

**SJPBAC MEETING, MARCH 10, 2006
APPROVED MINUTES**

I. ROLL CALL:

Susan Wright, co-chair
Laurel Eiler, co-chair
Tom Graney, voting member
Steve Conroy, voting member
Charlie Weston, voting member
Bill Cleveland, voting member
Diane Guess, voting member
Ron Westmark, voting member
Roland Wilson, voting member
Steve Newman, voting member
Jill Davis, communications committee
Julia Cunningham, communications committee
Rex Anderson, local resident
Anne Anderson, communications committee
Preston Russ, local resident
Debbe Wibberg, communications committee
Stan Bates, local resident
Doug Williamson, concerned citizen
Bud Arnold, Ashwood project manager
Paula Ramsey Pickett, Gulf County TDC
Melody Ray Culp, US Fish & Wildlife
Harold Mitchell, SJP State Park
Kim Wren, FDEP Aquatic Buffer Preserve
Martha Maglothin, Turtle Patrol
Lynn McKenzie , Turtle Patrol
Roy Ogles, FDEP Aquatic Buffer Preserve

As a part of roll call, a letter of resignation as chair from Ray Golz was passed out and will be made a part of the minutes. Ray's continued participation in the committee, as well as all the hours of time and significant work Ray's done on this project is appreciated by everybody on the committee. Susan and Laurel asked the group if they could simply continue as co-chairs, which was acceptable.

II. APPROVAL OF OUTSTANDING MINUTES:

MOVED, SECONDED AND PASSED 10-0 to approve the minutes of the February regular meeting and the special meeting. Nothing

significant occurred during the lapse in Laurel's phone connection and that note will be removed from the final minutes.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

ENVIRONMENTAL, STEVE NEWMAN:

Steve and Ron (Westmark) met with Roy (Ogles) and Kim (Wren) and had a general discussion on the pros and cons of renourishing the beach. Discussion on if the project was done correctly would they support it and yes, they would provided it was a healthy beach and properly permitted, etc. They may be able to offer some ideas for possible parking areas. Roy expressed a concern on the practice of beach driving. Roy expressed some concerns about sea oat planting as well.

There was discussion of the effect on the bay if Stump Hole were to breach. Roy stated he is not an expert on the matter but felt the impact would not be too great. Harold Mitchell commented on the situation at St. Andrews Bay and noted the salinity in St. Joe Bay is already very high.

The question was asked if there was support from the Aquatic Preserve for getting to the permitting process. Roy commented that restoring the sand on the beach, i.e., a healthy beach would be supported. Issues may come up about mean high water mark, but in general, pumping sand and creating dunes and turtle habitat is viewed as a positive step. They will have concerns about several areas of environmental impacts. Susan (Wright) mentioned that many of those issues will be addressed and resolved as part of the permitting process. Melody Ray Culp mentioned the timing of the project and pointed out the considerations that would need to be made if we received permission to construct during turtle nesting season.

FINANCE COMMITTEE, STEVE CONROY:

Reiterated goals and progress. Looking at the project version ending at R105, which was discussed in the previous special meeting. Discussed and had input from the access committee and 35% to 40% match is the assumption now. Based on those assumptions, the local funding share is around \$10.8 million of the 18 million with a 35% to 40% match. This will need to come from the MSTUs and the TDC

contribution. The other potential revenue streams are not realistic at this time as far as coming on line to help us. For anyone unfamiliar, Steve reviewed the 3 MSTU caps of 6, 4 and 2. The committee readjusted the possible model for allocation and is currently considering gulf-front contributing 70% of the local cost, gulf interior 15%, 10% for bay, and 5% from TDC funds. There will be a meeting with the bonding agent next Friday. Once that meeting occurs and he gives back his input, we can back into millage rates.

The committee also had some discussion of renourishment and how to pay for that. There was some discussion about preparing a review of possible future funding options to run past the commissioners for guidance on renourishment funds out of incremental tax revenues.

Paula (Ramsey Pickett) brought the committee up to date on other funding options being pursued, including a federal request to Congressman Boyd. We should know something on March 16th concerning whether the funding request was approved and at what level. Funds would become available the middle of September.

Roland (Wilson) asked about the status of The Friends of the Peninsula. Susan advised two months ago it was discussed that once the MSTUs pass and we're committed to the project, it will be implemented.

COMMUNICATIONS – TOM GRANEY:

The 4-color mailer, 1,231 mailouts were sent. 40 returned, address unavailable and as many as possible were corrected and remailed. Response has been excellent. Businesses have been very receptive to the rack card. Anybody with a business relationship in the county let Tom know and he'll get it to them. The main issue is businesses with employees need to understand that the activities out there need to continue or their income is affected. 20% of all salaried employees/wage – hourly wages in the county related to business generated by the project area.

