

**SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SJPBAC FEBRUARY 20, 2006
APPROVED MINUTES**

I. ROLL CALL

Roland Wilson, voting member
Charlie Weston, voting member
Bill Cleveland, voting member
Don Butler, County Administrator
Steve Newman, voting member
Steve Conroy, voting member
Andrea Heard, Communications Committee
Tom Graney, voting member
Paula Pickett, TDC
Ray Golz, Chair

VIA PHONE, Susan Wright, co-chair
 Laurel Eiler, co-chair
 Michael Dombrowski, MRD Associates

Michael discussed the findings as he planned to outline them in the feasibility study. The important points were:

1. Gulf County cannot control FDOT or Eglin AFB either philosophically or financially with regard to the beach restoration project from R105 south.
2. The cost of protection from 105 south and the installation of the groins at 112 adds approximately \$3.5 million to the project.
3. The "Gulf County" portion of the project, at \$18 million, provides shoreline protection from R75 to R105, as well as protection for the road in the areas from 105 northward where the road is potentially in danger of being impacted by a breach of the peninsula.
4. The "Gulf County" portion of the project would still function as well as the extended project and would also have the approximate same lifespan of 7.5 years.
5. It is uncertain that even should FDOT and/or Eglin choose to participate whether they would be in a position to do so by the 2007 deadline for project commencement.
6. The shorter project has a positive impact on the state matching funds due to the requirements of the FDEP for beach access.
7. A project without structures, groins or breakwaters, will be permitted as a rule in a shorter period of time.

A great deal of discussion occurred on the matter of presenting the project as a phased project and what, if any, financial responsibility Gulf County (i.e., the property owners in the project area) would be willing to assume for the 105-112 portion of the project if no funding came from FDOT or Eglin. Additional discussion centered around the impacts to beach access, particularly the reduced need for secondary accesses if the project length is shortened.

A variety of concerns, viewpoints, questions and approaches were discussed. The main focus of the special meeting was to bring out this information from the feasibility study, address what approach the committee wanted to begin considering for recommendation to the BOCC and ultimately the voters. Questions were raised about a potential alternative that would allow protection of the revetment area **without** extension of the project all the way into Eglin land. Michael stated it would be possible to perhaps construct breakwaters just south of the revetment and achieve that goal. Financially, the costs would be comparable to the larger, original project most probably.

There were expressions of concern on the time it takes to achieve forward progress in government projects, whether it is FDOT or Eglin. There were expressions of concern that if protection of the road at Stump Hole were taken out of the project, the support from both bayside and potentially gulf interior would be lost. The committee needs to explore the matter to decide whether the recommendation should be to move forward with a more expensive project, whether the original project or some hybrid, if the majority of the owners/voters are of the opinion they support the higher costs and therefore higher MSTU rates to achieve that goal.

Comments were made that working together with Eglin and FDOT should continue to be the goal. Whether to do phases of the project or absorb the costs of the larger project is the biggest question coming out of the discussion because of the unknowns of whether permission would be granted even without financial requirements from FDOT and/or Eglin. The point was made that perhaps Eglin and FDOT are both waiting to see if Gulf County's MSTUs pass before giving the matter a great deal of serious consideration. Without the MSTUs, their participation in our project is moot. Additionally, concerns were expressed that if we committed to a "full project only" course of action, we could find ourselves unable to construct anything due to the cost exceeding the MSTU caps.

The discussion focused on the beach access matching percentages with the different project lengths.

OTHER NEW BUSINESS:

Discussion occurred on the need to get signage up promoting public awareness of the project during Spring Break. A motion was made, seconded and passed 8-0 to spend \$600 to order and erect signs around the Cape reminiscent of the "Save the Cape" posters, directing people to the website for information.

There being no further new business or public comment, a motion was made, seconded and passed 9-0 to adjourn.

ADJOURNED at 1:00 p.m. EST