

**Draft Minutes**  
**Beaches and Shores Advisory Committee**  
**Tuesday, July 14, 2016, 9:00 a.m.**  
**Commission Chambers, Room 119**  
**18500 Murdock Circle, Port Charlotte, FL 33948**

*\*\*\*Please note that one or more Charlotte County Commissioners may be in attendance at any meeting of the Beaches and Shores Advisory Committee\*\*\**

**Members Present**

Clifford Kewley, Member-at-Large, Chairman  
Katherine Ariens, District 2  
Tommy Brock, District 3 / Vice Chairman  
Robert Pierce, FL Shore & Beach Preservation Assoc.  
Rich Parchen, District 4

**Members Excused**

[vacant], District 5  
Dick Whitney, District 1

**Staff Present**

Kristin Binns, Recording Secretary

**Guests Present**

Michael Poff, Coastal Engineering Consultants  
Commissioner Stephen R. Deutsch  
Commissioner Bill Truex  
Commissioner Christopher Constance

**Call to Order**

Chairman Kewley called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. and led the group in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Following the roll call, and on motion made and carried unanimously, the minutes from May 5, 2016, were approved as received.

**Additions/Deletions to Agenda Items**

Chair Kewley asked whether there were any additions to the agenda; none were offered. He gave an overview of the expected speakers and the anticipated topics.

**Citizen Comments on Agenda Items**

Mr. Andy Wing offered a couple of questions: he asked Chair Kewley to ask the Commissioners when the County intended to set the millage rate for the beach renourishment MSTU. He indicated that among the Key residents' concerns was the issue that if the millage rate was not set this year, then no revenue based on that rate could be collected until 2018, which means no beach renourishment until 2019 or 2020. Secondly, he asked whether there would be an advisory committee for the new beach renourishment MSTU; Mr. Wing indicated that he had not been able to get an answer to that question. Additionally, he asked if the group would consider having Christine Robinson come to speak to them; he indicated that Ms. Robinson, a Commissioner in Sarasota County whose district extends through the northern portion of Manasota Key, and she has become very aware of

the problem of beach erosion. Mr. Wing also suggested inviting Laird Wreford, also from Sarasota County, who is in charge of all the funding sources for the Sarasota County beach renourishment programs. Mr. Wing also mentioned speaking with Chris Porter, editor of the Englewood Sun-Herald, who works in alliance with WINK-TV, and Mr. Wing asked permission to invite them to cover these Committee meetings.

Chair Kewley responded that answers to these questions should be forthcoming soon; he indicated that the group would always welcome folks from Sarasota County to visit, listen and address the group, and enhance the cooperation between the counties. Commissioner Deutsch commented on Mr. Wing's suggestions as well, noting that the County enjoyed a good working relationship with Sarasota County, as well as other regional organizations such as WCIND.

Ms. Ariens asked for the acronym "WCIND" to be deciphered; Commissioner Deutsch responded with the full name of the organization: West Coast Inland Navigation District, and noted that this regional group represented four counties and is required by State statute, and is a source of a great deal of the funding that protects our waterways, especially the funds disbursed through the Marine Advisory Committee (MAC). The Commissioner gave additional details about the upcoming meeting schedule of WCIND, noting that the August meeting would be held in Charlotte County. Ms. Ariens indicated that she was interested in the meeting schedule, and whether the public could attend; Commissioner Deutsch noted that specific meeting notices were posted, but that he was not sure if that included our website, but that in any event, the public is always welcome to attend. Further discussion ensued on this topic and the topic of the blue-green algae originating in water releases from Lake Okeechobee.

