# TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Office of the Town Clerk

## REPORT OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD HELD ON JUNE 25, 1998

## I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Shore Protection Board was called to order at 2:00 P.M. on Thursday, June 25, 1998, in the Meeting Room of the South Fire-Rescue Station.

## II. ROLL CALL

On roll call, the following Shore Protection Board Members were found to be in attendance: Chairman Garrison D. Lickle, Vice Chairman George M. Moffett, II, Board Members Eileen C. Curran, Wayne F. Dimm, Charles C. Isiminger, and Joel Martino. Board Members Edward Hennessy, Jr., Gerald H. Levy, and Richard Raffo were absent from the meeting. Others in attendance for all or a portion of the meeting included: Town of South Palm Beach Mayor Margot Roberts, Town of Lantana Director of Marine Safety/Sports Complex Dan Reidy, City of Lake Worth Projects Manager Ray Smith, and Applied Technology & Management (ATM) Vice President Dave Decker. Staff members in attendance from the Town of Palm Beach were: Acting Town Manager Peter Elwell, Public Works Director Al Dusey, and Deputy Town Clerk Susan Eichhorn.

## III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Agenda was unanimously approved as printed, through motion of Board Member Levy, seconded by Board Member Martino.

## IV. APPROVAL OF REPORT OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING HELD ON APRIL 21, 1998

The report of the Shore Protection Board Meeting held on April 21, 1998, was unanimously approved through motion of Vice Chairman Moffett, seconded by Board Member Dimm.

Post Office Box 2029 • 360 South County Road • Palm Beach, Florida 33480 • (561) 838-5416
Fax No. (561) 838-5417

## V. CONSIDERATION OF FINAL DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE COASTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN (CCMP) UPDATE DOCUMENT

Public Works Director Al Dusey explained that there may be some forthcoming changes regarding the section on cost estimates, and that Dave Decker of ATM was continuing to work on that section, including the sediment budget and Island-wide modeling.

Mr. Decker commented that ATM was continuing to work on the estimates, and one item that had not been included in cost estimates was mitigation, as they had not been able to ascertain the percentage of mitigation per acre of impact that would be required by regulating agencies.

Mr. Decker referred to the CCMP Plan Update document, and distributed an addendum related to the cost estimate portion of the document noting that a sediment budget had been added. Mr. Decker responded to technical questions relating to the information and figures projected in the CCMP Plan Update, as well as questions regarding the effects of sand movement and placement. Mr. Decker indicated that a table would be developed with estimates of the costs for each reach, breaking it down in column form.

In response to the query of Chairman Lickle, Mr. Decker explained that he did not think there were any material differences of opinion between ATM and Aubrey Consulting, Inc., as the two entities looked at the report from different perspectives. ATM prepared the document as a plan while the feedback from Aubrey seemed to focus more on the implementation of the plan.

Mr. Dusey maintained that ATM had the professional responsibility for the document and the summary report, and that the summary report could reflect that the conclusions and recommendations were consistent with the peer review, however ATM was still basically responsible for the document. The final document reflected that agreement was reached on major points.

Mr. Elwell commented that he believed there could be some kind of overarching statement indicating that both engineers agreed on the body of the documents, without addressing every specific page or fine detail discussed. He again noted that the Island-wide modeling information was not yet included, and before the document was considered a final document that information would need to be included.

Mr. Decker commented that the way ATM looked at the document was as a plan that made recommendations on management steps for the shoreline. The majority of the comments received from Aubrey were guidance comments on implementing the plan.

Mr. Elwell added that there was agreement that certain of those steps ought to be incorporated into this document, because they were important enough that they provide essential guidance to the plan. There were hundreds of pages that Aubrey had not found cause to comment on as well. Once the modeling piece was inserted, there would be agreement between Aubrey and ATM, and all of Aubrey's comments on the document, its quality and value to the Town and the other communities involved, would be incorporated. The purpose of the peer review was to have a separate set of technically astute eyes on the document to advise of things that may need to be addressed in the document. Aubrey had done that, and some changes had been made accordingly. However, if there were any remaining differences, one would not necessarily look to one engineer or the other to be the final arbiter.

