

**MINUTES OF THE MARINE ADVISORY BOARD
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8TH FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
FORT LAUDERDALE
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2008 – 7:00 P.M.**

<u>Board Members</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	Cumulative Attendance 5/2008 through 4/2009	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
John Terrill, Chair	P	6	0
Barry Flanigan, Vice Chair	P	5	1
Rick Schulze	A	2	4
Mark Swenson	P	6	0
Randolph Adams	P	4	2
Norbert McLaughlin	P	3	1
Alec Anderson	P	6	0
John Baker	P	4	2
John Custer	P	5	1
Bob Ross	P	6	0
Lisa Scott-Founds	P	4	2
Stephen Tilbrook	P	5	1
Michael Widoff	P	6	0
Eugene Zorovich	P	6	0
Herb Rassing	P	4	0

Staff Present

Jamie Hart, Supervisor of Marine Facilities
 Andrew Cuba, Marina Manager
 Matthew Domke, Downtown Facilities Dockmaster
 Levend Ekendiz, Intracoastal Facilities Dockmaster
 Cate McCaffrey, Director of Business Enterprises
 Louis Villanueva, Marine Attendant, Las Olas Marina
 Brigitte Chiappetta, Recording Clerk, Prototype, Inc.

I. Call to Order/Roll Call

Chair Terrill called the meeting to order at 7:09 p.m. Roll call was taken and it was determined that a quorum was present.

II. Approval to Reschedule Meeting from January 1, 2009 to January 7, 2009

Chair Terrill asked Board members if they were in agreement to reschedule the next meeting of the Marine Advisory Board from January 1, 2009 to (Wednesday) January 7,

2009. Finding no objections, Chair Terrill announced that the next Marine Advisory Board Meeting will be scheduled for Wednesday, January 7, 2009.

III. Updates – Cate McCaffrey

Ms. McCaffrey stated that one of the primary goals of her unit is to provide a service, and they are concerned with providing a quality service. She said that she believed that to be the case as occupancy is good, customer satisfaction is high, and there have been improvements and growth in the City's marinas. Admittedly, said Ms. McCaffrey, projects do not move as quickly as desired for a variety of reasons. She stated unequivocally that the unit's staff is an excellent staff and one that she would like to see involved in moving this project along.

Ms. McCaffrey voiced a concern over dialog and specifically wished to address that, and make some suggestions for 2009. One of the unit's goals is to listen to the Marine Advisory Board. She said that she does not want the Board to think that they are not listening, but does admit that they could be better listeners. Ms. McCaffrey is concerned that she has heard anger and frustration from the Board. She admitted that she does not share the historical perspective that many of the Board members have, but when shared with that perspective, she better understands some of the frustration. Because she is not hearing much positive feedback, she felt compelled to address the Board this evening.

Ms. McCaffrey advised that one of the issues with the floating docks is funding, which has been an issue for a long time. As stated last month by Mr. Hart, she reiterated that this project must be completed in order that grant funding does not run out. Along the way, she said, they have been met with a number of obstacles. She explained that it is not their intention to keep anything from the Board, but sometimes there is nothing new to report. The reports, she said, are always going to be based on facts.

Ms. McCaffrey announced that she had a list of questions from Mr. Tilbrook and said that it is helpful to see a list of questions in order to help this Board in its mission to advise the Commission.

It was recently learned, said Ms. McCaffrey, that a new survey is needed of the New River, which is an unexpected obstacle. She said, however, that she may have been remiss in not bringing that to the Board's attention.

Ms. McCaffrey said that she would respond to Mr. Tilbrook's list of questions at the next meeting of the Marine Advisory Board. She apologized for not having those answers at this meeting. She suggested that the Board communicate with the Liaison before the

next meeting so that they know exactly what the issues are so that they can be addressed.

Ms. McCaffrey suggested that Staff listen better and for all to consider how blessed we all are, especially during this time of year. She acknowledged that she is blessed to have the staff that she has working on these projects, which are of concern to the Board.

Chair Terrill then opened the matter to the Board for discussion.

