

**MINUTES OF THE MARINE ADVISORY BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE, FLORIDA
THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 2011 – 6:00 P.M.**

<u>Board Members</u>	Attendance	Cumulative Attendance 5/2010 through 4/20/11	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Barry Flanigan, Chair	P	5	3
James Harrison, Vice Chair	P	7	1
F. St. George Guardabassi	P	7	1
Bruce Johnson	A	4	4
Randolph Adams	P	8	0
Norbert McLaughlin	P	8	0
Jim Welch	P	6	2
Robert Dean	P	6	2
Mel DiPietro	P	5	3
Bob Ross	P	6	2
Stephen Tilbrook	A	4	4
Tom Tapp	P	5	3
Herb Rassing (6:41)	P	7	1
Frank Herhold	P	1	0
Lisa Scott-Founds	P	1	0

As of this date, there are 15 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Andrew Cuba, Manager of Marine Facilities
Jonathan Luscomb, Supervisor of Marine Facilities
Cate McCaffrey, Director of Business Enterprises
Levend Ekendiz, Intracoastal Facilities Dockmaster
Matt Domke, Downtown Facilities Dockmaster
Officer Rick Rhodes, Marine Police Staff
Tony Irvine, Public Works
Karim Rahmankhah, Engineering Design Manager
Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

Following waterfront resident attendance over the course of the last three or four meetings, the Board has become increasingly aware of a problem with

the water depth of city canals, much of which are based upon 30 year old survey data, and its affect on boating and real estate. By unanimous consensus, the Board asks that this issue be brought to the Commission's attention, with a recommendation of a master plan including a survey to establish dredging priorities within the navigable waterways of the city.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Vice Chair Flanigan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and roll was called.

II. Approval of Minutes – December 2, 2010

Motion made by Mr. DiPietro, seconded by Mr. Tapp, to approve the minutes of the December 2, 2010 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

III. Statement of Quorum

Vice Chair Flanigan noted that a quorum was present. The Board welcomed new member Frank Herhold.

IV. Waterway Crime & Boating Safety Report

Officer Rhodes reported that there were diesel fuel spills on December 3, December 10, and December 17. The spills occurred between Peterson Fuel and two private vessels. In the first two cases, the Coast Guard was notified and the situations were resolved. On December 17, the Coast Guard was notified by the Fort Lauderdale Police Department rather than either vessel, and a follow-up investigation is underway.

A separate fuel spill was also reported on December 17, and the Marine Unit responded to assist the Broward County Environmental Protection Agency. No source was located and the spill dissipated with the tide.

Seven burglaries occurred in December. Officer Rhodes noted that the incidents seemed to be isolated rather than part of a pattern of burglaries. Between December 16 and December 30, items including various electronics, fishing equipment, and a bicycle were stolen from vessels. All scenes were processed for additional evidence and detectives are continuing the investigations.

A vessel accident occurred on December 10 when a sailboat struck another vessel, causing minor damage. On December 18, a vessel recovering buoys from a regatta was stalled, swamped, and capsized in rough seas with four occupants aboard. The Police Department responded and rescued the passengers.

The Marine Unit issued two citations and 36 warnings in December.

Officer Rhodes concluded that on December 11, the Marine Unit participated in the annual Winterfest Boat Parade, which he said was “an extremely successful event.” There were no safety incidents, injuries, or accidents to report. He thanked Winterfest personnel for working with law enforcement and accepting requested safety guidelines, and thanked the Coast Guard and the Broward County Sheriff’s Office for their assistance as well.

Ms. Scott-Founds noted that the Boat Parade was the “kickoff” event for Fort Lauderdale’s Centennial celebration, and the Winterfest team put a great deal of effort into the parade, fireworks, and other events. She also thanked Vice Chair Flanigan for his assistance in arranging for vintage boats to participate in the event.

Vice Chair Harrison said he had recently used the newly installed floating docks, and had some safety concerns. He asked if there will be any changes in patrolling along the Riverwalk due to the proximity of the docks and boats. Officer Rhodes said he was not aware of any policy changes, but would follow up on this.

Vice Chair Harrison continued that a change in the law allows police cruisers to anchor at a great many locations within the City, and asked if there has been any discussion about this policy. Officer Rhodes said there is “greatly increased” latitude in allowing cruisers to anchor in several locations; he noted that some homeowners have expressed legitimate concerns, and a meeting was held earlier in the day to specifically address this issue.

