

MARINE ADVISORY BOARD

June 2, 2005 – 7:00 P.M.

CITY HALL

CITY COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM – EIGHTH FLOOR

100 North Andrews Avenue

Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Board Members	Present	Cumulative from 5/01/05	
	Absent	(P)	(A)
Randolph Adams	P	P-2	A-0
John Baker	A	P-1	A-1
Ryan Campbell	P	P-2	A-0
Richard Duncan	P	P-2	A-0
Joseph Hessmann	P	P-2	A-0
Roger McKee	P	P-2	A-0
Norbert McLaughlin	P	P-2	A-0
Robert Sadowski	P	P-2	A-0
Rick Schulze	A	P-0	A-2
John Terrill, Chairman	P	P-2	A-0
Stephen Tilbrook	P	P-2	A-0
Dr. Geraldine Udell, Vice Chair	P	P-2	A-0
Eugene Zorovich	A	P-1	A-1
Joan Brochu	A	P-1	A-1

Staff

Jamie Hart, Supervisor of Marine Facilities

Bruce Larkin, Director of Business Enterprises

Officer J. Hancock, Fort Lauderdale Marine Police Unit

Visitors

Glenn Bryant, B.K. Marine Construction, Inc.

Harold Kopietz, Ocean Front Water Sports

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

The June 2, 2005 meeting of the Marine Advisory Board was called for order at 7:17 P.M. by Chair Terrill. A quorum was achieved with ten board members present.

II. Approval of Minutes – May 5, 2005

The minutes of the May 5, 2005 meeting were reviewed and the following corrections noted:

Mr. Adams advised that on page two it was noted that Mr. Adams nominated John Terrill for the position of Chair, when in fact Mr. Terrill was nominated by Roger McKee.

In addition **Chair Terrill** noted that the cover sheet still listed Mr. McLaughlin as Vice Chair when in fact that position is held by Dr. Udell.

With those corrections, a motion was made by **Mr. Campbell** and seconded by **Mr. Adams** to accept the minutes as amended. A vote was taken and the motion carried unanimously.

III. Report

• Waterway Crime and Boating Safety, Officer J. Hancock

Officer Hancock advised the Board that last month there were four boating accidents, all property damage or minor incidents. In addition, part of the Jungle Queen's wooden dock collapsed while passengers were debarking causing several persons to fall into the water. There were minor injuries reported.

Officer Hancock advised that there were five burglaries reported, small in nature; fishing rods and some electronics. No pattern has been detected.

In addition Officer Hancock reported three boat thefts, two in the western portion of the city and one in the eastern portion. Officer Sandy Donnell's of the Marine Patrol was able to take one of the culprits from the east-side theft into custody after the vessel was spotted at the 15th Street Fisheries.

Officer Hancock apprised the members of the Board of the security activity for the upcoming OAS Conference, being held June 3rd to June 8th as it relates to causeway closing times and vessel traffic restrictions.

Mr. McLaughlin inquired if a commercial vessel had to call in advance to be escorted through the area. Officer Hancock advised that any vessel over 100' would need to make those clearance arrangements ahead of time. **Mr. McLaughlin** asked who the contact person was to assist barges and tugs. Officer Hancock advised that those vessels will be worked through as quickly as possible. He added that the Coast Guard will be monitoring the situation on channel 16. **Chair Terrill** added that VHF12 would be also monitoring the situation.

Mr. Hessmann inquired which dock collapsed in the Jungle Queen incident. Officer Hancock advised it was the dock on the river where passengers disembark for food and entertainment, not at the Las Olas dock.

Mr. Hessmann noted that there are seven freighters anchored off Fort Lauderdale Beach at this time, and he speculated that more would be arriving. He inquired if these freighters would be subject to the same regulations for the OAS Conference. Officer Hancock advised that the port was working out the logistics as far as getting these vessels in and out in some type of workable fashion. In addition, fuel tankers will be going to the same locations in order to unload and take on fuel. As far as the container ships and freighters, the port is trying to keep them more towards the southern end for ease of movement. He added that when the cruise ships leave over the weekend, space will open up.