Mr. Zorovich thanked Ms. McCaffrey for her comments and said that he believed it took "guts" for Mr. Tilbrook to say what he did. He acknowledged that this issue is an ongoing one and that it was time for someone to say something. While it appeared to be difficult for Mr. Tilbrook to state his concerns and that he appeared to be a little angry, perhaps it will not happen again if this Board could receive some kind of status reports. Mr. Zorovich suggested that this matter be placed on the Agenda and if something does come up, staff can so inform the Board.

Mr. Anderson added that if nothing has changed since the previous month, a status report indicating "nothing has changed" should be provided. Mr. Anderson agreed that Ms. McCaffrey does have a wonderful staff that does a wonderful job.

Mr. McLaughlin asked what was involved in the survey. Ms. McCaffrey said that when the City applied for the State and Army Corps of Engineer permits, the City's consultant found that the State has new rules, or perhaps rules that they did not follow before. Mr. McLaughlin asked if a developer was not hired that should have had all these things in order. Ms. McCaffrey said that the consultant that was hired did have everything in order, but this is simply a new obstacle.

Mr. Adams asked if this obstacle comes from the State, which Ms. McCaffrey acknowledged was correct.

Mr. Tilbrook thanked Ms. McCaffrey for coming, and thanked Staff for all their hard work on this project and other projects, and voiced that this is a fine staff as well. He conveyed that his comments last month and this month in writing were not intended to be personal. He acknowledged that they were due to a frustration with the process. His questions deal with who is overseeing the project, details about the schedule, status of the funding, the deadlines and how they will be met. Mr. Tilbrook expressed that he feels these questions to be within the Board's responsibility to ask since there is funding on the line.

While Mr. Tilbrook confessed he would have preferred to have answers at this meeting, as a number of the questions were articulated at the last meeting, he does look forward to receiving an update at the next meeting.

Mr. Tilbrook asked if Chair Terrill is the person the Board should look to in order to make sure this item is on the agenda each month. Chair Terrill explained that in the recent past, a week to ten days before a meeting, he would sit down with Mr. Hart and the Director of Economic Enterprises and go over the agenda. Sometimes when there was not much to go over as far as what staff was doing, the meeting still took place. When not working on the agenda item, said Chair Terrill, a relationship of trust was being built. He expressed that this was not currently being done and that it really should be done.

Chair Terrill said that he believed Mr. Tilbrook was really referring to the last Marine Advisory Board meeting when the floating docks update was supposed to be an agenda item for some feedback. Chair Terrill expressed his impression of the meeting was that there was a great deal of frustration – not just in the progress of the floating docks, but perhaps more so in the lack of information. Chair Terrill suggested that this Board's past year history suggests that this matter has come up again and again asking for information. He contended that how the docks are going is very important, however, this Board still needs information. Chair Terrill suggested that in order to put this to rest, that this be an agenda item – not an update – month to month so that the public is put on notice. It will also be their opportunity to ask questions or to get information on the floating docks.

At this time, Chair Terrill opened the matter to the public for discussion.

Scott Strawbridge stated that he serves as Vice Chairman of the Riverwalk Fort Lauderdale Trust, as Co-Chair of the Master Plan & Projects Committee and as Chair of the Fort Lauderdale Board of Adjustment. Mr. Strawbridge wanted everyone to understand what was at stake here, relating to the floating docks.

Several years back, recalled Mr. Strawbridge, this Board forged a relationship with the Riverwalk Trust when wishing to conduct an experiment with a floating dock at Riverwalk Trust. He divulged that this item became a pivotal moment for the Riverwalk Trust, wherein the relationship became one of partnership and positivity, and it had previously not been so for a long time. When Mr. Hart said that the City wanted to get the project going, but did not have the funding for the design work or to put the grants in place, the Riverwalk Trust put up \$50,000 to get this experimental project going and to see the vision come true. This vision would encompass not only the solo dock, but the system.

Mr. Strawbridge recounted that the Riverwalk Trust worked together with the City, with Ken Greenberg (who did the Downtown Master Plan), and with Beyer, Blinder Belle (on the New River Master Plan). He advised that the City is now embarking on another study called the "New River Public Realm Plan" which is currently out for bid. The consulting team is expected to vision what will happen in the public realm – how the programming, maintenance, operations and general overall picture of Riverwalk will look for the next 25 years. Mr. Strawbridge emphasized that marine activity is one of the Riverwalk Trust's main area of concern, and that the docks are "critical."