Mr. Herhold asked if the burglaries in December occurred at night. Officer Rhodes explained that in some cases, the vessels’ owners have been away from their homes, so the time the burglaries occurred could not be determined.

Mr. Guardabassi asked how fuel spills are reported. Officer Rhodes said some are reported by the captain of a vessel or the individual directly involved in the spill; others are often reported by witnesses.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if any arrests were made in the recent cases involving stolen outboards. Officer Rhodes replied the Detective Bureau is handling these cases, and no arrests have been made yet.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the regatta from which buoys were recovered prior to the vessel accident was a sanctioned regatta. Officer Rhodes said he was not sure. Mr. McLaughlin explained that he was surprised a vessel would go into rough seas to recover buoys.

V. Marine Advisory Board Election

- **Chair**

Vice Chair Flanigan noted that former Chair John Terrill has left the Board due to term limits, and Mayor Seiler appointed Mr. Herhold to serve as temporary Chair until a new Chair could be elected.

Mr. McLaughlin nominated Vice Chair Flanigan to serve as Chair. Mr. Tapp seconded the nomination.

Motion made by Mr. Adams, seconded by Ms. Scott-Founds, to close nominations.

In a voice vote, Vice Chair Flanigan was unanimously elected as Chair.

Although a vote to elect a Vice Chair was scheduled for February, Mr. Cuba advised that since the former Vice Chair is now the Chair, this vote could be held tonight as well. The Board agreed to hold this election.

Mr. Ross nominated Mr. Harrison to serve as Vice Chair. Mr. Herhold seconded the nomination.

In a voice vote, Mr. Harrison was unanimously elected as Vice Chair.

VI. Application for a Dock Permit – 901 Cordova Road – Matthew and Kathryn A Birken Friedman

Matthew Friedman, Applicant, explained that he and his wife recently purchased the property at 901 Cordova Road, and are applying to use the existing dock for their vessel. They did not plan to make any changes unless maintenance is necessary.

Chair Flanigan clarified that the application is for a permit to use the existing dock, which is traditionally required at some locations in the City.

Mr. DiPietro asked if the use is disputed by neighbors in any way. Mr. Cuba said notice had been sent to the Applicants' neighbors. The Applicants would pay no costs to the City, and are required to maintain the dock.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the City checks on whether or not an Applicant maintains the dock, and if the City has liability if it is not maintained. Mr. Cuba said the dock is City property, so the City assumes all liability; however, Marine Facilities does not regularly inspect docks. An engineer has inspected the dock prior to the Application to ensure its current safety.

There being no further questions from the Board at this time, Chair Flanigan opened the public hearing. As there were no members of the public who wished to comment on this Item, Chair Flanigan closed the public hearing and returned the discussion to the Board.

Motion made by Mr. Tapp, seconded by Mr. Ross, to recommend approval of the dock permit. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

VII. Discussion – City Canal Dredging

Mr. Cuba introduced Tony Irvine, City Surveyor, and Karim Rahmankhah, Engineering Design Manager, from Public Works. He recalled at the previous meeting he had distributed copies of a report by Mr. Irvine, which detailed the methodology associated with the City's dredging policy. The Board had requested that Mr. Cuba invite members of the Engineering Department to attend tonight's meeting.

Chair Flanigan explained that an individual had reported a dredging issue in the canal along which he lived. He felt the Board should "take a very active role" in ensuring that canals are kept in better shape through dredging. He noted that there are City funding issues associated with the lack of dredging, and hoped that the Board, the Engineering Department, and neighborhood associations could lobby the City Commission for a more active dredging policy. He added that he hoped the Board would make dredging a regularly scheduled item for discussion at meetings in order to keep track of the progress being made.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the City's dredging budget is \$500,000 per year. Mr. Irvine advised that this is the current budget; it varies from one year to the next depending upon what is allocated. Mr. McLaughlin asked if there is a dredge contractor. Mr. Irvine said the contractor is currently in the process of getting a permit; he has been given eight canals to dredge as his first work order. He noted that the original permit conditions do not allow dredging to begin until April 1, 2011.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the bid was for \$55 per cubic yard. Mr. Irvine confirmed this, and said the process was suction dredging. Mr. McLaughlin asked how the number of cubic yards in a given canal is determined. Mr. Irvine explained that he arrives at a digital terrain model of the bottom of the canal. Mr. Rahmankhah's Department then cuts the profile and determines the quantity to be dredged before the work order is issued. If the contractor accepts these figures, no overage is allowed.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if the NGVD depth requirement "should equal what it has to be" when dredging is complete. Mr. Irvine said the field inspector ensures that

the correct depth is achieved. The contractor accepts the City's figures for purposes of payment, but the actual dredging is done to the NGVD amount.