### **New Business**

#### **Manasota Key Beach Erosion and Renourishment**

Mr. Ben Bailey, County Building Official, on recent structure evaluations. Mr. Bailey addressed the group on the recent activity evaluating structures on the coast, looking for any further deterioration of conditions since Tropical Storm Colin caused damage earlier; he said no further progression of damage was observed. However, there are still a couple of buildings that show cause for concern – these are some older (circa 1950-60) single-family homes which were not built on pile foundations, but were slab-on-grade. One of these showed erosion up to the foundation, to the extent of being deemed unsafe; he did not have information as to any steps the owner was taking. Another structure showed erosion, but was deemed to be safe for occupancy. Mr. Bailey also mentioned a couple of condominiums with issues; on one (a newer building), the engineer's analysis showed no problems. A few buildings at La Coquina showed erosion up to the foundation, and a couple of end units received a recommendation to be vacated. Notices have been sent out, generating some calls concerned with the County's plans to demolish the buildings, but this is **not** what the County will be doing. In the event of further storm damage, however, more action might need to be taken, but at this time, Mr. Bailey said, the notices are sent in order to advise the property owner that permits are needed as part of the process to address the unsafe situation. There is, of course, a need to wait for the necessary state permits as well, but when they are forthcoming, Mr. Bailey assure the group that Charlotte County would expedite their end of things. Chair Kewley asked, regarding the buildings that were designed and constructed to more current building codes, and in particular constructed on pilings, whether it was true that additional erosion may not cause them to be declared structurally unsound; Mr. Bailey agreed, noting that the point of having the engineer examine such structures was simply to confirm that there was no damage to the structure. Commissioner Deutsch also commented on the

expeditious delivery of these inspection services, and asked if there was any specific number of residential units or families, and an estimate on total dollar loss. Mr. Bailey indicated he did not have that type of detailed data, but that there had been a total of three dwellings that had safety issues.

Next to speak was Mr. Shaun Cullinan, County Zoning Official, on the process for temporary protection of affected structures. He identified his specific responsibility as dealing with the emergency situation regarding these sites: emergency shoring, DEP issues, and the like. He indicated that the Community Development Department had packets prepared for anyone who contacts the office regarding the structure safety issues, and also speaks with the affected property owners to walk them through the specific options. The emergency shoring is a matter of placing rip-rap, sandbags or other temporary barrier material on the property for a temporary action while waiting for permanent work approval from DEP. Permanent approval from DEP, and what can be done then is a second matter, and finally, addressing structural issues. He gave information regarding the timeline for response to individual requests.

Commissioner Constance joined the meeting. Commissioner Deutsch posed a question about damage that puts the structure within the bounds of "the 50% rule" asking whether that was applicable in this situation. Mr. Cullinan responded that the rule would probably be in effect in these circumstances, noting that it is not necessarily only the County standard but is a FEMA standard also; he went on to describe the significance of the 'rule' which is that if a structure is damaged to the extent that it needs to be repaired or replaced at a cost of more than 50% of the assessed value of the structure, then the structure must come into compliance with current building code and site standards. Commissioner Deutsch said the explanation was provided because that standard could require some very expensive mitigation scenarios. Mr. Cullinan indicated that none of the properties inspected so far had reached that benchmark; this is a matter for structural engineers to decide. Chair Kewley had a question about other methods of bringing properties up to code, in terms of elevation; he asked if anyone had inquired about having that kind of work done. Mr. Cullinan indicated neither he nor Mr. Bailey was aware of anyone planning to do that type of activity at this point. Mr. Brock asked if anyone is approaching the owners in advance of need, noting the way property owners south of the public beach had banded together in the 90s to create their seawall; he felt that if owners worked as a group, they might get quicker results, and it might turn out to be less expensive. Mr. Cullinan responded that there has been an outreach to property owners about banding together for solutions. Mr. Brock concurred that education about the situation was a long-term process, connected somewhat to residents' perceptions of the immediacy of the threat.

