



TOWN OF PALM BEACH

Office of The Town Clerk

REPORT OF THE SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, APRIL 5, 2010

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Shore Protection Board was called to order at 8:59 a.m., on Monday, April 5, 2010, in the Emergency Operations Center, 355 S. County Road, Palm Beach, Florida.

II. ROLL CALL

On roll call, the following Members were found to be present: Chair Ecclestone, Vice Chair Frank and Members Lindsay Buck, Goldstein and Cooper. Members Katz and Baker arrived later in the meeting.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Ecclestone led the Pledge of Allegiance.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the Agenda as presented was made by Member Lindsay Buck and seconded by Member Goldstein. On voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITIZENS - 3 MINUTE LIMIT PLEASE

There were none.

V. COMMUNICATIONS FROM SHORE PROTECTION BOARD MEMBERS

Member Lindsay Buck stated that she had heard from the Surfrider Chairman and he informed her that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) had denied the permit for the Singer Island Breakwater Project. She wanted to discuss that project and if that would be the beginning of the shutdown of that project after 4 to 5 years. She requested that the Board discuss contacting the County regarding changing the EIS study for the south end of the County and using the money instead for sand search and other alternatives.

Chair Ecclestone indicated that the sand study report should be discussed with Surfriders to see if all could agree on a solution that would be amenable to all.

1 *Board Members Baker and Katz have arrived.*

2
3 Public Works Director Paul Brazil provided the Board with an update on the withdrawal of the
4 County for their permit on the Singer Island Project. He added that once the Environmental
5 Impact Statement (EIS) study was done for the South County Project, the Town could decide at
6 that time if they wished to pursue the project further with them.

7
8 Member Lindsay Buck asked why the County did not perform an EIS for Singer Island when
9 they were doing one for the South County project. Public Works Director Brazil responded that
10 it was a time issue, he believed.

11
12 Responding to Council Member William Diamond, 220 Wells Street, regarding the preliminary
13 findings that the structures would block the flow of sand south, Mr. Brazil noted that if anything
14 was built entrapping too much sand, it would be negative for the Town and limit how much sand
15 gets to the sand transfer plant.

16
17 Member Lindsay Buck asked if the EIS would be a sand search analysis. Public Works Director
18 Brazil responded that the EIS would be an alternatives analysis.

19
20 Member Katz had no comments.

21
22 Member Goldstein also was going to ask about Singer Island and proposed having multiple
23 meetings in April and May. Public Works Director indicated that the Shore Board should have
24 their budget recommendations by the next meeting on April 22, 2010.

25
26 Chair Ecclestone indicated that he had the same concern with the budget. He asked if it would
27 be reasonable at the end of the meeting to recap what would be done next year and at the next
28 meeting. He also asked about Phase II of the Sand Transfer Plant and what had been approved.
29 Public Works Director responded that the conceptual design and the permitting process had been
30 started. After the permit is issued, the final design would be approved based on the permit
31 criteria.

32
33 Vice Chair Frank discussed the use of structures and asked how far along the South Palm Beach
34 project was in relation to the plans, and if it were similar to what was denied at Singer Island.
35 Public Works Director indicated that the County's design was very similar to the Singer Island
36 project. He asked for continuous updates and was informed that the County staff will provide an
37 update to the Shore Protection Board at an upcoming meeting.

38
39 Vice Chair Frank also stated that the presentation provided in the back-up, did not include the
40 past history of the exploration for sand. Public Works Director Brazil indicated he would
41 address that when they got to that item.

42
43 Responding to Member Cooper regarding the Sand Transfer Plant and its impact to the pipe
44 design relative to surfers, Mr. Brazil responded that the discharge was originally proposed to
45 extend about 2,000 feet, which was a reasonable distance in order to get to an area where sand
46 moves faster. The plan was to go further south to avoid harming the surf break area completely.