In addition, Mr. Strawbridge stated, businesses are struggling downtown. He recalled that on November 1st at Jazz Brunch there were 4,000 to 5,000 in attendance, and there was not a spot available at the floating dock. The message, Mr. Strawbridge said, was that every person on that floating dock had money to spend and would likely benefit those struggling downtown businesses.

Mr. Strawbridge recalled that several Board members had expressed a desire to bring their boat downtown to enjoy Riverwalk, but their boats were too small to tie up to the bulkhead. Yet, the \$8 Million bond investment in Riverwalk has turned almost \$2 Billion in new investment in the downtown over the last 20 years. Mr. Strawbridge expressed that the floating docks are a key lynchpin in how to utilize all of the wonderful community aspects that are available downtown, both public and private.

While this Board does not report to the Riverwalk Trust, nor is anything owed to the Riverwalk Trust, Mr. Strawbridge contended that there is great concern that this project is running up against the funding deadline after all the hard work that had been put in. While it is not the Trust's job to micromanage what this Staff does, it is their job to advocate the best riverfront possible, and this includes the marina operations as well as the upland operation.

Mr. Strawbridge conveyed that he hoped that Staff and the Commissioners be strongly encouraged to finish this project on time and hopefully that it looks a little better than the first attempt at a floating dock. While grateful for the dock that is currently in place, it appears as though it was not implemented as well as could have been done. Mr. Strawbridge said the number one concern was that the docks are constructed, regardless of what they look like.

Dr. Ray Dolony stated that last week he had guests in from out of town and took them downtown by boat to have dinner, but was unable to find a place to tie up. Chair Terrill responded that this was the reason for the docks.

Motion by Mr. Rassing, seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, to have the floating docks issue placed on the agenda each month, and that the Board be provided with a timeline for the project, which would include milestones. By roll call vote the motion was **granted** unanimously 14 – 0.

Mr. Anderson recalled that this was requested a year ago, and that he felt the timeline was not being utilized properly. He would expect a professional update every month, which will keep the Board apprised and help to motivate staff. He would also like to urge the City Commission to tell the City Manager to make sure that staff knows this is their highest priority

Mr. Adams asked Ms. McCaffrey if the project management has a project schedule. Ms. McCaffrey responded they do not, but that the consultant is working on one now. Ms. Adams said that even though the City hires a consultant, it cannot hire away its responsibility, and that this is the basis for his displeasure with what has occurred.

Vice Chair Flanigan volunteered the services of Mr. McLaughlin, as having probably more experience than anyone in the room on docks, seawalls, floating docks and pilings. He expressed hope that the City staff could at least get Mr. McLaughlin's input.

Mr. Ross referenced Mr. Strawbridge's comments about faults in the existing floating dock, and asked for his input. Mr. Strawbridge stated that his impression is that it was imagined that the docks be closer to the bulkhead, and that perhaps there was a misunderstanding about the draft in that area or perhaps a miscalculation. Also, he questioned the way the handicap ramp at high tide projects through roughly 50 to 60% the length of the dock. He noted that the dock at George English does not do anything like that and it looks like it is restrictive, having only a 3-ft. walkway on each side of that ramp. He said that it appeared as though there was some confusion in the design and implementation of it. Mr. Strawbridge, not being an expert, preferred not to give advice on the floating dock. However, he stated that he has seen many others that looked more functional and more attractive and do not project so far out in the waterway so as to impede navigation for other boats.

Mr. McLaughlin supplemented that there were initially two designs for the floating dock and they were "almost like night and day on design." The initial stationary landing was actually too low and it had to be changed twice in order to get it above the seawall height, because the height of the floating dock was not taken into consideration as to how much was actually above the water to begin with. Thus, when the tide came up, the floating dock was actually higher than the seawall, which made the ramp higher. The actual stationary platform, said Mr. McLaughlin, would have to go from the seawall up to the stationary platform and then down to the floating dock if designed properly. If

not designed that way, then when the floating dock came at high tide, there would be a situation, especially with an ADA dock, where one would have to jump off the other end of the ramp. Mr. McLaughlin acknowledged that there were some design flaws in the floating dock, but he does not know which design was actually implemented, however, he believed they went with the City's design.