Mr. McKee added that it was his understanding that no boat can stop or anchor while the vessels are moving through the port area. Officer Hancock said all traffic will be kept moving at idle speed under the bridge and there will be slow speed zone imposed from that point forward on both sides. Most boats will probably have a police boat escort to assure movement. He added that multiple jurisdictions, such as WC, Coast Guard, and Customs, will be cooperating for this effort.

Chair Terrill listed the boats that will be restricted: personal watercraft, inflatable, and kayaks. He inquired if this restriction was posted at the marinas. Officer Hancock assured the Board that flyers were handed out at every one of the marinas in the city and most of the facilities that do major maintenance/repairs.

IV. Report **Mega-Yacht Appreciation Week**

Chair Terrill reminded the board that this idea was initiated by Past President Barry Flanigan, who continues to assist with the program. It is intended to provide a means with which to welcome mega yacht owners and captains to the City of Fort Lauderdale, encouraging them to return. Each visiting mega yacht generates an average of \$400,000.00 in the local economy per visit. Last year Mayor Naugle issued a proclamation welcoming the yachts to the city. Each year crew members come by the thousands to study and sit for various exams in Fort Lauderdale; such as captain, mate, or engineering licenses. The course takes many months and costs thousands of dollars. It was suggested by Mr. Flanigan to organize a scholarship program for these students. The city would benefit by receiving appreciation, goodwill, and respect from the yachting industry. **Chair Terrill** noted that there may be grant money available for this purpose.

Mr. Adams inquired if the grant money would be limited to only the citizens of Fort Lauderdale or would be open to visiting students. **Chair Terrill** noted that students come from all over the world and are not typically Broward County residents.

Mr. Baker inquired if the Marine Industry Association had any similar program. **Chair Terrill** did not know of any MIA involvement at this time.

Mr. Hessmann felt the program deserves merit and would be a benefit to the City, but as the City's budget was limited and overstretched at this time his desire was to table the discussion to give the Board time to look into alternate funding and support from other sources. **Chair Terrill** acknowledged it would be wise to look into what grants are available and encouraged the City to pursue grants. In addition information

is needed as to how the program would be structured. There had been some discussions in the past for this Board to host or co-host an event at the Fort Lauderdale Boat Show for the purpose of gauging interest and raising funds.

Mr. Baker inquired if other locations, regionally or internationally, have a similar program in place. **Chair Terrill** noted that he had not heard of any.

Mr. Hessmann noted that the Triton editor was present and suggested that an article in this popular media on this potential program would assist in locating interested parties.

Mr. Adams inquired as to what the consequences would be if the program was initiated and then was terminated. **Chair Terrill** felt that every single crew member that would be educated would be an asset to the City and the industry at large, and didn't feel there would be negative consequences should the program not be able to continue.

Mr. Adams added that once the out of town student was trained, the crew member left the area, whereas if we trained a resident that student would keep his talent and resources locally. **Chair Terrill** noted that Mega Yacht Appreciation Week was specifically designed to encourage mega yacht decision makers. **Mr. Adams** added that the average boat, out of the 46,000 that are registered, is 26'. He noted that it was the small boat owner's money being used, and he would prefer something be done for that segment of boat owner.

Mr. Duncan noted that grants are not guaranteed from year to year.

Frank Herhold added that the MIA SF is in their second year of a grant program from Work Force One wherein one employee's salary is paid. He continued that there is grant money available for training local people, and there is a tremendous need for mega yacht crews. He suggested that Donna McBride from MIA SF, the Work Force One coordinator, work with the Marine Advisory Board to explore utilizing Work Force One grants.

Mr. Duncan suggested contacting the schools that will be involved for their input.

