is stable, provides storm protection, supports recreational use and enhances property values."

Mr. Martino suggested incorporating the words: "ecologically" and/or "aesthetically" somewhere in the same sentence.

Mr. Martino requested that the word "many" be substituted with "*some*" or "*most*" in the first sentence of the second paragraph of the Executive Summary (While *many* of the shoreline...); as well as the insertion of a date for the original CCMP. In the same paragraph, fourth sentence, Mr. Martino suggested the words "to eliminate" (The need *to eliminate* or *mange* the causes...) be removed. In the fifth sentence of the same paragraph he suggested the addition of the words "in spite of the Sand Transfer Plant being operational."

In response, Dave Decker of ATM noted that the Sand Transfer Plant had been operating only for a portion of the time that the numbers were calculated, and noted that the body of the report emphasized how much sand was contributed by the Sand Transfer Plant, and agreed to incorporate that information into the Executive Summary, so that it would be known that there was still a net erosion in spite of the Sand Transfer Plant.

Mr. Martino then referred to the ninth sentence in the second paragraph of the Executive Summary ("While it is not likely that the Island's shoreline can be restored to pre-inlet conditions, it is very important that the beaches be nourished to provide a reasonable level of storm protection") and suggested that it be eliminated.

Mr. Martino referred to the second page of the Executive Summary, top bullet ("Implement the Lake Worth Inlet Management Plan") and suggested that a date be included. On the second bullet, he suggested that the words, "i.e., groins, fill, etc." be included, as well as the elimination of the word "maintain." On the fourth bullet, he suggested that the word "Evaluate" be inserted as the initial word.

Mr. Martino referred to the third paragraph on page two of the Executive Summary (Six individual beach restoration efforts are proposed in the plan). He suggested that the six efforts be referenced through graphic representation. In the same paragraph, third sentence, he suggested that

the word "initial" (The *initial* beach restoration component of the Plan proposes to place...) be replaced by the wording "the first phase of beach restoration throughout the Island is proposed to place..."

Mr. Martino referred to the last sentence in the third paragraph, suggesting that the term "coastal structures" be further described.

Mr. Martino then referred to the last sentence in the last paragraph on the second page of the Executive Summary, suggesting that it be identified as the "Conclusion," and be re-worded to include the three primary benefits (storm protection benefits, enhanced property evaluation and environmental/ecological benefit).

Chairman Lickle suggested that an asterisk ("\*see chart for breakdown of community costs, and refer to a page number") be added to the estimated cost of \$52,000,000 mentioned in the third paragraph on page two of the Executive Summary. He also suggested that wording be added as follows: "...at an estimated cost of \$52,000,000 *if all eight initiatives are implemented over a ten year period.*"

Board Member Curran suggested that the Executive Summary include a sentence explaining the rationale behind the sequence of the eight initiatives.

Chairman Lickle suggested that a map identifying the reaches be included.

At this time, Board Member Joel Martino moved that Chairman Lickle be appointed to draft a separate document as an overall viewpoint, to be reviewed by ATM before distribution at the next Shore Protection Board Meeting. The motion was seconded by Board Member Moffett, and carried unanimously.

## **VII. IDENTIFICATION OF TIME LOCATION AND ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING**

Staff was requested to contact Dr. Bill Stronge of Florida Atlantic University or Dr. Tom Curtis of the University of South Florida to invite them to address the Shore Protection Board at the next meeting to be scheduled on October 21 or 22, 1997 at 1:30 P.M. at the South Fire Station. (The date was later confirmed to be Tuesday, October 21, 1997).

**VIII. ANY OTHER MATTERS**

There were none.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:45 P.M.

SHORE PROTECTION BOARD

  
Garrison D. Lickle, Chairman