Mr. Rassing arrived at this time (6:41 p.m.).

Mr. McLaughlin noted that homeowners often state that dredging does not go sufficiently deep, and when he has been involved in measurements, this is often the case, even when the required amount has been removed. Mr. Rahmankhah said when a project is complete, a post-dredging elevation is done to make sure that the NGVD has been achieved.

Mr. McLaughlin said when a seawall is installed, there are often complaints afterward that allege the depth of the water is different from before the seawall. He said this is because the depth prior to the seawall's installation is not the NGVD measurement. He said once dredging has been completed, silt can settle back to the bottom and change the measurement.

Mr. Irvine said previously the City would "figure the quantities and then pay truck measure;" this resulted in "more fights and...arguments" regarding the quantities. As a result, the new policy allows the City to figure the quantity for which the contractor is paid, and inspectors come back to check the dredging to ensure the correct depth has been reached. He noted that in recent years, maintenance dredging has often gone slightly deeper than the original measurement "to avoid being sent back" to do the work again and ensure the canals are sufficiently deep for the boats that are using them.

Mr. McLaughlin agreed that on many of the City's canals, the NGVD measurement would not be adequate for many of the boats in these areas. He asked how the City could change the depth. Mr. Irvine said they are "looking at the body [that] has the best position to start that process rolling." He noted that Pompano Beach, for example, has a priority dredging policy similar to what the City had in 1993; they do not have a standard for priority dredging. Mr. Irvine explained that while having a standard for dredging has been helpful to the City in many ways, they are also "handicapped by our standard," as there are some areas in which the boats used are "outgrowing our canals."

Mr. McLaughlin asked how the first eight canals scheduled for dredging are chosen. Mr. Rahmankhah said this is done based upon the list of residents who have called the City to complain about the need for dredging: a surveyor is sent to these canals and it is determined whether or not the canal meets the City's standard. If it does not, it is added to the list. Mr. Irvine noted that one canal in particular suffered from a problem due to unregulated stormwater outfall; it was placed at first priority on the list, as it was "a stormwater issue more than typical maintenance."

Mr. McLaughlin observed that when the City recently put in its sewer systems, several canals were filled in as a result, as silt and water was put through the City's drainage system. He estimated that this had added one to two feet to many canals in just "the last couple of years." Mr. Irvine said this was not unexpected, and the issue could be directed to WaterWorks "as a consequence of their construction."

Mr. Irvine also clarified that dredging the eight canals did not constitute a year's work for the City, but were only "the first task order." He estimated that they expected to dredge approximately 20 canals this year.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if an individual complaint would mean the City would dredge the entire canal on which that individual lived, or only the area "just behind that person's house." Mr. Irvine explained that when a complaint is received, he is given a survey request, and the individual is asked to show them the area in question. The survey is then done of "200-300 ft. of canal," unless they receive a complaint that "the whole canal has problems," in which case they would typically run a profile of the center of the canal. If "high spots" are found, they then survey the entire canal.

Mr. Guardabassi asked if a survey is done within 100-200 yards of an individual's dock "down the middle of the canal," there may possibly still be shallow areas from the mouth of the canal to the dock. Mr. Irvine said if a profile of the canal shows high spots, the entire canal is dredged; if the canal is within allowable limits, the area about which the complaint was received is targeted for dredging.

Mr. Herhold asked if the price of \$55 per cubic yard includes disposal, and where the soil is taken for this disposal. Mr. Rahmankhah said disposal is the contractor's responsibility, and soil is taken to the County landfill in Pompano Beach.

Vice Chair Harrison asked what would be Mr. Irvine's estimation of a budget that "would make the system work better." Mr. Irvine explained that he could not say, as boats were different years ago and the canals worked better. Because there is now a "bigger class of boats," more water and greater width of the channel is required.

Vice Chair Harrison asked if Mr. Irvine could estimate what the budget might be to keep the canals at NGVD depth. Mr. Irvine said he could not determine this, and would have to see how dredging progresses with the established budget throughout the year.