Mr. Tilbrook commented that the first dock was a pilot project, and the intent of a pilot project is to work out the bugs and come back with improvements and evaluation. Mr. Tilbrook suggested that this be scheduled for another meeting. He also suggested that it would be a good idea for everyone to go out to the dock and take a look at it. Then, at another meeting, there can be a pilot project update.

Chair Terrill asked if it was the will of the Board to request that the first pilot project be included with the update of the floating docks, to which the Board concurred.

Mr. Tilbrook stated that he knows the Board is not supposed to direct staff, but instead to make recommendations to the Commission. He expressed that the right thing to do would be to entrust the Chair to make sure there are certain items on the agenda and that the Chair work with the Liaison to make sure that they are on the agenda. Once this information is provided, he said, the Board's motions can be directed to the Commission. He expressed that after the comments made last month, he is wary of directing criticism to staff and admitted that it can be inappropriate.

IV. Waterway Crime & Boating Safety Report

There was no report this evening as Sgt. Andy Pallen was unable to attend.

V. Application – Waiver of Dock Distance Limitations – 709 Idlewyld Drive

- **John C. Rebhan**

Tyler Chappell, of The Chappell Group, on behalf of the Applicant, announced that he was not going to go through the entire presentation again this evening, but would instead show the waiver request as well as the proposed plans. These plans, he said, were developed as a compromise between himself and the adjacent property owners. It is believed, said Mr. Chappell, that this is a compromise that will allow both the Applicant as well as the adjacent property owner to be able to access their properties as well as navigate the waterways.

Mr. Chappell advised that Scott McLaughlin of McLaughlin Engineering was present this evening to answer any questions about the survey.

Mr. Chappell displayed a PowerPoint presentation and advised that the distance of the existing mooring pile #1 on the north side is 51.8 ft. from the property line. The relocation of the existing mooring pile will be 68.3 ft. from the property line, which will be an additional 10 ft. from the north side of the property line. This is being done at the request of the adjacent property owner to allow more access to her dock as well as increase her visibility.

The existing mooring pile in the middle of the property is at 53.2 ft., and this pile will be removed. The existing mooring pile #3 on the south side is going to remain at 52.9 ft., which is the waiver request of 27.9 ft. In addition, there is a proposed floating marginal dock, which distance has not changed. It was then noted that by moving the northern pile further out, it would give an additional 10 ft. setback to the adjacent property owner, but also would give more of a 45 degree angle for the bow line off the bow of the boat. Mr. Zorovich noted that the current configuration would have put the bow lines directly in front of the bow. This now allows for a better mooring configuration for a vessel with the proposed dock.

Mr. Chappell advised that he was able to obtain the survey of the adjacent property owner, which shows location of her dock and mooring piles in relationship to the properties. It is not being requested that the adjacent property owner move her piles. In addition to processing this Application in compliance with City Code, permits are being processed with the Army Corps of Engineers, Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Broward County Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Zorovich expressed that he was happy to see that common sense prevailed and that everything discussed last month was addressed. He stated that he did not see a problem with the proposal.

Mr. Ross indicated that he was very disappointed as he thought it had been discussed to move the pile 20 ft. to the south, and now it is 5 ft. He believed the discussion was to bring it into the setback line. Mr. Chappell responded that there was no discussion regarding a 20 ft. setback for mooring piles. Mr. Ross said that he felt the property owner would be happier with it much further back. Mr. Chappell advised that the existing piles have been moved 10 ft., and the dock and boat still remain at the 25 ft. setback.

Chair Terrill stated for clarification that he recalled at the last meeting that individual Board members had different thoughts on where the pilings might work best. He recalled that the Applicant was not entertaining any discussion of moving the pilings at all.

Mr. Rassing recalled at the last meeting that the neighbor to the north of the Applicant was upset about the pilings being so close to her property. He asked whether the pilings could not be removed or moved back 20 ft. Mr. Chappell said that the location on the plans is the preferred location for mooring, and based on what the Applicant has now and what has been requested from the adjacent property owner, it was felt that the 10 ft. setback was appropriate when considering the layout of the neighbor's dock and the Applicant's dock, as well as how far the neighbor's piles extend from her property line. Mr. Chappell also stated that this will actually provide the neighbor with better access to her dock, but that she already has unobstructed access on the north.