Chair Terrill agreed with the concept and added that time is needed to look into other options. This item will be tabled for further discussion at the next meeting.

V. Application for Motorized Beach Boating Concession Waiver Best Western Hotel, Harold Kopietz, Ocean Front Water Sports

Mr. Hart advised the Board that the property in the application is larger than most at 400 feet, with a swimming area located 150-200 yards away from the intended concession site. He presented slides of the site showing the buoy markers that will be removed daily. The signage was displayed and was in order, and will also be removed and stored each night.

Mr. Harold Kopietz, the proposed concessionaire, addressed the Board. He advised that he has been operating in the Fort Lauderdale/Pompano Beach area for 23 years, with no safety citations. In addition each of his customers is prepared with 10-15 minutes of operating instructions with additional cautionary instructions regarding swimmers, divers, and other watercraft they might encounter, and a quick course in boating safety. Customers are admonished to idle past the swimming area.

Mr. Duncan asked if there were Coast Guard regulation requirements on the buoys. Mr. Kopietz was unsure about Coast Guard requirements but his intention is to mark the corridor to allow access and egress of the watercraft from the beach. **Mr. Duncan** asked if the buoys were located outside of the swimming zone in the vessel exclusion zone. Mr. Kopietz noted the craft must progress through the buoys like a channel until they get beyond the vessel exclusion buoys. Mr. Hart added that the city regulates out up to three miles and as long as approved, non-permanent buoys are used, they are acceptable.

Mr. McKee inquired what the southern and northern boundaries are for the parasailing operation. Mr. Kopietz answered that he had not plotted the boundaries per se; however, once the boat is out it usually stays out about a mile. **Mr. McKee's** concern is that another concessionaire may be performing the same service and they may interact with each other. Mr. Kopietz advised that there is nobody to the north of his location within two miles that performs parasailing. In addition, at his present location in Pompano there are several such vendors and they have been operating without incident. He noted that the vendors shuttle in on an airboat and pick up the customers. Mr. Kopietz added that once his watercraft is on the ocean, the jet skis have boundaries so they can be continuously observed.

Mr. Duncan said he was under the impression that the application was for a Jet Ski operator. He inquired if parasailing was also a part of the application. Mr. Kopietz answered yes.

Mr. Hart read through staff's recommendations:

- Corridor buoys shall be placed at a maximum of 100' apart starting from the 100-yard boating restricted outer demarcation line, presently established by the white cylindrical buoys, inward to the beach.
- Identification is required of all motorized rental watercraft, including the chase watercraft, sufficient in size to permit identification from a minimum distance of 150 yards.
- Proof of insurance is required for any other business or contractor operating in conjunction with concessionaire.
- Towing of customers on air floatation style or rubber tube craft is not permitted without prior authorization.
- Two signs are required to be posted at the high water mark on each boundary. Such signs shall be removed daily and stored in a designated area in a secured location.

Mr. Tilbrook expressed a concern about the impact this operation may have on the beach and asked how much jurisdiction the city had. Mr. Hart answered that it is considered private property once you reach above the high water mark. In terms of an environmental impact there are regulations in place that must be met. **Mr. Tilbrook's** concern is with storage of the vessels and he questioned if a building permit was required. Mr. Hart answered that for construction purposes a permit was required. **Mr. Tilbrook** added that in some areas where these types of concessions are operating the 50 foot demarcation mark starts at the water and impacts where people swim and use the beach. He inquired whether this permit grants an exclusive right to a section of beach. Mr. Hart answered that the code specifically provides authority to store

equipment above the high water mark, and grants them permission to do that. Mr. Hart suggested the Board attach a condition whereby the concessionaire must comply with all local, federal and state regulatory requirements. Mr. Kopietz noted that the selected location does not have a lot of sand and no equipment will be stored on the beach. **Mr. Duncan** said he would feel more comfortable if that statement is added as a condition. **Mr. Tilbrook** agreed.