Mr. Dean asked who had set the current depth. Mr. Irvine said it was established before he began working for the City, and was set "by this Board, in collaboration with the Staff, some 25-30 years ago." He noted that 10 years ago, the engineer

in charge of dredging had appeared before this Board to attempt to change this standard, but it was not done at that time because it was determined to be “too costly.” He stated it may now be more costly to not change the depth.

Mr. Dean asked if the City has contemplated performing a “general survey” of all the canals rather than addressing complaints. Mr. Irvine said this was done in the early 1990s, and priority zones were determined; since that time, the City has maintained these zones and other canals. He pointed out that there have also been storms and construction that have affected the depth since that time. In addition, due to budget cuts he does not have the resources to perform a general survey.

Mr. Dean asked if there was an estimate of “what it would take” to perform a general survey. Mr. Irvine estimated this would be “hundreds of thousands” of dollars and would require a separate independent study.

Mr. Dean asked what effect Mr. Irvine felt the upcoming Intracoastal dredging project would have on the City’s canal system. Mr. Irvine said the effect “can only be positive” on the use of the canals; dredging part of the Intracoastal Waterway would also improve the caliber of boats on the waterway “if the canals can carry the boats.” He felt it might also help with the silting of canals, as a deeper channel would prevent wakes from pushing so much silt into the canals. He reiterated, however, that most of the silt in the canals comes from storm drainage and is only exacerbated by the silt being brought in on the waves.

Mr. Tapp asked if the only source for funding the dredging of side canals is the capital budget based on ad valorem taxes – for example, if there were other Federal or State sources of funding. Mr. Irvine said they have explored other funding, noting that the Florida Inland Navigation District (FIND) will fund dredging of areas with “regional impact,” such as the New River; however, they do not fund local or maintenance dredging.

Mr. McLaughlin said he felt an overall survey would provide “a fairer way of dredging” than dredging based upon complaints. He observed that this might show other areas of the City in greater need of dredging, and asserted that before changing the standard to a greater depth, the City should first return all its canals to the current required depth of 5.3 ft.

Chair Flanigan asked if surveying could be done through a regional entity, and how much this might cost. Mr. Irvine said it is approximately time for another priority dredging project, in which the entire canal system is surveyed, priorities are established, and contracts are assigned. He noted that this would have to be recommended to the City Commission as a capital project, as the cost would be “a few million dollars.”

He continued that structural engineers recently evaluated the canal widths for safety by looking at “typical conditions;” they determined that they should not consider deepening canals that are less than 100 ft. in width. He noted that 70 canals of this width empty into the Intracoastal Waterway.

Mr. McLaughlin clarified that NGVD refers to the National Geotechnic Vertical Datum, or the mean seawater level at low tide. Mr. Irvine added that this is used in conjunction with “another datum” and a logarithm is used to translate the two sources of information.

Mr. Dean asked if a “rolling survey” over a number of years might be budgeted. Mr. Irvine said the best action would be “one massive survey” over a relatively short period of time, as the information is subject to change.

Mr. Adams asked how long a survey of all canals might take. Mr. Irvine estimated it could be done within six to nine months. He reiterated that this would be best given to a consultant rather than done by the City, as a consultant would have access to more personnel and equipment. He noted that the process would include surveying “a few hundred canals” and processing the data from these surveys.

Chair Flanigan asked what the Board could do to help get more dredging done. Mr. Cuba advised that one possibility would be to recommend that the City Commission provide additional funding for the work. Mr. Irvine suggested there are two steps the Board could take: changing the required depth for larger canals, and establishing a “comprehensive priority dredging program,” which would include determining a budget and making a presentation to the City Commission. He estimated that a budget could be presented to the Commission “two meetings from now.” If the Board wished to proceed with a recommendation before a budget is prepared, he said they could recommend a study.

Mr. Rassing asked if it would be possible to “tie in” a survey with the cleanup crews that visit the canals every month. Mr. Irvine explained that there is not sufficient Staff to attend the cleanup crews at this time, and the crews themselves would not be able to perform a survey. He suggested that the cleanup boats could be outfitted with a “bottom alarm,” which would alert them to where conditions are occurring in the canals; this information could then be reported back to Public Works.

Mr. Herhold proposed that police vessels could also assist in this, as they travel the canals regularly. Mr. Cuba said he would speak to both Sanitation and the Police Department regarding the use of depth finders to report shallow conditions.

Mr. Rassing suggested the answer was a twofold proposal: that the Pollution Solution vessel and the Police Department implement a depth-finding program and report concerns to Public Works, and that the Board recognizes there is a larger issue with dredging the canals.