1 Discussion continued among the Board Members regarding the surfers.

2
3 Member Katz commented regarding the Singer Island Project and South Palm Beach. He
4 suggested meeting with Town staff regarding Singer Island and provide the latest updates on
5 both projects. Public Works Director Brazil said both projects were from the County and he
6 could provide a written update at the next meeting, but the information he just provided was only
7 a few days old.

8
9 Member Lindsay Buck asked about the Town's share for the EIS study and Town Engineer
10 Bowser responded that it was approximately \$500,000. She wanted staff to ask the County to
11 respond if there would be alternatives to the South Palm Beach project since the Singer Island
12 project would not go forward. Public Works Director Brazil stated fundamentally the EIS is still
13 needed regardless of what is decided.

14
VII. REVIEW OF SAND SEARCH PROPOSAL AND RECOMMENDATION FROM STAFF
[H. Paul Brazil, Director of Public Works]

15
16 Public Works Director Brazil presented the item and indicated that should the Shore Protection
17 Board Members decide to move forward with the project to begin a sand search prior to October
18 1, 2010, then staff would forward to the Town Council that recommendation to approve an
19 amendment to the FY 2010 budget in the amount of \$495,000 along with a groin analysis in the
20 amount of \$195,000, for a total budget amendment of \$690,000. If approved by the Town
21 Council, contracts would be awarded to Applied Technology & Management, Inc. for the sand
22 search and Coastal Technology Corporation for the groin analysis.

23
24 Public Works Director Brazil, along with Town Engineer Bowser provided a history of the sand
25 search that had occurred in the past. The proposal was provided to the Shore Board Members in
26 their back-up.

27
28 Vice Chair Frank asked if more than one company was asked to provide a proposal. Staff
29 mentioned that other companies were considered, but a proposal was only requested from
30 Applied Technology & Management.

31
32 Member Katz indicated that the type of sand used is important. He said it was very important to
33 find good sand, and that could impact the economics of the projects. Public Works Director
34 Brazil indicated that trucked sand would be coarser. A smaller scale project would not cost as
35 much and the possibility of offshore sand use still would be expensive. Reach 8 was done to
36 eliminate a lot of the environmental concerns. Member Katz recommended using Ortona sand for
37 smaller scale projects since it may stay on the beaches longer.

38
39 Member Goldstein asked about taking sand from dredge projects and in order to use it on the
40 Town beaches. He also discussed the previously taken vibracores and asked if those borrow
41 areas would be considered again this time. Public Works Director Brazil indicated that they
42 were reviewing several options.

1 Member Lindsay Buck stated she had a series of questions that dealt with the past data inventory
2 and allocation between the two budgets. It appeared that there were several different studies to
3 pull the data from and there was a lot of action within the County. She asked if that data was
4 relevant and it was. When the sand search information is all combined and there was \$403,000
5 needed to analyze the south end and why more of the cost was in the northern end.

6
7 If there was so much historical data, do they really know what is out there and if it was an
8 exercise in futility. She wanted to know what the costs were to analyze the study.
9

10 Mike Jenkins, Team Leader from Coastal Technologies and Management authored the proposal
11 and indicated that the vibracore spacing is mandated by the State. In terms of regional data, there
12 are extensive data sets but they do not answer the questions completely, although they can be
13 helpful. He touched upon the main costs of the proposal.
14

15 Member Lindsay Buck asked if Juno Beach was in compliance with the spacing and they had,
16 according to Dr. Jenkins. He noted that the dredging contractor did not have the ability to screen
17 as he placed the sand. There were some issues of that. The coarser, better offshore sand tends to
18 be where there are rock concerns.
19

20 Public Works Director Brazil indicated that by staying in a coarser area, was a very important
21 point. It costs more, but it is sand that would better stay put.
22

23 Member Lindsay Buck asked what the quantity of sand was at "Rush's Reef". Dr. Jenkins stated
24 that the sand is a couple of hundred cubic yards and the challenge was how to recover it. They
25 would not want to mess up the surf break. Member Lindsay Buck stated that it has been messed
26 up and discussed with the Surfriders and they know also it is good-quality sand. Public Works
27 Director Brazil said they would be included but he would hate to mess up a good area.
28