Mr. Widoff believed that it was his understanding that the Applicant and the adjacent neighbor had agreed to what was before the Board this evening. Mr. Chappell confirmed that there has been an agreement to a compromise at 10 feet. Mr. Widoff questioned why then the Board was addressing what they wanted.

Chair Terrill remarked that it might be fair for the Board to not discuss its understanding of the neighbor's desires because she is present at this meeting. He said that when this matter is opened to the public, she will be the first person called to speak, at which time the Board will have a general idea of how she feels about this proposal. Therefore, Chair Terrill asked that the discussion be confined to questions related to the dock.

Mr. Anderson said that he rarely votes in favor of these requests and that he is philosophically opposed to them, having voted against such requests in the past on Idlewyld. However, Mr. Anderson said, he does not have a problem with this Application because both neighbors have apparently seemed to agree.

Finding no further comments from the Board at this time, Chair Terrill opened the matter to the public for comment.

Dean Trantalis, on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Westin who live to the north of the Applicant, advised that the drawing before the Board this evening was provided to them just yesterday at the end of the day, and had just seen it for the first time this morning. Mr. Trantalis confirmed that there had been discussions about possible compromises in which to hopefully resolve his clients' concern which is simply whether there will be space for his clients to navigate their boat in and out of their dock, if and when they do get a boat. His client is not trying to deny the Applicant their right to a waiver into the waterway. It is understand that the Applicant will respect the 25 ft. setback from the Riparian rights line.

Mr. Trantalis referred to the diagram displayed by Mr. Chappell. He admitted that he is not a boat captain and defers to the Board's knowledge and experience to be able to tell

him that what the Applicant is requesting is acceptable. He reiterated that his client just wants the ability to move a boat in and out.

Mr. Zorovich recognized that the Applicant had at least tried to make an adjustment, since at the last meeting he refused to do so. He himself has an issue where he is unable to go straight out from his dock as there are pilings both in front and in back of him. He believes the Applicant's proposal to be a good compromise.

Chair Terrill recalled that at the last meeting he had touted himself to be an expert, and when thinking back on this, admitted to being embarrassed, as he is surrounded by his peers. Everyone on the Board is a boater and many members are licensed. Chair Terrill advocated that pilings are necessary, while noting that Bahia Mar does not have any pilings off the dock and they operate just fine. He stated that Idlewyld Drive is exactly ½ mile long and there are exactly 43 pilings, either a single piling or a cluster of 2 or 3 along that ½ mile. In some way, said Chair Terrill, every one of those property owners that has pilings maneuvers around those pilings.

Chair Terrill said that the Applicant's neighbor has two pilings at this time. Chair Terrill said that with the Board's expertise as boaters and the time they have spent looking at these types of packages, they must ask if they get a sense of anything wrong, and whether there is a glaring error. As such, the Board has an opinion even before opening up the hearing to the public to find out what the neighbors and community think. When the neighbors weigh in, the Board listens carefully. He said that it is the Board's responsibility to decide if it is reasonable and realistic, and stated that it is so important to listen to the neighbors' opinion because they may be speaking some sense that never would have occurred to the Board. The Board needs to weigh its judgment, not based upon the package that the Board already read, but their new comments that are brought forward. Chair Terrill stated that it is the Board's job not to give a neighbor greater weight than they have earned through their concern and comments.

The Applicant has rights. They do not have a right to an approval of the waiver. They do, however, have a right to the application process, just like a neighbor has a right to share their thoughts. Both of these must be weighed by the Board. Personally, said Chair Terrill, he does not feel that what is being proposed is unreasonable.

Mr. Anderson commented that the Board's purview is not to look at what the State Code is, but what the City Code is and the waiver that is before the Board. Mr. Hart stated that, historically, waivers were reviewed on the basis of navigational issues.