Mr. Adams noted if this is communicated to the City Commission before a study is done, the Commission might "send it...back" and request that a study be done first. This would create a longer delay. Mr. Guardabassi said the goal at this point was to make the Commission aware of the dredging issues, and Mr. Irvine could produce a budget for a comprehensive survey within roughly two months.

Mr. Dean asks who directs Staff to take action. It was clarified that this is done by the City Manager.

Mr. Rassing asked when the \$500,000 budget for dredging was initiated. Mr. Rahmankhah said there is a "five-year program" that budgets \$500,000 for each of the five years. Mr. Irvine noted this program was originally budgeted at \$300,000 and has increased slightly over time. Funds are retained from years in which little or no dredging was performed; Mr. Irvine advised that most of these funds are committed to the Chula Vista area, which has very narrow canals.

It was noted that the communication to the City Commission should also include the reason the communication is being sent: the Board has received complaints from homeowners regarding their inability to use their boats, and the size of boats has changed as well, which could discourage boaters from relocating to Fort Lauderdale unless the dredging issue is addressed.

Mr. Adams offered the following communication: over the course of the last three or four meetings, the Board has become aware of a problem with the depth of the canals, and this is affecting boating and real estate. These issues need to be brought to the Commission's attention, and the Board recommends a master plan to establish dredging priorities which include a survey within the navigable waterways of the City.

John DiSalvatore, private citizen, said he had spoken to the Board on this issue at a previous meeting, and advised that "the main issue is the water depth." He stated that he lives on a canal and cannot take his boat out for day cruises due to the water depth. He added that the 5.3 ft. referred to previously is "in layman's terms...4 ft.," and noted that the canal on which he lives is next to a fast zone and is affected by wakes. He concluded that a survey and dredging could be done after a new depth standard is established.

Chair Flanigan noted that due to the length of time since the last comprehensive survey was done, the depth of most areas is not known. He explained if the depth is not known, it is difficult to make a recommendation to deepen it. Mr.

Dean agreed with Chair Flanigan that the Board cannot make an informed recommendation until they “have an idea of...what the problem looks like.” He explained that the Board’s communication would inform the Commission that there is a problem, and the Commission must be able to direct the resources to address the problem.

Mr. Irvine pointed out that Pompano Beach does not have a standard depth, but has established a priority dredging program. He suggested that part of the proposed master plan could be to consider establishing “depth criteria for different priority canals.” He also recalled that the Board has expressed support for increasing the depth of canals where needed, and said this support could also be expressed to the City Commission.

Mr. McLaughlin advised that the depth of some canals cannot be changed, as this would undermine the seawalls. Mr. Rahmankhah agreed, stating that “any canal less than 50 ft.” in width cannot have its depth altered. Mr. Irvine said for canals of 60-100 ft. width, further geotechnical work would be required as well.

Mr. Guardabassi said although the City’s canals are not considered to have a regional impact, it is a regional problem because lack of dredging may prevent prospective homeowners from relocating to Fort Lauderdale; this would mean loss of revenue.

Mr. Irvine explained that most grant funding applies to “submerged sovereign lands in the state of Florida,” which does not include the City’s side canals. He agreed it is worth exploring the possibility, but advised the Board that efforts of this nature have never been successful.

Vice Chair Harrison asked if Utilities might be able to contribute part of their budget toward dredging, as they are responsible for the stormwater drainage that brings a good deal of silt to the canals. Mr. Irvine explained that this has occurred in specific isolated areas, and stormwater funds are traditionally used to mitigate the issue. Drainage upgrades are also made to stop the discharge of stormwater.

Chair Flanigan and the Board thanked Mr. Irvine and Mr. Rahmankhah for their information.

Mr. DiPietro pointed out that property taxes for waterfront properties are “appreciably higher” than the taxes for dry lots, and asked if some of the property tax revenue should go toward maintaining the waterways. He asked if the Board could recommend diverting some tax revenue toward upkeep of the canals. Chair Flanigan said maintenance funding currently comes through the General Fund, and the City Commission would need to make any changes. Mr. McLaughlin recalled that at one time, the City’s Charter had included a clause stating they would “appropriate funds for the wet streets and the dry streets.”

VIII. Discussion – FFWC Manatee Restrictions

Mr. Cuba said the Board had previously requested that the recommended changes to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission (FFWC) manatee restrictions be discussed at tonight's meeting. He distributed copies of the FFWC's response, which was also given to the Local Rule Review Committee (LRRC) in December 2010.