Mr. Tilbrook advised he felt very comfortable with this operator but felt precautions should be taken in case there is a future operator. Mr. Kopietz added that should the beach ever be dredged and sand added he would come back for an amendment.

Mr. Campbell asked for clarification on the high water line definition. Mr. Hart answered that typically it is where the property line meets the high water line. Below that would be considered public beach. **Mr. Campbell** asked how far out from the water line the cones would be placed for the swimming area. Mr. Kopietz answered approximately 100 yards. **Mr. Campbell** asked what the distance was between the two cones that are parallel to the beach. Mr. Kopietz said he didn't know the answer to that but where he is located now in Pompano Beach they are 50 yards away. Mr. Hart noted that they are different in different areas. **Mr. Campbell** inquired how far out it will extend from the six buoys in the channel. Mr. Kopietz said the last two buoys will be even.

Mr. Tilbrook asked if the Marine Advisory Board was the final granting authority. Mr. Hart answered that the Marine Advisory Board would send its recommendation to the City Commission.

Mr. Tilbrook made a motion to recommend approval subject to the conditions outlined by staff with the additional condition that there is no overnight storage of watercraft or equipment on the sandy beach. **Mr. Hessmann** seconded the motion.

Mr. Hart noted that the code does allow storage above the high watermark. **Mr. Sadowski** inquired why there were no permanent buoys allowed in the corridor. Mr. Hart answered it was because of permitting and regulatory issues.

The question was called, a vote taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

VI. Regulation of Boatlifts

- John Terrill

Chair **Terrill** requested that this item be put on the agenda so that the Board may explore the current code ordinances and whether they are fair and equitable to all property owners. The code currently limits the maximum amount that a boat lift can extend into the waterway to 10% of the width of that waterway or 20', whichever is less. Currently a boat that is in the water is allowed to extend up to 30% of the width of that waterway. The average boat is 26' and has an 8-9' beam, which means that the property owner that has an average size boat in a typical 100' canal is faced with the choice of taking out the dock and putting the boatlift up against the seawall or forgoing the boatlift entirely. If the canal were 120' wide the same property owner could squeeze a 2-4' dock between the seawall and the boatlift. In the year 2000 this Board had asked the City Commission to approve the hiring of consultant to study the code of ordinances.

Funding was not available to hire said consultant, but staff conducted a study. City staff recommended at that time that every single component of the boatlift code be changed. They either loosened or tightened restrictions on the side setbacks, the height of the lift, the maximum distance that a lift could extend into the waterway, and the number of lifts allowed per lot. Unfortunately there wasn't any correlation made between a boat on a lift and a boat in the water. Nothing came of that effort. **Chair Terrill** suggests the Board consider scrutinizing the past effort to identify items that merit change, thus avoiding a total rewrite.

Mr. Adams inquired as to who brought this issue up at this time. **Chair Terrill** advised that the issue was originally brought up by Barry Flanigan. **Chair Terrill** also noted that the issue was brought up in 2000 and never resolved, and he feels now may be the appropriate time to have it reconsidered. He added that he has spoken to many homeowners that feel the restrictions are not fair. **Mr. Adams** inquired if anyone from the City had brought up this issue. **Chair Terrill** answered that no one from the City has inquired.

Mr. McLaughlin opined that a boat on a lift is no different than a boat in the water, and he recommended 30' of the canal be made available to a boat whether it be on the lift or at dock as the relationship is the same.

Dr. Udell disagreed saying the relationship is not the same as one is physical and permanent, such as pilings and metal framework that may extend 30' out into the canal. She noted that when a boat leaves the boat lift, the lift still remains. One of the big problems is the neighbors complaining about their view being blocked by the boat's propellers and the nasty boat bottom hanging in the air. They feel their riparian rights are being violated.