Mr. Rassing said that it was his understanding that the pilings were never really permitted. Mr. Hart agreed this was correct. Mr. Chappell advised that the waiver

process was being brought to this Board first in order to bring the piles into compliance with the City waiver process before going through the lengthy process of a year for permitting with the agencies. As a condition of approval, the Applicant must abide by the conditions of the DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) permits. If permitting by DEP restricts the Applicant to the 25-ft. setback of the dock or piles, then the waiver is voided. Therefore, the waiver is contingent upon DEP approval and that is why the Applicant comes to this Board first, because to go through DEP approval of a year and then come to the Marine Advisory Board as well as City Commission and get denied is an expensive proposition.

Mr. Rassing contended that every time he sat down, the Board gets a new configuration of where the pilings are going to end up. Mr. Chappell agreed and added that it has been a moving process for the Applicant, and has been frustrating because the Applicant is trying to appease a neighbor that is requesting that piles be moved.

Mr. Chappell stated that he disagreed with Mr. Trantalis and that he did receive the plans more than just this morning. In addition, this was discussed over the phone at which time Mr. Trantalis advised that his client, Ms. Westin, would agree to a 10 ft. compromise. That has now changed again and that is why the configurations are changed. Mr. Chappell stated that he hoped tonight what is being proposed is the best compromise the Applicant can offer that was believed to be what the neighbor had agreed to, given that the neighbor's piles are on the property line, do not have a waiver, the dock does not have a waiver, her dock is 42 ft. long which is beyond code, and Mr. Trantalis indicated that she has a 50-ft. boat, which would not be in compliance with code as she only has 51 feet of property that abuts the waterway. Therefore, she would only be permitted to have a 40 ft. boat. Furthermore, said Mr. Chappell, the waiver process for her dock would still imply that the Applicant would request that she move her piles 10 feet and not keep them on the property line or inside the property line as they are today. This has been the source of frustration for the Applicant in that the neighbor next door is asking a lot of the Applicant, when not abiding by the same rules.

Mr. Chappell offered that the Applicant's waiver request is consistent with the waivers all up and down Idlewyld. Mr. Chappell agreed, as stated by Chair Terrill, that most of the piles along Idlewyld are up to the property line. The Applicant's property is one of the biggest along Idlewyld and sits next to one of the smallest lots.

Chair Terrill reminded the Board that they must either recommend or not recommend a waiver application to the Commission and tend not to get involved with negotiating. At the same time, he said, if there is a suggestion that works with people, that is fine, but it should not be expected because that is not the Board's purpose.

Chair Terrill again asked if anyone from the public, including the neighbor, wished to speak, as this would be the last opportunity.

Ms. Westin stated that she did not intend to speak this evening, and came with all intentions of being a generous and good neighbor to a neighbor that has not been that way towards her in the last five years she has lived there. She said that from the beginning all she was concerned about was being an advocate for her own property so that when she obtains a boat that it be navigable, and that when she chooses to sell her home, that whoever purchases it will feel they have a value in which they have invested their money. She admits that she is now angry, but will say that she respects the objectiveness in which the last two meetings were held, and respects the professionalism.

Ms. Westin said that if the Board feels that if this was their property and they were in the same position as her, that a vessel could be navigated without the expertise of a boat captain in and out of her dock area with that 10-foot addition, then she will leave it to the Board. If the Board feels it is fair and she is not being hurt by that, then it will be acceptable to her.

Mr. Rassing asked Ms. Westin what it is that she would like. Ms. Westin said that she would have preferred that the pilings be moved to the setback at the very least. A lot of comment and conversation had been received from her neighbors. They said to her that putting the lines further in front or directly along the setback line would give the Applicant's boat the same amount of protection as if put out at the angle of 10 feet. She only asks the Board that they take into consideration that she is not sacrificing something, or she will regret that she has done the wrong thing by allowing this waiver, as she will not get it back down the road.

There being no additional public wishing to speak on this item, Chair Terrill closed the matter to the public.

Mr. Anderson said that he is, by record, not in favor of waivers. Therefore, he cannot vote for a waiver when the neighbor is opposed to it. He would vote, however, to defer the matter.

Mr. Widoff, understanding that the neighbor's dock is not in compliance, felt that the Applicant was being requested to make up for that by moving its pilings away from the neighbor's dock, which is there inappropriately. He felt the Applicant had done more than was necessary to obtain a waiver, which this Board has granted numerous times in this area, and as such, sees nothing wrong with the Application.