He added that the Governor of Florida has issued an executive order placing a moratorium on "any new rules prior to his department's review."

Mr. Herhold said he had attended the LRRC meeting in December 2010, and said the executive order makes this issue "a new ball game." In addition to the moratorium on new rules, existing rules are to be reviewed by the Office of Fiscal Responsibility and Regulatory Reform. He expected "a lengthy delay" to any changes in the rules.

He continued that the proposed changes are relatively minor and he did not feel any of them were "out of line;" he characterized the changes as "adjustments." He noted that the process known as coincidental analysis was what the Marine Industries Association of South Florida (MIASF) had objected to.

Chair Flanigan asked if the marine industry had "taken a position" to the Governor's office or to the FWC. Mr. Herhold said a member of the MIASF had requested that the process of coincidental analysis be reviewed.

Mr. Cuba suggested that the Board discuss the subject more thoroughly at a subsequent meeting, as the situation had changed since the previous meeting. Mr. Guardabassi said since the Governor is reviewing the proposed changes, he might be "open to lobbying" from the City, asking him to consider not enacting the rule. Chair Flanigan observed that the marine industry itself might have greater influence.

Mr. Herhold added that there is also a new head of the Department of Environmental Protection.

Chair Flanigan recalled that the Board had sent a communication to the City Commission in December 2010, which expressed concern about the potential additional regulations and their possible impact on the boating community. He suggested if the Board wished to revisit this issue, they could state that their position has not changed.

Motion made by Vice Chair Harrison, seconded by Mr. Rassing, that after review by the Marine Advisory Board, they are opposed to the proposed changes as outlined in the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission report.

Mr. Guardabassi stated he felt the FFWC should be “rolling back the existing rules,” as he felt they are based on flawed assumptions regarding the safety of manatees. He said residents have “already given up some of our rights under the current laws.”

Chair Flanigan said at this point, the Board is simply asking the City Commission to request that the Governor “hold the line” on existing regulations. To revisit or repeal these existing regulations, he cautioned that it would require “a stronger body than this Board” to exert that influence. He concluded that this would be a separate issue.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

IX. Reports

- **Broward County Marine Advisory Committee**

Mr. Adams reported that there was no meeting this week.

- **New River Floating Dock Project**

Mr. Cuba said the docks have been installed at the Performing Arts Center and 5th Avenue sites. They are not complete but are in place. The Andrews Avenue site is also underway. He estimated that all docks would be complete by the end of February.

- **Riverland Woods**

Mr. Cuba reported that the ramp is in place at this site, although it is not yet open to the public. The project is expected to be complete by the end of the month.

- **Water Taxi Code Review**

Mr. Cuba said he and Chair Flanigan had met with the operator of the Water Taxi and “came up with some ideas,” which are currently under review by the City Attorney’s Office. He said this would most likely be on the Board’s Agenda in February.

- **Commission Agenda Reports**

At the December 7, 2010 City Commission meeting, the boat lift Code revision passed its second reading and became effective on December 17. Three waivers approved by the Board were also passed at this meeting.

Mr. Herhold requested an update on a discussion at the Conference Agenda meeting regarding the Middle River Bridge. Mr. Cuba said he did not have any information on this issue.

X. Old / New Business

Chair Flanigan requested an update on the 15th Street Boat Ramp. Mr. Cuba said this project went out for bid the previous day and the anticipated completion date is August 2011. He noted that more information is available online.

Chair Flanigan asked if funding is available for the north seawall. Mr. Cuba said there are roughly 1700 linear ft. on the north side of the New River seawall that are in poor condition; some money is available through the Engineering Department, and he is seeking matching funds for these dollars. He said there will be short-term repairs in the meantime to maintain the integrity of the structure.

Mr. McLaughlin said the various utility companies should mark where their utilities cross the river, as leaving them unmarked could be "disastrous." He noted that signs or markings are required to warn boaters not to anchor or dredge at these sites.

Mr. Adams said he had received a call regarding the state's submerged land leases on the Middle River at 20th Avenue. A landowner had been notified that he was in arrears for a submerged land lease of which he had not been aware. Mr. Cuba advised if a dock exceeds 1000 sq. ft., a submerged land lease is required.

Mr. Rassing said he would like to commend Ms. Scott-Founds on the success of the Winterfest Boat Parade.

XI. Updated Communications to City Commission

Nothing more at this time.

XII. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:12 p.m.