Mr. McLaughlin noted that the mooring piles used to dock a boat are permanent. **Dr. Udell** agreed but added that a mooring piling doesn't have a large framework around it. Some of the frames measure 20-40 feet. **Mr. McLaughlin** also added that boats that are lifted don't usually have bottom paint. In addition, from an environmental standpoint, a boat on a lift has a better chance of not sinking during inclement weather subjecting the water and area to oil and gasoline residue. In addition lifted boats have little barnacle growth, and are better attended to than boats that are left in the water. **Dr. Udell** restated that property owners' rights and views are the major concern. She added that in 2000 the City was hesitant to involve itself for fear of in potential legal entanglements.

Mr. Hessmann agreed with both sides, noting each had valid points; however, he is against raising this issue at this time, noting the Commissioners didn't want to deal with this issue five years ago, and they probably don't wish to consider it now. In addition, the Planning and Zoning Board would have to become involved to deal with the code issues.

Mr. Duncan added that currently whether to install a lift or not is the choice of the property owner. At this time there are regulations covering boat lifts which are different than other storage methods with regard to set-backs and requirements. Making the regulations the same for both makes sense; however that is not the case at this time. When a boat owner desires a variance the issue comes before the committee for variances. **Mr. Duncan** has been on said committee four years and has only had a few applications. He does not see this issue as a large problem. He suggested a history on

how many permits are issued per year by the code department that asks for variances would be helpful. **Mr. Hart** noted that the City of Fort Lauderdale's code in terms of limitations is behind other municipalities. In addition there is the issue of zoning wherein Fort Lauderdale has a density problem in terms of vessels. He also noted that Glenn Bryant from BK Marine would tell a different story whereby contractors can't get permits without going through the waiver process because our code is too restrictive. He reminded the Board members that this board does not deal with zoning issues, but with navigational and safety issues. The last time this issue was raised at a City Commission meeting the Commissioners did agree with the Marine Advisory Board's recommendation to go along with the consultant study. There was an RFP packet prepared, but this issue was not high on the priority list and funding was not available and this item was eventually dropped.

Mr. Tilbrook inquired how the code was deficient. **Mr. Hart** answered that the code allows vessels to dock out to 30%, yet a structure can only extend out to 10%. Most other agencies allow at least 20%. **Mr. Hart** added that the technologies of lifts have changed requiring a different consideration.

Mr. Adams inquired if anyone had revisited this issue, and added that in order to address this issue regulatory considerations are going to have to be reviewed by this Board as well as Planning and Zoning. **Mr. Hart** noted that the Chair had requested the Board revisit this issue at this time. He added that this is a time consuming, difficult issue and suggested the Board consider studying a small section at a time.

Mr. Tilbrook noted that there is no way to separate this issue from a zoning issue, because frankly it is almost purely a zoning issue and has little to do with navigational problems. He added that in reviewing staff's recommendations, not only for this issue but all the waivers that are granted, there are no real criteria that can be applied. A potential benefit in addressing this issue again is that criteria can be clarified to determine what the impacts on navigation will be, what the neighborhood impacts will be, and what the visual impacts will be. He added that ultimately it will be the willingness of the Commission to address this issue that will matter.

Mr. Duncan added that the footage into the canal depends on the size of the canal and that normal limits for a vessel in the water has always been the criteria used in the past for variances. It is his opinion that the code limitations should be the same for both instances.

Chair Terrill passed out two pages of photographs of boats on lifts, large motor yachts, and smaller docked boats. **Chair Terrill** disagrees that boatlifts are ugly. He noted that larger boats take up the view corridor far more than the boats on a lift, and this fact should be considered when decisions regarding limitations are made. **Chair Terrill** suggested this item be continued to the next meeting where a member of Planning and Zoning can address their point of view with this Board.

Glenn Bryant spoke to the Board. It is his opinion that the city code is too restrictive and many people have boat lifts that are illegal because of it. It was his estimation that this number could reach upwards to 60-70%. It was his opinion that most people don't care to go through the tedious process of obtaining a variance, which is why not many are brought up for consideration. It is Mr. Bryant's opinion that the 10% rule should apply to the boat dock only and not to a lift. In fact, he feels the boat lift was added to the code without much thought at how difficult adherence would be.