Mr. Michael Poff, Coastal Engineering Consultants, presented on the beach renourishment plan noting Coastal Engineering Consultants was recently selected as the consultant that will carry forward the work on the design and permitting of the beach renourishment plan. First, he noted that the reason there are seawalls and rock revetments on properties such as Mr. Brock's is because there have been times in the past when there was no sand on these beaches. He noted that long-term residents have seen the sand come and go over the years; he referenced a study done many years ago by Florida State University and the DEP, in which this process was called the "sand wave" and was historically seen as a natural process that transported sand alongshore and naturally restored beach areas over time. Current studies, however, which are the result of the feasibility study completed last year, indicate that the sand wave can no longer be depended upon to serve this purpose. Mr. Poff also emphasized the regional nature of past efforts and the hope that the current situation will also call forth a joint effort.

As for the erosion studies, going back to 2003, they have determined that there is a chronic erosion problem that would not be adequately addressed by natural sand transport. He noted that at every meeting with Manasota Key residents over this time period an informal vote recorded half wanting the project and the other half not wanting it. The Commission would not move forward without something closer to unanimous consensus, and so the issues remain.

Objections have historically involved, first, the question of public access vs. private access; many Key residents simply do not want non-residents crossing their 'pocket beaches'. This will be a key issue needing to be resolved. He stated if a County implements a managed beach program, and seeks funding from outside local sources, there are going to be public-access requirements in order to get that funding from the state or federal government. Secondly, objections centered around what is called an upland construction easement, and refers to the fact that part of the renourishment work would be done on private property and many homeowners would not sign the easement that would allow this. Mr. Poff noted recently the language of these easements has been vastly improved, in order to address the comments and concerns voiced by citizens in 2003 and in 2006; he noted that a lot more residents on the south part of the Key (where work is currently being done) received these new easements and many more had been returned signed than ever before. This indicates that County efforts to 'fix' the language had been successful; however, Mr. Poff said, he understands that the conversations regarding these are still on-going with many property owners. The bottom line, however, is that if the necessary equipment cannot cross your land to work on the beach, then the beach cannot be rebuilt in front of your property. Finally, Mr. Poff noted, there was the issue of a level of trust; some folks simply do not trust the government, and these folks might likely never sign anything or participate in any way.

Mr. Poff summarized his experience in discussing these matters with Key residents, and his advice to them has continued to be that they need to come before the Commission as often as it takes, to indicate that they are among the affected residents and that they want to be part of the managed beach project; he acknowledged that Key residents have started to do that. He thanked people for demonstrating this level of trust and willingness to move forward on a project. He also tied the possibility of state cost-sharing on this project to the issue of residents' acceptance of the creation of public access in terms of using those five-foot wide private accesses from the Bay to the Gulf and putting in parking along the right-of-way. He indicated that, at the next meeting on this matter, his group should have figures to discuss with residents, both in terms of amount of beach there currently compared with what renourishment would provide, and in terms of sharing the burden of the cost. He noted the existing program on Palm-Knight-Don Pedro Island receives something like 45% state cost-sharing, based on their willingness to give access and allow parking. Mr. Poff also indicated that, once residents are in a managed beach project, if they experience a big storm causing beach erosion, there would be eligibility for cost-sharing and reimbursement from FEMA towards restoring the sand eroded by the storm.

Mr. Poff noted that the issues in bringing forward a funding program for the work reflects the great number of variables to be considered and having to weigh the chances of getting state money for the project. He stated that if the project does not get state funding, then the price tag for County residents will be enormous. Discussion ensued on the rising costs of construction. Building a seawall will be more expensive today than it was in 1993; in fact, for people with rock revetments now, building a seawall now would likely involve driving steel sheet-pile with a cap on it,

something which might have a cost per lot even more significant than a beach project would be over a 20-year period.