29 Lastly Member Lindsay Buck asked if they were looking inside the inlet for any sand and was
30 there any reason to believe, they could study the inlet. Public Works Director Brazil specifically
31 asked Dr. Jenkins not to study that areas due to the recreation use, environmental protest etc.
32

33 Member Katz assumed that in the ten years there would need to be three to five million cubic
34 yards of sand for the beaches. The problem was not only finding sand, it was finding the right
35 kind of sand. He said it was both quantity and quality. He also wanted to know how Dr.
36 Jenkins was not going to repeat earlier mistakes and if he was going to duplicate the previously
37 studied areas and his response was to make sure that the study done would be done right. Parts of
38 the past problems were sands that were identified did not meet quality standards. He noted he
39 was doing a phased approach to be sure that the steps are done in the order that they should be
40 done.
41

42 Dr. Jenkins indicated that borrow area three was difficult to get to, and there were issues with
43 rock at the time. Member Katz asked that some of the prior studies were for sand searches. He
44 asked Dr. Jenkins how he was going to conduct his study when his client was the Town, as
45 opposed to the County. The County had not ventured into the waters offshore of the Town for

1 their searches. There has been a lot of coordination with the County and the Town on working
2 together in the effort to locate sand.

3
4 Vice Chair Frank stated that there was beach quality sand coming into the inlet. Where did the
5 gold sand come from and why can't the Town locate that type of sand, instead of the gray sand.
6 Dr. Jenkins responded that the gold sand was from "modern" sand in the beach system and surf
7 zone. The off shore sand (gray sand) are referred to as historic sands. Vice Chair Frank asked
8 if there was a shortage of off-shore sand and Dr. Jenkins agreed.

9
10 Chair Ecclestone said he understood the cost involved in finding the good sand on the outset to
11 obtain the best quality sand. Vice Chair Frank asked Dr. Jenkins to explain the cultural resources
12 and historical significance.

13
14 Member Cooper asked for a point of clarification in seeking offshore sand and Public Works
15 Director stated that he wanted everyone to be clear of the expectations. Most likely, the sand
16 would be the gray sand and it was unlikely to find the gold sand.

17
18 Member Cooper asked about the ten year needs and wondered if the project would be considered
19 a large scale project since it would be three to five million cubic yards of sand. He also asked if
20 the sand bleaches and it does.

21
22 Member Cooper asked question about costs for the vibrocores and if there were additional costs
23 for additional coring. Public Works Director Brazil indicated that they would ask for a ten
24 percent contingency.

25
26 Chair Ecclestone asked if the Town could go to other areas, north of the inlet for sand searches.
27 Public Works Director stated that the State owns the waters and permission would be needed to
28 test in there. He stressed the need to find sand.

29
30 Member Lindsay Buck asked about the schedule and beginning the study in June. If this were
31 approved, could the schedule be moved back sixty days. Dr. Jenkins said he may be able to start
32 earlier, but the field work comes after the necessary field work is complete. It was the
33 consensus of the board to begin earlier, if possible.

34
35 **Motion to approve the sand search proposal to the Town Council made by Vice Chair**
36 **Frank and seconded by Member Goldstein. On voice vote, the motion carried**
37 **unanimously.**

38
39 Town Engineer Bowser indicated that this would be a budget amendment so the second reading
40 would not occur until May. Money would not be available until May. Dr. Jenkins would not be
41 able to begin work until the third week of May at the earliest.

42
43 Public Works Director Brazil commented on the inlet dredging directive from the last meeting.
44 He was going to submit a proposal at the next Town Council Meeting to perform the inlet
45 maintenance dredging permitting effort. There are funds available, but he will continue to try to
46 get all parties to participate.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the Shore Protection Board meeting of Monday, April 5, 2010, was adjourned at 10:38 a.m.

APPROVED:

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Llwyd Ecclestone', written over a horizontal line.

E. Llwyd Ecclestone
Chairman

Shore Protect Board Backup