Dr. Udell recalled the problems she had with one of her neighbors after she installed a permit compliant boat lift because the boat now blocked the neighbor's view. She noted that some boat lifts are being installed perpendicular to the seawall which also causes problems. It is her opinion that the Commissioners are bogged down with other city problems and this is not a good time for this issue to resurface.

Mr. Adams made a motion that this discussion be terminated for tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Chessman. A vote was taken and passed 6 to 4 with Mr. Adams and Mr. Hessman voting against.

VII. Old/New Business

Mr. Hessmann reported a safety issue he observed at the north end of Fort Lauderdale Beach beyond Birch State Park whereby when the conditions are right people are launching sail boards in that area, particularly after the lifeguards leave for the day. This is a known surf area. **Mr. Hessmann** witnessed a sail boarder operating in the vicinity of a surfer and the two almost colliding. Before a fatality occurs, **Mr. Hessmann** desires this Board to address this problem with the City Commission in the hopes of producing a code regulating sail boarding. **Mr. Hessmann** noted that this is not the first time he has brought this safety issue before the Board.

Mr. Duncan inquired if launching sail boards there was in violation of current code ordinances. **Mr. Hessmann** answered it was, and that sail boarders should not be allowed where there are swimmers or surfers. **Chair Terrill** inquired if surfing was legal in that area. **Mr. Hessmann** answered that surfers have been in that area as long as he can remember, but doesn't know technically if surfing is considered legal. **Mr. Tilbrook** inquired if this was an issue of enforcement. **Mr. Hessmann** indicated that he could not answer that question and that it needs to be addressed.

Mayor Naugle entered the room and was recognized by **Chair Terrill**. Mayor Naugle advised that the City Commission is going to receive a recommendation on rates for special events in city parking lots, which may include the Billfish Tournament, at the Tuesday meeting. It was the Mayor's understanding that there may be a significant increase in rent. He wanted the Board to be aware of this fact because the Marine Advisory Board has taken a position on this item. The Mayor left the meeting at this time.

Mr. Hart advised that he has spoken to the marine sergeant about the surfer/sail boarder issue. They researched the definition under the beach/boating restrictive code because the sail boarders are operating in the 100-yard exclusion zone. He was unable to find a definition captured in the code for sail boards because that type of craft is a new innovation. Mr. Hart is not aware of any code that could be used to enforce or regulate sail board usage. Mr. Hart noted that he will schedule this issue for the next meeting and come back with a more definitive recommendation.

Mr. Hessmann made a motion that this item be placed on the agenda next month for the Board to study in preparation of a recommendation to the City Commission of ways to stop the mixture of these dangerous activities that are causing a safety issue. Mr. Campbell seconded the motion.

Mr. Duncan asked that the Board be provided with surfing code ordinances and information as well.

Mr. Campbell requested that the same information be obtained for wind surfing as well. Mr. Hart noted that staff studied the wind surfing code and that sailboards do not fall into that category. Mr. McLaughlin inquired as to why this is. Mr. Hart did not have the definition in front of him but assured the Board that the two were vastly different.

The question was called, a vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.

VIII. Reports

• Terminal Waterbus Relocation

Mr. Hart noted that some progress has been made on the desired location in that staff had been asked to provide a survey to the City Commission of locations at city marinas. The 17th Street location is not finalized because of parking issues. Mr. Hart advised that the waterbus may be stored at one of the city's facilities temporarily. The city extended the waterbus agreement only until June to stay at Bahia Mar. Mr. Hart added that at this time no decision has been made as to where the 16 vessels will be relocated. Mr. Hessmann inquired as to what the county's position was. Mr. Hart advised that the county has been working on a space at the port, but with the process involved, the security issues, and the length of time that will take, it has not been finalized yet.