Mr. Poff then considered the priority tasks related to their scope of work:

1. Getting a pre-application meeting set-up with the agencies to present this project to them, to prepare them for the forthcoming permit application. The number one hurdle for the project concerns the "near shore hard-bottom" which is the exposed rock that exists beneath our sand surface. He emphasized that it's not all sand out there in Gulf but rather limestone 'bedrock', and that has become exposed along 6,000 ft. of beach on Manasota. What had been just a fraction of an acre exposed in the 2001-2003 study period, today has grown to 4.25 acres (as of Fall 2015) – significant gain during a time when no new sand is arriving; also, for those who have rock revetments, the constant impact of waves and wave amplification on these coastal structures leads to a scouring action. This is the source of the problem there today; the price-tag for repair continues to increase at the same time (\$6-7 million dollars of the total cost will be to mitigate the impacts to the hardbottom.) Mr. Poff provided some details of what the repair would entail, and also commented on the lack of usefulness of some of the newer, more innovative technology (special types of breakwaters, etc.) until the underlying foundation of the beach was replenished. He indicated that the consulting scope of work did include evaluating such structures.
2. Complete a public access inventory in support of the application due to the state by the end of the month
3. Prepare and submit the funding application.
4. Conduct field surveys on the Key over the next 30-60 days, including identifying a potential mitigation reef site.
5. Provide technical support to the County and residents regarding temporary measures.

He emphasized the orderly progression of this project, and asked people to be guided by that necessary project timetable – e.g., if the structural analysis of breakwaters or innovative technology were to be prioritized, that would slow down the permit process. Mr. Poff noted that sand sources have been permitted for the current project, and those same sand sources could be relied on for this project, allowing the permitting part to move ahead more timely. It will also be important to meet with the agencies routinely, since covering and mitigating for hard-bottom is the most challenging thing to permit in this state specific to beach projects of this scope and magnitude. He spoke about other approaches which lead to months or years of arguing with the agencies, and assured the meeting attendees that his group intends to permit covering the entire hard-bottom and mitigating for it, rather than arguing for covering less than the entire area. Because the project has been so long gathering consensus, things need to be done with all due speed at this point.

Mr. Poff also touched on the aspect of the consultant's scope in helping to guide the temporary stabilization measures. He indicated that if two or more neighbors are taking different approaches to stabilization, this could have adverse impacts; their scope makes them available to consult with the County staff and help guide individual property owners in choosing the best type of temporary stabilization.

Commissioner Deutsch asked a question about the availability of sufficient sand offshore to address these problems; Mr. Poff responded that about 1.2 million yards of sand have been identified several miles offshore, of which they would be

able to use about 300,000-400,000 yards for the current project, leaving sufficient sand to do one project on Manasota Key, but at that point additional sand sources would need to be identified for both the renourishment part of the existing project, and future work on the Key.

Commissioner Deutsch then asked for a guesstimate of how long the work, once completed, would last (understanding that Mr. Poff cannot predict future weather conditions.) Mr. Poff responded with information on such options as 'advance nourishment' that would be useful in prolonging the longevity of the project, but which would have cost implications as well. Past feasibility studies have looked at eight – ten years for renourishment cycles for the Key, based on the historic averages. Further discussion ensued on the possible life-span of the project, given the area's history of notable storms; Mr. Poff also pointed out that once in the program, some future storm damage would be largely covered by the state and the federal government. So, eight to ten years without problems is the goal, but if you don't have ideal conditions, you do have the option to seek additional funding so that the cost burden doesn't change for the homeowners. Further discussion ensued on potential costs of various alternative approaches, but due to the large number of factors affecting such scenarios, Mr. Poff said he has hesitant to give any figures. He did provide information on circumstances under which seawalls could be permitted, and the eligibility requirements.

Chair Kewley mentioned the many questions people have about the time-frame for this work, wondering why it takes so long to get the sand onto the beaches; he asked Mr. Poff to comment on the regulatory thicket they must work their way through. Mr. Poff mentioned the two primary permits that must be issued, one from the State of Florida, (DEP) and the other is from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) which is a federal permit. He gave some details about the process and the multiple entities involved in the review.