Board Member Martino suggested that perhaps there could be a one paragraph page inserted that indicated that Aubrey reviewed the final product, and based upon the peer review and the negotiated changes in the report, they accepted it.

Mr. Decker advised that he did not have a problem with a letter of agreement, however, he would need to discuss it with Mr. Hamilton of Aubrey.

Mr. Martino moved recommendation of approval of the Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan Update document with the conditions for approval being inclusion of the modeling section, inclusion of the addendum pages that had been handed out today, the sign off of both engineers that have been involved that there was no material difference of opinion between them about the contents of the document, and some work on the estimation section. Mr. Moffett seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Dimm pointed out that in the Peer Review, the last several pages of the letter from the Woods Hole Group were missing, which Mr. Decker replied that he would investigate.

Mayor Roberts pointed out that Reach 8 and 9 were not mentioned in Section 8 of the report, and questioned why they had not been included?

Mr. Decker replied that Section 8 summarized discussions with the State regarding various environmental issues, and he would check with Mike Barnett regarding this. It could be that there was no discussion on those particular reaches. In that section of the report the discussion had been pertaining to structures and groins, and those particular reaches did not contain many, so that could be one reason they had not been brought up. Mr. Dusey noted that these were the minutes of a meeting that had occurred, and if those reaches had not been discussed, that was something that could not be changed.

Chairman Lickle commented that there was a gross analysis of how much sand had actually been taken out of the Inlet since 1928 in Section 2, which was approximately 7 million cubic yards, of which only about 1.7 million had been replaced on the beaches, probably as a result of past practices of the Army Corps of Engineers of pumping sand offshore. He noted that he had mentioned this a reference point in order to be sure that never happened again.

Chairman Lickle then referred to a letter from Clay Shaw's office wherein there was a question of appropriations of approximately $3 million to provide modifications to the upland disposal site at Peanut Island to allow for year round dredging activities of Palm Beach harbors, and requested further information.

Mr. Elwell replied that the material dredged out of the turning basin that was not beach quality material went onto Peanut Island to maintain navigation in the area between the Inlet and the Port Facility itself. It was permitted as a secondary disposal site for beach quality sand.

Mr. Dusey reported that he had obtained a copy of the preliminary and final assessment process regarding the Hillsboro project. He explained that in that project every property owner had access to the beach, and the island had been divided into 5 sections, with a weighted value to the properties in each one of those sections based upon whether they received shore protection, recreational benefits, and erosion control. Weighted averages were developed for all properties, and that was divided into the cost of the project per household per year.

In response to Chairman Lickle, Mr. Dusey replied that he would contact Dr. Stronge to remind him that some streets in the north end of Town did have beach access so that he could take that into account in his modeling information data.

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

The next meeting of the Shore Protection Board was scheduled to be held on Thursday, September 17, 1998 at 2:00 P.M. at the South Fire-Rescue Station. The primary purpose of that meeting will be to hear a progress report and preliminary findings from Dr. Stronge regarding his economic study.

## VII. ANY OTHER MATTERS

Chairman Lickle inquired into the status of the selection process and competitive bidding for the public relations portion of the CCMP project. Mr. Dusey replied that the selection panel would meet on July 2, 1998, with two firms that had responded to advertisements.

**REPORT OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING**
**HELD ON JUNE 25, 1998**

Mr. Dusey requested the endorsement of the Shore Protection Board regarding sand search activities, so that when authorization was requested from the Town Council to proceed, the endorsement could be relied upon.

Vice Chairman Moffett moved endorsement by the Shore Protection Board that the Town proceed with sand search activities. The motion was seconded by Board Member Dimm, and carried unanimously.

## VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 P.M.

Garrison D. Lickle, Chairman