Mr. Duncan inquired what "temporary" actually means should one of our city marinas be utilized. Mr. Hart opined that it could be up to six months, adding that the locations being considered are mostly on the New River (a site by the tunnel, a site at Marshall Point, Cooley's Landing, and the seawall by the Performing Arts Center) and at the Las Olas Marina on the south side.

Mr. Larkin advised the Board that when the conversation about the 17th Street location took place, staff was asked by the City Commission to look at alternatives. A list of alternative city facilities was identified because those are the only ones staff has any kind of direct control over. The list of alternatives displayed the advantages and disadvantages of each site. No priorities were establish, and no one site was recommended over another. The City Manger was presented the list and with his approval it was provided to the City Commission. Follow-up individual meetings with each of the Commissioners have taken place at the direction of the City Manager to talk about the list and get their input. When those meetings are completed, which should be within the week, Mr. Larkin will communicate back to the Manager what the findings are. At that point the City Manager will decide what action should be taken next. Those conversations have been all from the perspective that the waterbus would be expected to pay fair market rent for any site they may use. Some of the sites have permit issues and other issues that need to be addressed.

As far as the county is concerned, there has been conversation about the convention center hotel site, and the county administrator is leaning towards perhaps making that site available through a competitive RFP process.

Mr. Tilbrook requested an update be provided to the Board at the next meeting. **Mr. Duncan** inquired about the maintenance issues should the waterbus use city facilities. Mr. Hart said the city has controls over that issue by code.

- **Broward County Marine Advisory Committee**

Mr. McKee asked Mr. Herhold to comment on the progress being made. Mr. Herhold advised that Bruce Larkin, Chair Terrill, Norm Taylor from the Broward County Director of Office of Economic Development, Bob Harbin, and Susan Engle have all been involved with this project. Mr. Herhold advised that through a process a solution has been worked out that makes sense for boaters and for security. A year ago the County Commission asked MIAF to work with the Parks and Recreation Department as to exactly where we can create and locate new recreational marine facilities. A study was done and an interim report was generated and presented to the County Administrator, who studied the material and asked a dozen in-depth questions. A great deal of research and data has been accumulated as a result of both the study and the follow-up questions. A researcher was hired at one point to complete the task. The only questions left to be addressed can only be answered by county staff. A brief report was made to the County Administrator. The research data was reviewed by the Marine Advisory Committee. The data includes a list of sites, an inventory of existing marinas and dockage facilities, a list of lost facilities, and a list of related businesses of the marine industry. Mr. Herhold acknowledged it is a slow, tedious process and will probably take the rest of the summer before it is completed. A final report is expected to be complete and ready for presentation to the Broward County Marine Advisory Committee by their first meeting in the fall, then subsequently to the County Administrator, and ultimately the County Commission.

On another note, Mr. Herhold advised that the Working Waterfront bill was passed and will take effect as soon as the Governor signs it on July 1st. This bill will provide a number of tools for the industry such as a tax deferment program, and a grant program for more public access facilities.

Mr. Herhold announced also that legislation has been provided for a general permit for municipalities and governmental entities for grants.

Mr. Tilbrook inquired if that would apply to the City's floating docks. Mr. Herhold felt it would.

Mr. Adams inquired about the status of the floating docks on the New River. Mr. Hart replied that the task order for funding for the consultants was scheduled for June 7th; however, he has learned that the consultant's fee was considerably higher than originally estimated, not through the fault of the consultant, and the item was deferred to a future City Commission meeting. He advised that should staff be unable to lower the costs, there is CIP funds that can be utilized. Mr. Larkin added that this information was just learned today.

IX. Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn the meeting by **Mr. Campbell** and seconded by **Mr. Duncan**. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

Chair Terrill adjourned the meeting at 8:51 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Jody E. Lebel
Court Reporter/Public Notary