Charlie (Weston) mentioned the Stronge report and a series of articles talking to that issue. Julia (Cunningham) has talked to Tim Croft about it.

Future projects were discussed, including one more major mailout in April that will contain the survey for the nonresident property owners.

Two town hall meetings were discussed and scheduled tentatively for Friday, April 21st and May the 20th, a Saturday.

Discussion occurred on the cost how it would be paid for. Paula has had discussions with Linda Griffin, supervisor of elections, and the estimate for the referendum vote is approximately \$2,000.

Discussion occurred on the recommendation of the TDC to the BOCC for an increase in the bed tax which will be dedicated to beach restoration.

BEACH ACCESS: LAUREL EILER/RON WESTMARK/SUSAN WRIGHT:

Update was given on the primary access points and the review being done for the beach access in the area north of Stump Hole. Some of the possible leads for secondary access have proved unsuitable due to location, right of way or other issues. Since the need for secondary access is low – one or two at the most – there is still a good likelihood of finding a willing owner to grant us the easement.

Harold (Mitchell) emphasized how important getting and keeping public accesses are. Another community had 15 county public access only five years ago. They sold most of them off to developers and now they can't meet their requirements for public access for state matching funds

IV. FEASIBILITY STUDY REPORT, MICHAEL DOMBROWSKI, MRD ASSOCIATES:

Michael discussed the recommendation he would be giving to the Gulf County Board of Commissioners. He went over the two-page executive summary with the committee, which outlined the "phased approach" that had been discussed somewhat in the SJPBAC special meeting in February. Details of the recommended project can be found in this document on the website at this link:

<http://www.savethecape.com/pdfdocs/BEACHPROJECTFACTS.pdf>

Michael noted that continued coordination with FDOT and Eglin AFB would create the best environment for the second phase to become reality. It may not be part of the initial construction in 2007, but it would still be viable whenever built, whether two years from initial

construction or even as possibly part of the first scheduled nourishment effort.

Michael noted that Eglin's participation would, in the long run, be beneficial to everybody. Eglin loses \$10 million of land a year due to the extremely high erosion rates in their area. Over 30 years, roughly \$325 million in land will be lost at that rate of erosion. It seems logical that Eglin will take some action, but what or when is unknown. By phasing the project, the door is left open for Eglin to participate when and if they choose to do so without delaying construction of our beach project.

Michael noted that although the recommended project doesn't protect the entire Stump Hole, it does protect a good portion of it and also approximately 2,000 to 3,000 feet of the roadway to the north of Stump Hole that is vulnerable to storm damage. The revetment will continue to be expanded to the north if nothing is done and it's possible the next storm will breach that area of roadway north of the revetment.

Michael pointed out the price for both phases of the project done together was \$21.6 million. The cost of the recommended project is \$18 million.

There was a discussion that by starting with the recommended project, perhaps the momentum would encourage FDOT and/or Eglin to participate. It was noted the performance of the recommended project is expected to be just as good as if the entire project was constructed at one time. There was some discussion of having answers at the town hall on what the costs would be for the maintenance phase.

There was discussion on if there was any possible way to extend the recommended project 500 feet south. Michael explained the "nodal point" and the problem with sand leaving without structures, which then brings the project back to the Eglin/FDOT segment again. Roland asked if more protection could be provided to the revetment further out. Michael stated there would be discussion at the FDOT meeting in Chipley on the issue of the road at Stump Hole.

Roy asked about the sand search and vibracores and whether the engineers were looking at the biology of the substrate. Roy asked if they could be instructed to make that information available to the Aquatic Preserve. The potential borrow sites were discussed and

Michael noted the sites currently under consideration were about 3 miles offshore and outside of the aquatic preserve.

There was some discussion on the MSTU and the ordinance and can the cap be changed and if so how can they change it. Tim McFarland will be contacted to get more specifics on this matter.

After additional discussion on the feasibility study. THE FOLLOWING MOTION WAS MADE, SECONDED, AND PASSED 8-0:

THE SJPBAC SUPPORTS AND ENDORSES MRD ASSOCIATES' RECOMMENDED BEACH PROJECT WHICH ENCOMPASSES THE AREA FROM THE STATE PARK TO APPROXIMATELY THE MIDDLE OF THE STUMP HOLE REVETMENT, CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 5.9 MILES (R75 TO R105.5)

MOTION TO ADJOURN 4:00

Submitted for review, March 21, 2006, Laurel Eiler