Mr. Bock asked who specifically people should contact, Mr. Cullinan or Mr. Bailey, with regard to their situation; Mr. Cullinan identified himself as the point person, and also referred to the packets available for homeowners which give all the necessary information, application forms and the like. He noted that contact can be made through the Commissioners office or through the Administration office, or directly to the Zoning Division of the Community Development Department.

Mr. Poff then said he would address the questions from Mr. Andy Wing to the best of his ability. With regard to setting the millage rate, he would have to defer to the County; with regard to setting up an advisory committee, he said that the property owners may want to move ahead on their own if they see the need beyond this Beaches and Shores Committee which he felt was the primary vehicle to date for matters like this. With regard to Sarasota, he noted there had been a meeting in Fall of 2015, but due to events since then, Sarasota seems to have become more engaged; within the scope for the project, there is technical support and some further meetings have been set, which he expects will involve Sarasota.

Comments were also offered regarding the benefits of the cooperation between the County and WCIND; WCIND will be meeting in Commission Chambers on Aug. 26<sup>th</sup>, and Mr. Poff indicated he would be present for that meeting.

### **Old Business**

#### ***Update on the Stump Pass 10-Year Inlet Management Plan***

Chair Kewley commented on progress of this project, and turned the floor back over to Mr. Poff for additional comments. Commissioner Deutsch indicated he thought a ribbon-cutting would be appropriate once the project was complete. Mr. Poff then mentioned the Florida Shore and Beach Preservation Assoc., which is having a meeting in September, in Naples, at which he will be speaking on the topic of this project; he then gave a few comments on Stump Pass, noting that once you decide to manage a natural system, understand you are in it for the long haul, which that long-term project handily illustrates. Coming up for the project, he noted that in 2012, the prior 10-year permits were winding down (new permit periods have been extended to 15 years via a change in state statutes) and the County examined its process, looking for possible improvements. It was noted that at Stump Pass and adjacent shorelines there has been a lot of erosion because the inlet has been over-dredged; it was an economical sand source, but caused erosion, so the question became how to better manage the resource. The answer is to reduce the use of Stump Pass for sand needs, which led to identifying offshore sources; five sites have been identified, each with about several hundred-thousand yards of sand which is beach-compatible. A similar shoal formation was used for the Venice Beach projects over the past 20 years.

Stump Pass will continue to be dredged for navigation purposes, but the quantity will be reduced, and the planned structure will be built there. Mr. Poff noted that dredging outfits are very busy currently, with the many beach projects generated by recent hurricanes like Sandy and Isaac; there aren't enough dredgers to do everything that needs doing, and of course that affects the bid pricing. By the same token, new people are looking to get into the business, and it can be challenging to work with new people who don't understand the significance of shorebird and sea turtle abatement and protection measures. The cost of the construction work is about \$8.2 million, and the state cost-sharing at this point is approximately \$3.1 million. In related news, the County had filed an appeal to FEMA for the recovery funds available after the 2012 project; after some back and forth regarding sand that had eroded from our beach built in 2010-11 while other parts had remained stable or been naturally nourished, our appeal was approved. There will be more money overall, though less of it will come from the state and more from the federal government.

### **Citizen Comments**

Chair Kewley opened the floor to citizen comments.

Mr. Mickey Beaudoin spoke but the microphone was not on and his comments were inaudible.

Mr. Ed Hill spoke but the microphone was not on and his comments were inaudible.

Commissioner Bill Truex offered a brief history of meetings and visits to West County, and meetings between the Commissioners and the ACOE in Washington, DC, and other officials. The County is actively engaging, including our legislative delegation, with the ACOE and the FDEP, working to move the response to this situation along. Responding to a prior speaker's comments about spreading the cost, Commissioner Truex commented that he had raised that issue with residents of the Key and was "nearly shot for it". He indicated that what he considered a "tiered system" would be beneficial to the community as a whole. Giving himself as an example of a citizen who does not live on the beach, but considers the beach an asset, he said that at a minimum, West County should consider being involved in participating in the project. He said he received pushback from those who felt that all people should end up paying the same dollar amount, which he could not agree with, so he ceased his attempts at that time, but still believes that, as a community, they need to have that conversation: even if a small amount came from the off-island people who benefit from tourism tax and the business generated there, it would still be a large amount to help offset the overall cost. He encouraged all the involved people and organizations to work together