Mr. Tilbrook expressed that it is a challenging process to balance the interest of neighbors, particularly when dealing with homes. He offered that this is an extraordinarily wide section of waterway and for that reason the Board has often approved waivers for docks and pilings to extend out into the waterway beyond the 25 feet. From that perspective, he looks at whether there are extraordinary circumstances that warrant the dock or the pile to be out from the property line more than 25 feet. Mr. Tilbrook expressed that he felt the proposed improvements make it a better situation and that he would support it.

Mr. Swenson also feels the proposed solution is far better than the original. Since the neighbor's existing mooring pile is staying on the north, he believed that it was irrelevant whether the neighbor has the ability to enter or leave her dock from the south and it will not have any bearing on the moved pilings since her piling is there anyway. In addition, to be able to squeeze in a boat, and knowing that the tides there are quite strong, it would be challenging for anyone to be able to squeeze a vessel in between the pilings to the south, even if the ones being moved are not there at all.

Motion by Mr. Adams, seconded by Mr. Widoff, to recommend approval of the Applicant's request for waiver, based upon the conditions as presented. By roll call vote the motion was **granted** 11-3 (Mr. Anderson, Mr. Ross and Mr. Rensing dissenting).

Mr. Terrill suggested that in the future that Staff assemble the documents relating to an application and make one submission to the Board. When documents are provided via e-mail and distributed at the meeting, it becomes confusing as to which documents are to be referenced.

VI. Broward County Marine Advisory Committee

Mr. Adams advised that the Broward Boater Improvement Program (BIP) is a funding under the County to various municipalities and cities for marine projects. There were four projects before the Committee:

- 1) Deerfield Island Boat Dock Project, which passed;
- 2) Fort Lauderdale 15th Street boat ramp pre-development project; which passed;
- 3) Tamarac Veterans Park boat ramp dock and lighting project, which passed; and
- 4) Fort Lauderdale's Coontie Hatchie Park floating dock project was rejected.

Mr. Adams advised there was nothing further to report.

VII. Old/New Business

Mr. Zorovich recalled that he had previously asked about the Coast Guard be contacted about discussing posting the measurements of the heights of the bridges on the center of the bridges. Mr. Hart said that he will correspond with the Coast Guard what can be done.

Mr. Adams suggested that he contact John Fiore and coordinate that with the County because certain issues come up at the County level as well.

Chair Terrill asked if there was an update or report on the 15th Street boat ramp and the proposed changes. He acknowledged that he only read about it in the newspaper and was surprised to see some quotes from Staff about a project that sounds exciting, but was concerned that he did not know anything about this project. Chair Terrill suggested that this Board get a report on whatever is proposed for 15th Street.

In addition, Chair Terrill stated, it should be a "no-brainer" that this Board be updated on such things without having to ask or read it in the newspaper and get such information after the fact.

Motion by Mr. Rassing, seconded by Ms. Founds, to recommend that Staff provide an update on the 15th Street project. By voice vote, the motion was **granted** unanimously.

Ms. Founds reminded everyone about the Winterfest Boat Parade which will take place next weekend. She thanked Mr. Hart and law enforcement for their assistance.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

**POWERPOINT PRESENTATION
TYLER CHAPPELL, THE CHAPPELL GROUP**

**Application – Waiver of Dock Distance
Limitations – 709 Idlewyld Drive**

PROPOSAL

TABLE 1

LOCATIONS OF STRUCTURES FROM NORTH TO SOUTH	SURVEYED DISTANCE OF STRUCTURE	PERMITTED DISTANCE WITHOUT WAIVER	AMOUNT OF DISTANCE REQUIRING WAIVER
EXISTING MOORING PILE #1 (NORTH) (TO BE RELOCATED)	51.8'	25'	N/A
EXISTING MOORING PILE #1 (NORTH) (RELOCATED)	68.3'	25'	43.3'
EXISTING MOORING PILE #2 (MIDDLE) (TO BE REMOVED)	53.2'	25'	N/A
EXISTING MOORING PILE #3 (SOUTH) (TO REMAIN)	52.9'	25'	27.9'
PROPOSED FLOATING MARGINAL DOCK	37.2'	20'	17.2'