to make the effort consistent. FDEP has approved the alignment of the armoring, but there are still issues involving the conforming structures which are not eligible for armoring – but there is an appeal process for that issue, and one resident has already won his appeal. The important part of this process is that each participant needs to remain in alignment, since it is the ‘returns’ that create additional damage; it is extremely important to have a coordinated effort.

Ms. Toni Orr, owner of one of the houses that has been condemned, noted that she has met with Mr. Cullinan and with Commissioner Truex, and has been doing her own research as well. She said that her concern involved a determination that her house was ‘slab on grade’ but she believes that is not the case, and she brought her 1950s blueprints with her to demonstrate that the house has stem wall. She stated her belief that the whole premise is wrong and objected to having to file an appeal based on that faulty evaluation; she also objected to the condemnation. She asked for assistance in dealing with this situation.

Commissioner Constance thanked the committee for its work on this matter, and for the valuable information about past efforts to address these beach-related issues that the meetings have provided. He emphasized that a large part of the responsibility for navigating this situation rested on the residents, and urged them to get together with their neighbors and act as ‘the front line of defense’ and get everybody on-board. The residents need to agree that this has to be a public beach and that there has to be a 100% unified response, not a patchwork response. He agreed with Commissioner Truex on the importance of everyone respecting the alignment and not creating a piecemeal response. He also advised the group that there is a domino effect possible here, particularly with regard to value: Before a house is condemned or lost, the owner can lose the ability to insure that house, which is a huge problem particularly if there is a mortgage; in that situation a bank can choose either to insure it themselves, for 3-4 times the usual premium, or they may decide not to do that and simply call the loan instead. Commissioner Constance characterized this issue as a major financial crisis for everyone. He also mentioned that there is a joint meeting with the Charlotte and Sarasota Commissioners coming up at which the main subject will be this situation and the desirability of making it a regional project.

Mr. Steve Stump, Manasota Key resident, noted that he lives at the north end of the Charlotte County portion of the Key where the issues are much worse than for residents on the south part. He said that residents of the south part had a concern with establishment of the public beach and where the demarcation is between private and public land, and he thought the legal department had been working on figuring that out and asked where private land ends and become public. Charlotte County Attorney Jeanette Knowlton said that would be established in connection with the Erosion Control Line (ECL) when the dividing line will cease to be the Mean High Water Line (MHWL) and become the ECL. But at this time, as Mr. Stump noted, it has been the MHWL.

Ms. Ariens asked Mr. Poff to comment about the MHWL and that the longer people wait to address the issue, the closer that line is to their structure. Mr. Poff responded with reference to Florida Statutes, noting the necessity to establish the ECL which is the pre-construction MHWL and which is supposed to be surveyed six months prior to construction. The MHWL is based on a tidal epic; NOAA publishes those elevations and the state confirms them. There is then a legal process, involving public workshops which a state representative attends and takes testimony from the audience as to their approval/disapproval of the line. All ECL he has been involved in, the hearing and workshop have been quick processes that result in the line being approved; however, in some counties, the matter has had to go to the Supreme Court, based on belief it is a ‘taking’ of private property. The Supreme Court did not uphold that view; it is not a taking. The County website has a link that links to information on the ECL process. Mr. Poff acknowledged that on Manasota Key, the ECL will be a complicated

matter, because of the existing rock revetment and armoring structures, and the fact that the MHWL falls on those revetments or on the face of a seawall. He said that he had contacted the state of Florida, the Survey Department that review the ECLs for completeness, with regard to deviations from the MHWL. Deviations arise because the state does not want to own private structures – e.g., your rock revetment; this is something the County can request, so that the line avoids such structures, and Mr. Poff indicated that such deviations would be proposed in this case as well and spoke about some of the possible outcomes. Once this is all settled, the ECL will be recorded in the public records, and that becomes your property line; the only time this established line could be lifted would be if the County stopped managing the beaches and let the area continue to erode, at which point the residents have the right to appeal to the state of Florida to have the ECL lifted. Having said this, Mr. Poff commented that he had never heard of this happening in the state of Florida.

He also went on to comment on the timing of setting the ECL, noting that if there are revetments or a seawall already, the timing is less important, because those structures are not moving; however, if there is still dry sand beach which is eroding, then the sooner you set that ECL, the more private property will be retained. But, still, it can't be done too soon because of the changes that could possible happen that would affect construction; six months is considered appropriate although he knew of instances where much more time had passed. However, every deviation from procedures in statute opens a project to challenges, which also has to be considered.

Mr. Andy Wing thanked the Committee members, and also said he wanted to emphasize a point made by Mr. Hill; another resource available to the Committee is the South Manasota/Sandpiper Key Association, which has about 650 members. They can send out an email blast to all members if necessary. Mr. Wing also thanked the County Commissioners for the Restore funds they released to start this process. Next, addressing the member from the Homeowner's Association, he noted that last November the County created the beach renourishment MSTU, and the boundaries were set at that time including everything on Manasota Key and Sandpiper Key, which amounts to about 1,800 property owners that would be funding this project. He agreed with the Commissioner that there was a lot of pushback based on a minority of property owners objecting to the public on their beaches; he felt this led to a very bad impression being left with the public about residents of the Key.

Mr. Wing also commented on the appropriateness of the Beaches and Shores Advisory Committee being the body to take this project forward; since this Committee has no revenue source, however, they can't present anything. That's why the MSTU had to be established; that is the third MSTU that island residents will be paying into: Stump Pass, Streets & Drainage, and now beach renourishment.

*[To hear the discussion in its entirety, please visit the Charlotte County Government website at <https://www.charlottecountyfl.gov/boards-committees/bsac/Pages/Meeting-Minutes.aspx> and choose the audio file for July 14, 2016.]*

### **Staff Comments**

Commissioner Deutsch thanked everyone who attended.

Mr. Cullinan noted that he had provided Mr. Hill with copies of the packets so they would be available at the Chamber in Englewood; he also has more on hand for anyone to may want one. He also indicated either he or Ben Bailey would be happy to come and speak to any groups that may want questions answered. Mr. Poff also asked for Chamber meeting schedules in order to coordinate presentations.

### **Member Comments**

Mr. Brock commented to the Commissioners about having a countywide MSBU to help defray the costs of beach renourishment, on the basis that every citizen can use the beach. He also felt the state and other entities would look more favorably on the request if local groups had developed some funding on their own first. Subsequent comments in response were inaudible.

Chair Kewley commented on his impression, based on many meeting on this subject, that the County has done everything possible to expedite a solution to this issue as soon as it became apparent what the gravity of the situation was.

He noted that while the next regular meeting of the Committee was scheduled in October, if there were special or newsworthy events, special meetings could be called to discuss them.

### **Election of Officers**

Chair Kewley called for the election. (Some microphones were off during this discussion.) Ms. Ariens asked for a legal opinion on her nomination of Mr. Brock as Chair; the response was inaudible. Ms. Ariens also asked about the significance of the person she nominated as having already seconded the nomination of someone else for that position, and asked did that matter to her nomination; the response was inaudible.

On a majority of the voice vote, Mr. Kewley was re-elected to the position of Chair, Ms. Ariens voting 'nay'. Ms. Ariens nominated Mr. Brock as Vice-Chair, which was seconded by Mr. Kewley, and passed unanimously.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:04 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Moore  
Recording Secretary

Minutes Approved by

Clifford Kewley, Chairman  
Beaches & Shores Advisory Committee